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Abstract

This dissertation explores creative collaborations between Sofia Gubaidulina, a contemporary Russian composer, and four internationally prominent bayanists and accordionists: Elsbeth Moser, Friedrich Lips, Geir Draugsvoll, and Alberdi Iñaki. I analyze their dialogues about both the composition and performance of some of Gubaidulina’s most significant pieces for bayan and accordion. My consideration not only provides a deeper understanding of this music, but it also provides insight into Gubaidulina’s compositional process. By examining how she addresses issues of collaboration, her authorial voice, changing intentions, and interpretation in performance, I implicitly provide a framework through which musicians might approach some of the Gubaidulina’s music in future performances.

Various unique features of the bayan and accordion necessitate approaches to composition that differ from those used for more “standard” keyboard instruments, such as piano or organ. For these reasons, a number of composers have collaborated closely with performers who provide insight into the limitations and possibilities of the accordion and bayan in a general sense—that is, as a bellows driven free reed aerophone—and also in relation to the specifics of their personal instruments, which can vary in terms of keyboard layout and range. Through ongoing dialogues, Gubaidulina and the four elite performers mentioned above formed creative
collectives characterized by mutual interdependence, akin to what sociologist Howard S. Becker (1982) describes as an “art world.”

By considering these relationships, I explain how Gubaidulina and her collaborating musicians crafted her *De Profundis*, *Silenzio*, *Fachwerk*, and *Cadenza*—music that, on one hand, would not exist without her as the composer, but that, on the other hand, would sound vastly different if created with a different network of contributing artists. Moving beyond the compositional processes, I discuss the implications of the artists’ dialogues in preparing Gubaidulina’s *In Croce* by examining four notable recorded performances in relation to the scores and transcriptions used and the discussions between performer and composer that preceded the recording sessions. What emerges is a sense of how Gubaidulina’s musical voice is the product of her personal musical vision, her openness to input from other artists, and perhaps most importantly a willingness and ability to adapt according to that input over the course of time.
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Introduction

My fascination with the music of Sofia Gubaidulina started in the mid 1990s when I was introduced to it by Elsbeth Moser, a close friend and a collaborator of Gubaidulina, who had come to Serbia to perform and lecture about Gubaidulina’s bayan pieces. I never thought that more than twenty years later I would be researching some of those compositions, let alone discussing them with the composer.

Since that event and throughout my evolving career as an accordion performer I have gone on to collaborate with a number of established and emerging composers on the creation and performance of their music. The nature of these dialogues was intriguing because of the constant exchanging of ideas and suggestions. It is always fascinating to see how composers explore different properties of the instrument, how they explain ideas and intentions that are often intangible and imperceptible in the scores, and how these are subsequently modified through our dialogues. More importantly, I have come to realize the importance of these dialogues; much of the music written by those composers would likely be performed differently if they did not provide input and guidance.

For all these reasons, my research explores the ways in which some of the established bayan and accordion performers who are Sofia Gubaidulina’s close collaborators — Friedrich Lips, Elsbeth Moser, Geir Draugsvoll and Alberdi Iñaki — have informed the creation of her bayan and accordion pieces. In addition to revealing the compositional processes behind Gubaidulina’s compositions, I also aim to show how her dialogues with those performers shaped performances of her music. This is especially important in the light of contemporary music performance practice where, in many of my experiences, discussing intentions of the composers has become a sort of an anathema. It turned out that Gubaidulina demonstrated even greater openness to the ideas of the four performers than many of the other composers with whom I have worked. This study also addresses the issue of writing and performing on less widely used and understood instruments, and those, in the case of the bayan or accordion, that are still changing. Indeed, this matter was addressed by Gubaidulina herself in our interview. Nevertheless, the focus of this dissertation is the creative dialogues between a composer and elite performer/collaborators and
how they might help us better understand Gubaidulina’s most significant compositions for bayan and accordion.

**Literature on Sofia Gubaidulina**

The most comprehensive biography of Sofia Gubaidulina to date, *Sofia Gubaidulina: Eine Bibliographie*, is by Michael Kurtz from 2001.¹ The most extensive study of Gubaidulina’s bayan and accordion music to date is by Ul’yana Aleksandrovna Mironova from the Gnessin Russian Academy of Music. In one section of her dissertation, “The Bayan Works of Sofia Gubaidulina,” Mironova describes only the first encounters of Gubaidulina with Friedrich Lips and Elsbeth Moser.² In addition, Mironova’s study lacks a critical perspective on the performance of Gubaidulina’s music. In *Symbol und Wirklichkeit im Schaffen von Sofia Gubaidulina*, from 2011, German musicologist and composer Philipp Ortmeier focuses on Gubaidulina’s *Seven Words* for cello, bayan, and strings, and discusses symbolic attributes of the composition. Another important publication on Gubaidulina’s music in German language is Valeria Tsenova’s *Zahlenmystik in der Musik von Sofia Gubaidulina*, in which the author, a specialist in Soviet modernism, discusses numerology in Gubaidulina’s compositions. A number of dissertations address the particularities of Gubaidulina’s music; in “Sources of Inspiration in the Music of Sofia Gubaidulina: Compositional Aesthetics and Procedures” (2002), Caroline M. Askew focuses on *Seven Words* and provides insight into the artistic dialogue between Gubaidulina and the cellist Vladimir Tonkha and the accordionist Friedrich Lips, concentrating largely on the novel performance techniques introduced by the two instrumentalists. From 2007, Jennifer Denise Milne’s dissertation “The Rhythm of Form: Compositional Processes in the Music of Sofia Gubaidulina” illuminates compositional processes in *Silenzio*, for violin, cello, and bayan. Fay Damaris Neary’s 1999 dissertation addresses symbolic aspects of Gubaidulina’s music and focuses on, among other pieces, *In Croce*, for cello and organ, or bayan.

Despite the fact that some of the above-mentioned writings mention Gubaidulina’s relationships with well-respected performers, collaborations with several notable bayan and accordion

---

¹ Originally in German, it was translated into English by Christoph K. Lohmann in 2007.

performers on significant compositions remain unaddressed. Furthermore, the authors largely focus on the particularities of Gubaidulina’s music, in particular, her religious and intellectual ideas, excluding performers’ perspectives on a collaborative process and performance issues.

**Literature on the Composer-Performer Relationship**

In the last several years there has been increasing discussion within academia about creative interactions between composers and performers. In their study “Collaboration and the Composer: Case Studies from the end of the Twentieth Century,” (2007) Sam Hayden and Luke Windsor categorize various collaboration situations. When performers fully obey composers’ instructions they consider the relationship “directive.” In contrast, they cite situations that are “interactive,” and defined by the composer and the performer both taking part in a dialogue to create a piece of music. In the interactive context, Hayden and Windsor note that the composer, nevertheless, retains authorship of the composition. At the opposite end of the spectrum from directive relationships, the pair posits what they call a collaborative one, which involves an equal contribution from both the parties.

Another perspective on the collaborative process is offered by Izabella Budai in her doctoral dissertation, “The Flutist as Co-creator: Composer-Performer Collaboration in the Flute Music of Hungary.” Budai sheds light on the compositional process of new music for flute in which performers’ influence was an integral part, albeit in various ways and to varying degrees.

Especially interesting in the study of composer-performer relationships is the work of Catherine Copolla. Copolla focuses on the problem of text and interpretation in a dialogue between Elliot Carter and Bernard Greenhouse, the American cellist who premiered Carter’s *Sonata* for cello in 1950. Copolla points out the ways in which Greenhouse influenced creation of the score, suggesting modifications in phrasing, dynamics, and other technical elements. Copolla further raises the question of authorship in her writing. She goes as far as suggesting the role of a co-author to the cellist, Greenhouse.

Work such as that of Hayden and Windsor, Budai, and Coppola are resonant with the experiences of the four bayan and accordion performers working on new compositions with Gubaidulina, which will be discussed later. However, none of the studies chronicles any changes in the composer’s intentions through dialogues with different performers and over time.
This matter is especially important from the perspective of writing and performing on a non-standardized, developing instrument such as bayan or accordion, because many of Gubaidulina’s collaborators perform on instruments that vary in range and keyboard layout. One might wonder, for example, what happens if a composer’s initial aim is not possible given the constraints of a particular instrument or conversely, might be realized differently in the hands of a specific performer (using a particular instrument)? Through dialogues with the four bayanists and accordionists, Gubaidulina was able to adapt not only to the specifics of their instruments, but also to the artistic attitudes of the interpreters. This created interactive collectives that informed both the creation and performances of the Gubaidulina’s compositions.

**Theoretical Framing and Methodology**

In his influential writing from 1982, Howard S. Becker describes works of art as the result of essentially collective activities. What makes Becker’s writing particularly interesting is his theorization of the collaborative formation in which a work of art is created, describing it as an “art world.” He says that producing a work requires division of labour where the person considered to be the author of a work performs the “core activity,” while many supporting activities are done by other people. For example, premiering a new piece of music requires a composer who, based on their skills and knowledge, must make various choices as to how the piece will sound. The piece requires a performer or performers who will perform it (unless the composer performs the piece by themselves). Performers then require instruments that are manufactured by specialized makers. The premiere performance requires a promoter and a venue. Finally, it also requires the audience that will eventually accept and endorse the composition. Importantly, Becker also emphasizes the possibility for change in art worlds. For example, activities that were considered less significant in the past can become of greater importance for the production and existence of the work over time. Likewise, reproduction of the work—for example, additional performances of a piece of music—might involve differently composed art worlds, with implications for the work itself.

---

4 Becker, 17.
Becker’s writing is crucial for my study of the creative relationships between Gubaidulina and the four interpreters discussed here because it emphasizes broader understanding of the collaborative processes. His approach to collaboration challenges commonly accepted beliefs in contemporary music performance practice that I have experienced on numerous occasions, which uncritically privilege composers and their intentions in dialogues with performers. Drawing on Becker’s ideas I show how issues such as composing, interpretation, and also authorship of the work are affected by the intentions of performers.

For this research I conducted interviews with the four above-mentioned performers and Gubaidulina herself. Friedrich Robertovich Lips from the Gnessin Russian Academy of Music in Moscow, introduced the bayan to the composer. They worked closely on the creation of five pieces for the instrument, and his performances often serve as models for subsequent performers of the music. In my interview with Lips, we focused on his role in the creation of *De Profundis* (1978) for solo bayan, Gubaidulina’s first piece for the instrument. Elsbeth Moser is an accordion teacher at the Hannover University of Music, Drama, and Media; she played a central role in Gubaidulina’s emigration to Germany in 1991, an event that marked the beginning of a profound relationship between the two. I asked Moser to elaborate on *Silenzio* (1991), a trio for violin, cello, and bayan, one of Gubaidulina’s most performed pieces. Geir Draugsvoll is a Norwegian accordionist and teacher at the Royal Danish Academy of Music. His connection with Gubaidulina began as part of his preparation for performances of the composer’s earlier compositions, and resulted in his 2009 premiere of Gubaidulina’s *Fachwerk* for accordion, percussion and strings. Alberdi Alzaga Iñaki is one of the most active young accordion artists today. Before starting his fruitful concert career and a teaching appointment at Musikene in San Sebastián, he spent several years studying under Lips in Moscow. In collaboration with Gubaidulina, Iñaki edited the cadenza of her bayan concerto *Under the Sign of Scorpio*, which was written for Lips in 2003, and he created an independent piece, *Cadenza*, in 2010. In our video conferences, I asked each of the performers to describe their experiences working with Gubaidulina and to comment on their roles in the compositional processes. In February 2017 I also discussed these questions with the composer in person, in Boston.

For the second part of my study, I analyzed recorded performances of Gubaidulina’s *In Croce* (1979), for cello and organ, transcribed by the same four artists. Analyzing the recordings, I
wanted to learn how these elite performers interpret the intentions of the composer as notated in the score, and also what issues arise from transcribing and performing the piece on their specific instruments. Importantly, and in the light of the Becker’s writing, I was curious to understand whether and how Gubaidulina’s instructions and guidance for the performances of In Croce have changed through dialogues with different performers over time. In order to supplement analyses of the recordings, I asked the performers to discuss issues such as their understanding of the score, composer’s intent, and freedom of interpretation. I also asked Gubaidulina to provide her thinking on these matters.

**Chapter Overview**

In the first chapter, I discuss the composer-performer relationship in a general sense. Various understandings of concepts such as author and authorship will be provided in order to create a foundation for the subsequent and more explicit discussion on the composer’s and performers’ intentions. This chapter will also introduce Gubaidulina’s thoughts on authorship, collaboration and freedom of interpretation.

The second chapter provides historical information on the bayan, its development, and Gubaidulina’s relationship with the instrument. This discussion helps clarify the contributions of the performers with whom she collaborated in relation to the specificities of the instrument. It will also provide insight into the composer’s compositional language through the frame of her bayan and accordion opus.

The third chapter showcases Gubaidulina’s specific collaborations with the four artists. These collaborations will be discussed in chronological order, from the oldest (*De Profundis* in 1978) to the most recent (*Cadenza* in 2010), exposing the development of the composer’s writing for the instrument in relation to her compositional language, her interactions with performers, and her attitudes toward collaboration.

The fourth chapter addresses performances of *In Croce* by the four performers and considers how they understand Gubaidulina’s intentions as notated in the score. The discussion of the performances will include analyses of the four different recordings, as well as the interpreters’ and the composer’s rationale for solutions to issues arising in rehearsals for performance.
The final chapter of this dissertation provides my understanding of the performance analyses and interviews with the artists. It also summarizes the study as a whole and reflects on key issues related to musical collaboration and Gubaidulina’s bayan and accordion music.
Chapter 1
Aspects of the Composer-Performer Relationship

In Western concert music, the relationship between composers and performers has been addressed from various standpoints by numerous musicians and scholars. My experiences as a performer of contemporary accordion music suggest that the way this creative connection is understood continues to be important in twentieth and twenty-first century music, especially because a large number of the compositions from this period were created through conversations with performers. This is especially common in new music for the bayan and accordion, instruments that remain somewhat unusual in schools and orchestras. For the sake of clarity, it should be noted that although in Western Europe the term “accordion” is used to describe both piano and button accordions, in Russia button accordions are called “bayan” while “accordion” is used to specifically describe the instrument with keyboard.

Recent critical attention to performance and related critiques of assumptions about composer’s authority and intent have brought about a long-overdue shift. The delay was in part due to institutionalization of western art music; most typically, in academia, the activities of composers and the performers have been studied separately. Composers and their compositions have long garnered the lion’s share of musicological study, often to the exclusion of serious inquiry into matters of performance. Similarly, composition is often taught far removed from the teaching of performance. Indeed, specialization within the practice of western art music has likely contributed to a lack of attention to composer-performer interaction as well. Thus, it is somewhat rare today for composers to actively perform or conversely, for noted performers to

---


6 Gubaidulina refers to all button instruments as bayans, regardless of their origin and make. Her scores always indicate instrumentation for bayan, even though some of her late works were dedicated, or created together with performers of button instruments made outside of Russia.
compose—or in the latter case, for their compositions to garner much attention. Consequently, the roles and intentions of composers and performers are often portrayed as disconnected. In the following writing I will argue that, on the contrary, the roles and intentions of the composer and the performer are closely intertwined, and often shape the creation of the compositions as well as their performances. I will introduce this discussion by presenting different understandings of author and authorship.

1.1 Different Notions of Author and Authorship

French philosopher Michel Foucault argues that the very notion of the author is a social construct. He refers to the author as a function defined by different cultural and social norms. Foucault says that properties of the author function, such as homogeneity, filiation, and authentication of one’s work, require recognition by society. Only under such circumstances will the creator be identified as an author. But even then, when society accepts a person as an author, the question remains if everything the author has created is exclusively his or her creation. In this way Foucault problematizes the ascription of authorship as sufficient rational for authority over meaning in a given text. Closer to matters of interpretation in performance, Foucault’s critique suggests that conventional assumptions of composer’s authority are not given, but rather, socially constructed.

Following Foucault, a number of other scholars have engaged in debates over authorship. In his article “Authorship as Re-placement,” Michael Joyce states that anyone can be granted the role of an author if they can provide a different purpose or meaning for a work by placing it in a new context. He suggests “inhibition” or “occupation” of a creation as the main prerequisite for authorship. Although Joyce’s examples are drawn from architecture or literature, his approach can be employed in a discussion of music. For example, the interpreter “occupies”

---

8 Ibid., 144.
9 Ibid., 142.
11 Ibid., 262.
the composition of a composer by studying or performing it. Interpreters intentionally “inherit”
the composer’s work searching for either its meaning or the most efficient ways to deliver a
solid performance. Despite the fact that the composer is the one who provides the information,
it is the performer who organizes and connects it.

Philosopher Paisley Livingston also offers insight into the concept of authorship. In *Art and
Intention: Philosophical Study*, Livingston states that any person capable of acting
intentionally for the purpose of communication or expression can be considered an author.\(^\text{12}\)
Much like Foucault, Livingston points out the importance of the social element for creation of
the work.\(^\text{13}\) His main focus, however, is a creative dialogue between two collaborators rather
than the social context. According to Livingston, the work can be produced with the
contribution of more than one person, but that this does not necessarily qualify them all as co-
authors.\(^\text{14}\) Livingston argues that authorship involves collaboration with a shared intention to
improve each other’s work.\(^\text{15}\)

The above understandings of author and authorship provide different perspectives on this
matter: Foucault questions the notion of authorship associated with individual achievements
and describes authorship as a social construct or practice; Joyce offers an open model of
authorship; Livingston’s approach provides a somewhat narrower focus on collaborators.

Becker’s writing, as previously discussed, favors a collective notion of authorship with a
composer performing a “core activity.” Importantly, he emphasizes the changing and evolving
nature and degree of integration in creation. The variability of these aspects of the creative
process opens the door for further discussion of the composers’ and performers’ intentions as a
dialogue.

---

\(^\text{12}\) Paisley Livingston, “Authorship, Individual and Collective.” In *Art and Intention: A Philosophical Study*

\(^\text{13}\) Ibid., 75.

\(^\text{14}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{15}\) Ibid., 78.
1.2 Composers’ and Performers’ Intentions

According to Randall R. Dipert, the most important intentions of the composer, or the high-level intentions as he calls them, are hard to convey in notation. Dipert states that high-level intentions represent either the meaning of the composition or the message that the composer is trying to communicate. These intentions can hardly be identified without deeper knowledge of the context leading to the creation of the piece. Dipert’s assertions were illustrated to me in December 2015, when French contemporary composer Philippe Leroux visited Toronto. Through a dialogue with performers, including me, he provided not only instruction on the technical aspects of his music but also information on the impetus behind the compositional process. For my colleagues and me, the fact that Leroux’s De L’épassieur, a trio for violin, cello, and accordion, represents the composer’s musical reaction to the death of another French composer, Gérard Grisey, was not apparent from simply reading the score. The information that Leroux’s experience of Gérard Grisey’s (himself originally an accordionist) passing played a major role in his creation of De L’épassieur helped us refine expressive segments of the composition.

In contrast to high-level intentions, Dipert identifies middle-level intentions of the composer, which include character, timbre, and pitch, and low-level intentions, which describe aspects such as instrumentation or fingering. In collaborations between composers and performers, it is often a context that informs those intentions. For example, collaboration with a certain performer can hinder a composer’s initial idea because of the technical predispositions of the performer’s instrument. Similarly, the input from a performer can expand the composer’s ideas by making him or her familiar with previously unbeknownst capabilities of the instrument.

In his book Authenticities: Philosophical Reflections on Musical Performance, Peter Kivy, the American philosopher and musicologist, draws on Dippert’s ideas as he describes situations in which composers have to adjust to present circumstances as “choosing among available

---

This is in line with Becker’s thinking, according to which the creation of a piece of art involves constant choice making by participants in the art world. My experience working with composers suggests that it is very likely that they will prioritize the high-level intentions—matters of their music’s meaning—over the others as they compose or as they ready their compositions for performance. For example, although Leroux originally intended for his trio to feature a button accordion (the accordion part was originally written in collaboration with Pascal Contet, the French performer of button instrument), the narrower range of my instrument (piano accordion), demanded modifications such as transposition and alteration of pitch durations. Leroux was willing to accept necessary changes in order to preserve his high-level or stronger intentions. Leroux’s attitude towards modifications of low and medium-level intentions to support high-level intentions was shared by another contemporary composer, Salvatore Sciarrino, during my workshop with him in Toronto in February 2017. Sciarrino found minor modifications of the text acceptable as long as they served the greater idea of the piece.

While debates over fidelity to the composer’s intent have continued among scholars, it is important to note that many of these discussions involve interpreting and performing texts written with fairly standard notation. Nevertheless, as scholars such as Kivy and Dipert note, there can be great uncertainty about what a composer intended in terms of meaning and various technical matters. This uncertainty can be compounded in many contemporary compositions when new, complex notations result in highly confusing situations for performers. It is, therefore, very easy to imagine the challenges of a situation in which performers are trying to decipher unknown intentions of the composer as illustrated through enigmatic notations. The problem of the connection between the composer’s intention and the text was also addressed by Pierre Boulez, an important figure in contemporary music:

---


Fidelity to the text also has its limits. There exist in music many parameters that have never been written down, and never can be. A score, in short, is the noting down of a certain number of values concerning pitch, rhythm and dynamics, etc. The quantitative relationships meticulously noted down by the composer are then modified by the performer. Whether he emphasizes an accent, a phrase, a timbre, or adjusts to the acoustics of the hall or the characteristics of the instrument, he will distort the notated text and continually impose minute variations on the printed score.22

To make discussion of a composer’s intent all the more challenging, Richard Taruskin suggests that a composer might have no intentions at all.23 In support of this, he offers a personal account of working with Elliott Carter who, during the rehearsal period for the premiere of his Duet for violin and piano, seemed indecisive in his dialogue with performers, providing rather vague performing instructions. However, the question arises: did Carter have absolutely no intentions as to how the piece should sound? The fact that the composer wrote the composition for a specific ensemble, and that the composition was notated in the moment of the dialogue, means that he was very well aware of his low and middle-level intentions. What Carter did not know, or at least was uncertain about, is the way some of those intentions should or could be executed. Importantly, and according to Taruskin, a powerful way to find answers to such questions was through dialogue with performers. In a sense, then, Carter’s position is not a surprise. From my experience working with composers, it is apparent that the more performing solutions that are offered, the more curious and flexible they become. It is exactly these situations that point to the need for more discussion of the performer’s role, which has long been either ignored or considered subservient to the composer’s intentions.

In her article “Shared Intention and Personal Intentions,” English philosopher Margaret Gilbert describes “the obligation criterion,” or the presence of a shared intention and general

compliance of the parties involved in a dialogue.\textsuperscript{24} Despite having the composer’s intentions clearly stated, it is up to the performer whether those intentions will be fully followed; a performer can emphasize his or her personal intentions. This is, however, something that has not been received with much enthusiasm by some composers, for example Stravinsky, Ravel, and Stockhausen. Boulez explains this as a reaction to the extensive liberties in tempi, phrasing, and rhythm, utilized by the pianists of the early twentieth century, and whose performances have been preserved on piano rolls. According to Boulez, such a performing style provoked some composers to express a high degree of skepticism towards freedom in interpretation.\textsuperscript{25} In contrast, Gubaidulina has on several occasions praised performances that differed from her notated instructions. For example, in an interview for \textit{Strings} magazine in 2011, she described Gidon Kremer’s rendition of her concerto \textit{In Tempus Praesens}, which she originally wrote for Anne-Sophie Mutter, as departing dramatically from her instructions as conveyed in the score. Yet, Gubaidulina complimented Kremer’s rendition of the concerto.

This is not to say that all interpretations are or should be equally valid. Rather, interpretation of a composer’s intentions depends on the performer’s knowledge, experience, and skill as they bring it to bear on their performance of a given piece of music as well as the composer’s expectations for compliance. Moreover, not only are the meanings and intentions of composers debatable, but also interpretations of them can, do, and perhaps, should change. As a result, original intentions of composers can be reshaped in unusual ways by performers, who can emphasize new qualities and new meanings. Regardless of their outcome, modifications of the original intentions of the composer nevertheless raise the question of authority. How are we to understand the composer’s right to instruct the performer and a performer’s autonomy to make choices?

According to Peter Kivy, instructions by composers that their piece should be delivered in a specific manner are merely suggestions of their intentions but not commands.\textsuperscript{26} As a performer I strongly agree with Kivy’s assertion. However, as an accordionist involved in contemporary

\textsuperscript{24} Margaret Gilbert, “Shared Intention and Personal Intentions,” In \textit{Philosophical Studies}, No. 1 (2009), 175.
\textsuperscript{25} Boulez et al, \textit{Boulez on Conducting}, 61.
\textsuperscript{26} Kivy, 11.
music performances and dialogues of various kinds, I often witness an accepted belief that a
composer’s intentions or suggestions, as Kivy calls them, should always be prioritized. This
can be problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, as Taruskin has said, we do not necessarily
know if a composer has specific intentions for a given piece of music, what they are, or how
firmly committed to them one is. Secondly, composers’ intentions can be modified even before
performers get to study them. For example, Becker states that the creation of an artwork is
often preceded by different degrees of editing by publishers, presenters, or copyright holders.
In the case of contemporary music, I would add that many scores might contain inaccurately
notated intentions of a composer. This is partly due to the fact that some of the novel
performance techniques cannot be written with conventional notation and typical notation
software. Unsurprisingly, many new scores are handwritten. Also, publishers sometimes
inaccurately notate composers’ intentions. I will exemplify this later by observing some of
Gubaidulina’s scores.

For many scholars and artists a key stake in the fulfillment of a composer’s instructions is the
composer’s reputation. Like Foucault, Becker states that the concept of reputation is common
in societies that value the individual over the collective.27 An author is considered reputable
because he or she possesses a skill that results in artworks that a society admires. Importantly,
Becker describes this phenomenon as evolving and changeable. Logically, performances
certainly contribute perceptions of one’s music and one’s abilities as a composer. A performer,
thus, can be an active participant in shaping a composer’s status or reputation. This shows that
the composer-performer relationship in contemporary music is a complex bidirectional
communication that involves various levels, both musical and extra-musical.

1.3 Gubaidulina on the Collaborative Process and Freedom of
Interpretation

In contrast to Ravel, Stravinsky, and others who demanded strict adherence to the directives
conveyed in their scores—and as such, envisioned themselves as sole authors of
compositions—Sofia Gubaidulina’s music was often shaped through dialogues with particular
performers whom she admired. In her interview for Strings magazine, Gubaidulina explained

27 Becker, 354.
how her violin concerto, *Offertorium*, was inspired by the style of violinist Gidon Kremer. Asked what in particular she found so inspirational about his playing, she said, “His ability to touch the string as if he is giving birth to a new being because of the way he is caressing the strings. By analyzing this quality, my own concept for the composition was born.” About her second violin concerto, *In Tempus Praesens*, which was dedicated to Anne-Sophie Mutter, Gubaidulina says, “I was fascinated by Anne-Sophie Mutter’s name. It reminded me of the goddess Sophia….Sophia is the initiator of the world. The spirit of Sophia is creative activity.”

Gubaidulina clearly acknowledges the inspiration she acquires from the performers. In our interview, I asked Gubaidulina to further elaborate on the importance of a performer’s contribution for her work. She said, “I am convinced that musical composition is a result of three components: the composer, the performer, and the audience. I believe that a successful musical composition must be collaboration between talented performer, talented composer and receptive audience. It takes excluding only one of these three elements to spoil the experience of the composition. Naturally, it is rare, and it is joy, when they are in accord.”

Gubaidulina’s statement reveals that for her, a composition exists in a setting which emphasizes performance as a means of communication between the composer, the performer, and the audience. She clearly acknowledges various factors beyond herself on which her work depends.

Gubaidulina then elaborated on her understanding of the performer’s role, offering encouragement for interpreters:

> I value inspiration of the performer greatly. I really like when performers bring their own initiative. Naturally, it is very desirable when they play the text as it’s written. However, sometimes performers have a better sensation of intensity [expressivity] or time before the audience, than the composer. When I attend a rehearsal, first I like to hear a run-through of the entire piece. If I hear something that adds to the meaning of the piece, not the text,
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because obviously there will be some changes in the text, I try to retain the performer’s conception. I don’t want to disturb the conception that the performer brings. However, I will make suggestions in cases when modifications by the performer deviate to a high extent, such as tempo. I can tell when performers come to the rehearsal whether they have a conception or not.

Gubaidulina’s statement that a performer can have a better sense of expressive segments of the composition, or of time, than a composer shows deep understanding of the role of a performer who, as Boulez has also stated previously, will likely adjust certain parameters of the composition in a live setting. While Gubaidulina does not ignore minor changes to the text that might occur in performance, she emphasizes conception. This means that she expects the performer to contribute to the meaning of the piece, typically as she envisioned it. Gubaidulina’s intolerance for drastic changes to her pieces was confirmed by Elsbeth Moser, the Swiss bayanist, in our interview:

I remember when we were in Lockenhaus [in 1986], which was at the beginning of her international career, Sofia was very cautious. She would accept everything the performers were suggesting or doing. Then I remember practicing Silenzio for a performance in Stockholm in 2000. One of the performers was so inaccurate; it was impossible to play together. Gubaidulina eventually stepped in, instructing the musician to be more precise. I think, from that moment, Sofia became more explicit about her ideas. Now she would talk to you very clearly. Of course, this also came with her reputation.\(^{31}\)

Moser thus points to how Gubaidulina’s confident exercising of authority in instructing performers grew in tandem with her reputation as an elite composer.

Gubaidulina’s scores, much like scores of other contemporary composers, are rich with graphic notations. Although they can represent composers’ intentions in ambiguous ways, Gubaidulina tried to clarify what such notations in her music can mean:

> Usually when I use graphic notations, there will be a table at the beginning of the piece, describing them. The most important thing for me in using this kind of notation is the relationship between freedom and metronomic precision. Most of my compositions are constructed with the principle of the contrast between something that is strict and freedom. In those instances, I use the particular sign at the beginning and end of the section where I want performer to take freedom. After such a section I often indicate tempo.\(^{32}\)

On the one hand, interpretative freedom for the performer is important for Gubaidulina. Not only does she encourage performers to introduce their own ideas in the performance, she provides them with notations that help engender liberties. On the other hand, the composer expects performers to deliver parts of her music fairly accurately, especially those parts notated in a conventional manner.

### 1.4 Conclusion

This section has introduced issues in the relationship between composers and performers in contemporary music practice as a complex of various artistic and social elements. Sofia Gubaidulina’s music for the bayan and accordion, which will be examined in the following chapters, includes a large number of both her own original ideas and those adapted from her influences. Gubaidulina’s stance that a work of music is a result of three elements, the composer, the performer, and the audience, indicates that she does not necessarily embrace the composer as an ultimate possessor of the piece; rather, she perceives it as the result of a common experience. This resonates with the Becker’s theory of collective art worlds. Furthermore, her openness for the input of the performers, both in the compositional process and in the performance, leave room for discussing a more collective notion of authorship. Gubaidulina is aware that the process of interpretation and performance of the composition
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\(^{32}\) Sofia Gubaidulina, interview with author.
unquestionably leads to its modification. However, in performing the “core activity” in the art worlds in which her music is created, she clearly conveys certain expectations that express, even define, her conceptualization seeking a balance between strict and free in her compositions.
Chapter 2
The Context of Gubaidulina’s Work for the Bayan and Accordion

This chapter will provide historical background on Gubaidulina’s initial contact with the bayan and will also explain the general tendencies in her writing for the instrument—more detailed engagements with specific pieces follow in the next chapter. Gubaidulina is, in fact, one of the most prolific composers for bayan and accordion, with thirteen compositions for them. Following my historical discussion and general stylistic analysis of this opus, I present a broad overview of her bayan and accordion compositions in chronological order in an effort to trace the development of her compositional style. My narrative is complemented by Gubaidulina’s own commentary on features of the bayan that have marked her compositions, as well as the inspiration behind them. This chapter is intended to provide a foundation for the specific collaborations with performers that I address in the rest of the dissertation.

2.1 Rediscovering and Accepting the Bayan

In 1946 Moscow’s Gnessin Academy of Music became the first major higher education institution in the Soviet Union to introduce a course for the bayan. The instrument was, and still is, one of the most popular Soviet and Russian folk music instruments and is only slightly less popular than its technically less refined cousin, the “garmon.” Today’s bayan is a type of a chromatic button accordion with keys arranged diagonally in either three or five rows within a range up to five octaves. The left-hand manual, which initially provided accompaniment to the right-hand melodic side and originally consisted of traditional bass-chord structures, was improved with the invention of the convertor in the 1960s. The convertor is a switch, which transforms chord buttons on the left side of the instrument into a chromatic single note keyboard similar to the one on the right side of the bayan or accordion. Compared to its western counterpart (the button accordion) the bayan is characterized by a different construction and tuning of the reeds, which results in its more robust, dryer sound. Some of the

exclusive Italian makers have branded their most technically advanced models as bayans, due to its mythical sonic reputation.

Both the bayan in the Soviet Union and the accordion in Western Europe encountered similar problems during their development. The first problem was a lack of serious literature, which led a great number of performers to focus on transcriptions of not only piano and organ works, but also popular music repertoire. The second issue was the standardization, or lack of standardization, of the instrument. Bayans produced by some of the best-known manufacturers from Moscow, Tula, and Kirov, often had a different range and different distances between the buttons.\(^3\)

However, these issues, along with the persistent stereotype that the instrument is unsophisticated, served as catalysts for the rapid development of the Soviet bayan school, which reached its zenith during the second half of the twentieth century. For a long time, Soviet bayan performers were dominant in international accordion competitions, especially the Coupe Mondiale and those in Klingenthal (Germany) and Castelfidardo (Italy). This, however, was no surprise given the fact that, in its early stages, the Soviet school of bayan playing was greatly influenced by the more established Soviet school of piano playing. Furthermore, the accessible literature for the bayan, which was created under the influence of Soviet socialist realism, was characterized by challenging virtuosic forms, thus creating technically superior performers. Another reason for the exceptional reputation of the Soviet bayanists was a very strict procedure in selecting the delegates for international competitions. Sergey Kolobkov, one of the first bayan teachers at the Gnessin Russian Academy of Music and the teacher of Friedrich Lips, Gubaidulina’s close collaborator, notes that audition tours across the entire Soviet Union were held in order to find potential candidates and that lengthy debates often preceded final selections.\(^3\)

The beginning of the 1970s was a period of further development of the bayan literature through the work of composer Vladislav Zolotaryov (1942-1975), an artist focused on both performing

\(^3\) Friedrich Lips, *Like It Was Yesterday...* (Moscow: Muzyka, 2008), 130. = Фридрих Липс, *Кажется, это было вчера...* (Москва: Музыка, 2008), 130.

and writing for the instrument. As an active performer, Zolotaryov was familiar with the bayan’s technical characteristics. However, his lack of institutional education often resulted in ambiguously structured music as well as inconsistent compositional language. What Zolotaryov certainly possessed was an ambition to bring the bayan in line with established instruments, ideally by encouraging respected Soviet composers such as Sofia Gubaidulina, Edison Denisov, and Alfred Schnittke, to write for it. Zolotaryov shared this idea with Friedrich Lips, with whom he became a close friend and collaborator after the beginning of his composition studies at the Moscow Conservatory in 1971 in the class of Tikhon Khrennikov. The friendship and work of Zolotaryov and Lips resulted in pieces which are considered classics of the bayan and accordion repertoire today: *Partita*, *Espaniada*, *Sonata No. 2*, *Sonata No. 3*, *Children Suites*, and other compositions. Moreover, this friendship resulted in the future activities, which significantly elevated the status of the bayan.

In the winter of 1974-75, after applying for membership at the Union of Soviet Composers, Zolotaryov got an opportunity to introduce his work to a committee that consisted of established composers such as Vyacheslav Artyomov, Sofia Gubaidulina, and others. The committee was presided over by Grigory Fried, the Soviet composer whose membership in the Communist Party was greatly beneficial for unofficial composers. On this occasion, Zolotaryov presented a program consisting of *Six Romances on Lines by a Japanese Poet*,
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36 Tikhon Nikolayevich Khrennikov (1913-2007) was a Soviet composer, a member of the Communist Party and the First Secretary of the Union of the Soviet Composers from 1948, when Joseph Stalin appointed him, until the break of the Soviet Union in 1991. His role as the Secretary General of the Union was not beneficial for the group of unofficial composers, as they did not reflect suggestions of the regime in their writing. Khrennikov’s actions often resulted in keeping Gubaidulina, Schnittke, Denisov, but also other composers, in isolation, denying their rights to travel to the West and visit festivals where their music was performed. In his decree, at the Sixth Congress of the Composers’ Union in November 1979, Khrennikov criticized seven composers for taking liberties in their work. Those composers, later known as “Khrennikov Seven,” were: Elena Firsova, Dmitri Smirnov, Alexander Kniafel, Viktor Suslin, Vyacheslav Artyomov, Sofia Gubaidulina, and Edison Denisov. This act brought a lot of publicity to the listed composers in the West. At home, however, it did not result in serious consequences. A mediocre composer, it is likely that Khrennikov’s actions were largely inspired by his vanity rather than ideology. For a closer insight into Khrennikov’s motivation, see Michael Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina: A Biography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007): 20, 64, 101-102, 113-114, 145-146, 178.

37 Grigory Samuilovich Fried (1915-2012) was a Soviet and Russian composer, and the founder of the Moscow Youth Musical Club in 1965, one of the venues where the premieres of works by unofficial composers regularly took place. Unlike Khrennikov, his membership in the Communist Party was of great advantage to those authors and served in part, as protection and support. See Michael Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina: A Biography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 74-76.
played on tape, and *Sonata No. 3* for the bayan, performed live by Friedrich Lips.\(^{38}\) In his memoir, Lips talks about the highly positive reception of this piece by the committee members, and especially by Gubaidulina, who approached both Zolotaryov and Lips to express her enthusiasm.\(^{39}\) Encouraged by Gubaidulina’s reaction, the bayanist suggested that she write for the instrument. Lips later paraphrased her answer: “I would gladly write a piece for the bayan, but I must familiarize myself with this instrument, that is to say, I do not know it at all! It seems to me that it has an enormous potential. Could you help me with this?”\(^{40}\)

At the time, Lips and Zolotaryov also approached other Soviet composers including Edison Denisov and Alfred Schnittke. Because of his many commitments and also health issues Denisov’s most widely recognized piece for the bayan, *From Dusk to Light* was not premiered until 1995, although he first spoke with Lips and Zolotaryov in the 1970s.\(^{41}\) That year there was a double premiere of the piece, one in France by the French accordion player Max Bonnay and the other in Moscow, by Lips. Despite his serious health problems, Denisov expressed the desire to write for the instrument once again, saying “I now have the urge — I believe that is normal — to write more for the bayan. It is an interesting instrument and has hardly been researched at all. I therefore wish to write a sonata for saxophone and bayan.”\(^{42}\) In a different letter Denisov also talked about writing a toccata for the solo bayan. However, none of his plans came to fruition since the composer passed away in 1996 in a hospital in Paris.

Alfred Schnittke’s first composition for accordion was a concerto with orchestra, composed when he was only fifteen years old. However, that piece has been lost. In 1988, at the Festival of Soviet Music in Boston, Gubaidulina’s and Schnittke’s compositions were performed. There, Schnittke stated to Lips, “You understand, everything that is heard on the bayan is rooted in popular music. Only Gubaidulina succeeded in achieving a new quality; in her case

\(^{38}\) Lips, *Like It Was Yesterday*, 70.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 72.

\(^{40}\) Ibid.

\(^{41}\) On April 1, 1987, the premiere of Denisov’s work inspired by Soviet songs from 1930s, *The Steamer is Sailing Past the Harbor* for bayan and percussion ensemble took place at The Gnessin Russian Academy of Music. This predominantly tonal work is rarely performed today and the only commercial recording available is from Friedrich Lips’s album *Rio Rita*, released in 2011.

\(^{42}\) Lips, 185.
one feels nothing of the popular style.” In response to this questionable compliment, Lips tried to convince Schnittke of the many sonic possibilities of the bayan, relating it to the organ, wind quintet, even bandoneon. However, Schnittke replied, “That is just what confuses me, it can actually be everything: it sounds like a harmonica, an organ or harpsichord, but where is its own true face? The bayan’s lack of a face of its own frightens me.” Finally, Schnittke suggested that Lips transcribe and perform some of his organ compositions.

While Gubaidulina’s contemporaries were focused on the bayan’s weaknesses, she recognized its strengths and advantages, using them successfully to support and realize her own ideas. In interviews preceding the writing of one of her most significant pieces for the bayan and accordion, the concerto Fachwerk from 2009, Gubaidulina clearly expressed admiration and also understanding of the instrument. According to her, the bayan is exceptional in its capacity to engender a metamorphosis of its technical aspects into fundamental aesthetic qualities: “This instrument possesses the most important attributes of existence and actuality, the centripetal and centrifugal forces of everything that exists. No other instrument in the world, generally speaking, possesses such a capability when using just a single button it can affect that transition from construction to aesthetic, and to essence on a deeper level.”

An examination of her bayan and accordion opus in the following sections will expose the most important segments of her writing for the instruments, simultaneously shedding light on her compositional language.

43 Lips, 195.
44 Ibid.
45 Other progressive Soviet composers of that time also seemed to struggle in approaching the bayan. From the group of the composers known as Khrennikov Seven, only Elena Firsova (1950) includes the bayan in a several works. The first time was in 1993 in Crucifixion for cello and bayan, or organ. Clearly, there is a parallel between Firsova’s work and Gubaidulina’s In Croce from 1979, in terms of both, title and instrumentation. Other Firsova’s work for the bayan include Prophet (2004) for baritone, mixed choir, and bayan, and Kubla Khan from 2011, a cycle which was co-composed with Firsova’s daughter, Alissa Firsova, and her husband, Dmitri Smirnov, one of the seven composers previously labeled by Khrennikov. Kubla Khan was composed in honor of Gubaidulina’s eightieth birthday.
2.2 Gubaidulina on Writing for the Bayan and Accordion

Gubaidulina says that for her, writing for the bayan differs from writing for conventional instruments, such as piano or violin, because “every instrument has a different personality.”\(^{47}\) Her approach to the bayan’s particular personality has been to develop an even more distinctive sound. For example, when I asked whether her experience with the improvisation group Astreya, which she co-established with Vyacheslav Atryomov (1940) and Viktor Suslin (1942-2012) in 1975,\(^{48}\) whose focus was unconventional treatment of various folk instruments, has contributed to her enthusiastic approach to the folk instrument, bayan, Gubaidulina says:

I don’t think there was a connection. None of us who were involved with the group were performers on the folk instruments; we just used them as sound material. We were touching them, playing with them. Also, one of the conditions we set ourselves was a rejection of tempered tunings. This group was our private, intimate project, without critics or audience. We forbade ourselves to use instruments such as piano, violin, other standard instruments, but also all the instruments we have studied previously. The bayan didn’t fall in this category because it is a tempered instrument.

The development of Gubaidulina’s writing for the bayan, however, cannot be discussed without attention to her collaborations with other performing artists. Gubaidulina discusses the importance of those dialogues for her understanding and treatment of the instrument:

It’s a profound question because it touches on the construction of the instrument. The bayan is an instrument that is, at present, in a stage of development. It hasn’t stabilized like Steinway [piano] or Stradivari [violin]. All four of performers have different type of instruments. Some of them have two instruments, one manufactured in Russia and the other one made in Italy. One of the most important questions in this regard is the question of register.

\(^{47}\) Sofia Gubaidulina, interview with author.

\(^{48}\) For more information on Astreya, see Kurtz, 119-123. Some of the commercially available releases of the collective include *Astreja: Live from Davos*, released by Leo Records in 1992, and *Astreya*, released by SoLyd Records in 2003.
[range]. For example, when I’m writing for Geir [Draugsvoll], I know that his instrument has a wider register, which I like to write for; but I also know that Lips’s and Moser’s instruments don’t have it. Iñaki’s instrument also has it. I have to come to some kind of a compromise. With Fachwerk, I am happy to have other performers, like Lips and Moser perform it, but some parts need to be transposed an octave lower. It is a challenge, but such modifications are not unknown through the history. For example, works that have been composed for harpsichord are today performed on the piano.49

Gubaidulina’s statement exhibits her deep knowledge of the nature of the instrument, which she acquired over time, but also some important performance issues, such as adaptation of the text, which will be discussed at a later point of this dissertation. The following discussion of her bayan and accordion opus will address the development of her writing for the instrument.

2.3 Gubaidulina’s Bayan and Accordion Opus

Gubaidulina’s writing for the bayan and accordion can be divided into three periods in relation to her collaborations with performers. The first period, from the late 1970s and 1980s, is when she explored performance and symbolic specificities of the bayan; this is also a period when Gubaidulina created all her bayan music in collaboration with Friedrich Lips. The second period, or the 1990s, is the period after her migration to Germany when she intensively collaborated with Elsbeth Moser, and when many eclectic forms were produced. Finally, the third period of her writing begins in the 2000s, when Gubaidulina focused again on the instrument and its symbolism. This period is marked by collaborations with various performers on the bayan and accordion, resulting in predominantly large forms.

The following table provides an overview of her complete opus for the bayan and accordion, which will be discussed in more detail below.

49 Sofia Gubaidulina, interview with author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 1970s</td>
<td>Explorations of the bayan and the beginning of the number symbolism.</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>De Profundis</td>
<td>bayan</td>
<td>F. Lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Bacchanale (Unpublished)</td>
<td>s, sax qt, bayan, perc</td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Seven Words</td>
<td>vc, bayan, str</td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Et Expecto</td>
<td>bayan</td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 1990s</td>
<td>Employment of the number series; diverse chamber-music compositions.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Silenzio</td>
<td>vn, vc, bayan</td>
<td>E. Moser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979 (1991)</td>
<td>In Croce</td>
<td>vc, org / vc, bayan</td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Tatar Dance</td>
<td>bayan, two dbs</td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Figures of Time</td>
<td>SO incl. bayan</td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Gallows Songs</td>
<td>Mez, fl, perc, bayan, db</td>
<td>E. Moser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 2000s</td>
<td>Return to instrument symbolism (construction); large forms (concerti).</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Under the Sign of Scorpio</td>
<td>bayan, orch</td>
<td>F. Lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Fachwerk</td>
<td>bayan, perc, str</td>
<td>G. Drausgsvoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Triple Concerto</td>
<td>vn, vc, bayan and SO</td>
<td>E. Moser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Sofia Gubaidulina’s bayan and accordion opus from 1978 to 2017

2.3.1 The late 1970s and the 1980s: Explorations of the Bayan with Friedrich Lips

The end of the 1970s is a period marked by an emergence of religious concepts in Gubaidulina’s writing and it includes her first composition for the bayan. *De Profundis* (1978) for solo bayan, which was created as a result of the composer’s encounter with Friedrich Lips at the Union of Soviet Composers, is inspired by Psalm 130 (“Out of the Depths”), and it incorporates the characteristics of Gubaidulina’s early writing: the intervallic system, aleatory, moderate tonality. Interpreting the psalm, the composer structures the piece, often shaping the material from a lower to a higher register. Similarly, the intervallic system is employed to gradually broaden or decrease the texture of the piece. This composition also incorporates graphic notations, as discussed above, indicating freer treatment of the text. Such elements in

---

50 Abbreviations according to Oxford English Dictionary.
the composition can potentially be interpreted as the influence of Gubaidulina’s work with Astreya. Composed in 1978, this piece was premiered by Friedrich Lips in April 1980, at the Moscow Youth Club.\textsuperscript{51}

*Bacchanale* (1978) was composed on the poems of Boris Paternak (1890-1960).\textsuperscript{52} At the time of the premiere of the piece (December 1978), Friedrich Lips was on tour, and the bayan part was performed by his student, Vladimir Dolgopolov. Other musicians were Anna Soboleva (soprano), the Lev Mikhail Saxophone Quartet, and Mark Pekarsky (percussion), the recognized Soviet and Russian percussionist. A succession of unfortunate circumstances turned the premiere of this piece into a debacle, and Gubaidulina who was deeply disappointed with the outcome, decided to remove this composition from her official opus.\textsuperscript{53}

Another religiously-inspired piece, *Seven Words* (1982) or *The Seven Last Words of Christ*, for cello, bayan, and strings, is one of Gubaidulina’s most performed pieces, and it was written in collaboration with Friedrich Lips and Vladimir Tonkha (cello), another long-time friend and collaborator of the composer. The form of this cycle, originally published under the title *Partita* in 1985,\textsuperscript{54} coincides with seven expressions of Christ on the cross and, consequently, it consists of seven movements. According to the composer, the main idea of the piece is crucifixion. During this period, Gubaidulina had not expressed interest in numeric symbolism, but she was certainly fascinated by the idea of the symbolism of musical instruments: “I like very much the idea of instrumental symbolism, when the instrument itself, its nature and individuality, hints at or implies a certain meaning. The instrument’s quality and the meaning of music join each other. The word ‘symbol’ means synthesis, of fusion of meanings.”\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{51} Kurtz, 280.

\textsuperscript{52} Boris Paternak was a Soviet poet who received the Nobel Prize in 1958, but was then forced to reject it under the pressure of the regime.

\textsuperscript{53} Kurtz, 139.

\textsuperscript{54} Peter Schmelz explains this altered title of the cycle as a common practice in publishing religiously inspired music in the Soviet Union. See Peter John Schmelz, “Listening, Memory and the Thaw: Unofficial Music and Society in the Soviet Union, 1956-1974” (PhD diss., University of California, 2002), 526.

\textsuperscript{55} Lukomsky, “My Desire,” 20.
According to Lips, who premiered this piece with Tonkha in Moscow in October 1982 with Ricercar Chamber Orchestra under the baton of Yuri Nikolaevsky, each instrument in the cycle represents a religious symbol: the bayan is God the Father; the cello, God the Son; and the strings, The Holy Spirit of God. The idea that the nature of a musical instrument coincides with the nature of its music, or that unique qualities of an instrument inform the composition, is something Gubaidulina would explore profoundly in her later writing for bayan. In this composition, however, Gubaidulina exhibits the idea of crucifixion initially in the cello part. For example, the pitch A is performed on an open string, while the neighboring D string performs glissando from Bb to G#, creating a sonic crossover. However, Gubaidulina implements this idea in the bayan parts as well. According to the composer, Friedrich Lips invented a technique where the same pitch is performed on the right and left-hand manuals; one of them is then bent by gently depressing of the key and applying a substantial pressure of the bellows. This technique results in one steady pitch, another fluctuating, creating the effect of their cross.

![Figure 1. Seven Words, I, bayan part: RN 5. Crucifixion represented through a pitch crossover of the bayan.](image)

However, the way this motive is notated in the score and explained in the performance notes does not fully coincide with Gubaidulina’s idea of the crossover because a note that is bent can only produce pitch-glissando downwards, not upwards. As such, one cannot produce the crossover effect. This example illustrates a discrepancy between composer’s intentions as notated and the sonic outcome. It also indicates the partial knowledge of the instrument’s technical capabilities that the composer had at the time.

In her previous creation, De Profundis, Gubaidulina uses a unique quality of the bayan—air noise—as one of many extended techniques; however, it is in Seven Words that this technique resembles a religiously inspired idea. At the beginning of the sixth movement of the cycle,

---

56 Lips, 169.

57 Sofia Gubaidulina, interview with author.
whose title coincides with the final words of the crucified Christ, “It is finished,” Gubaidulina utilizes air-sounds together with clusters to describe the last breaths of Christ (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Seven Words, VI: m. 1. Clusters and air-sounds portray Christ’s final breaths.

Gubaidulina expressed to Lips on one occasion her fascination with this unique feature of the bayan, which occurs in nearly every one of Gubaidulina’s compositions for the instrument: “Do you know why I like this monster [bayan], so much? Because it breathes!”

In Et Expecto (1985), a sonata for bayan that was also religiously inspired and refers to the second coming of Christ, Gubaidulina employs another compositional device that figures into many of her pieces: numeric symbolism. In particular, she manipulates the numbers from the Fibonacci Series (Figure 3). This five-movement cycle was initiated by Lips in order to employ a large contemporary form for the instrument.

---


59 Fibonacci Series is a sequence of numbers in which one number represents a sum of two preceding numbers. For example: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55… However, the sequence can also open from zero: 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21… Even though Fibonacci Series was a primary means of Gubaidulina’s form organization, she also used series closely related to Fibonacci. In other words, derivative series constructed on the same principle, but with different numbers. For example, Lucas Series: 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, 18, 29, 47…; Evangelist Series: 2, 5, 7, 12, 19, 31, 50…; and rarely, Bach Series: 1, 4, 5, 9, 14, 23, 37… Some of these series and their utilization in Gubaidulina’s writing will be thoroughly discussed in the next chapter.

60 Lips, Like It Was Yesterday, 170.
Additionally, Gubaidulina introduced in this piece a new technique of playing the bayan: the bellow-ricochet. With rapid circular movements of the corners of the bellows with left hand, the performer jerks the bass side of the instrument, producing sharp, percussive accents on sustained chords. Usually, bellow-ricochets consist of three, four, or five accents. This technique, however, does not reoccur in the composer’s later pieces for the instrument. A ricochet similar to the one in *Et Expecto* was, however, one of the techniques Gubaidulina implemented in the well-known symphony, *Stimmen…Verstummen…* composed in 1996. At the premiere of the symphony Gubaidulina turned to Lips after the violins exposed gestures in a nearly identical manner to that in *Et Expecto* for the bayan, whispering: “Well, you gave me some excellent ideas!”

2.3.2 The 1990s: More Number Series and Collaborations with Elsbeth Moser

The 1990s was a period of an intensive collaboration between Gubaidulina and Elsbeth Moser, who was involved in the creation and performance of the majority of the composer’s bayan pieces at the time. *Silenzio* (1991), a five movement cycle for violin, cello, and bayan is dedicated to Moser. Like *Et Expecto*, this trio is characterized by numeric symbolism. However, numbers and calculations permeate both the micro and macro form of the piece. In

---

61 Lips, 173.
this regard, especially important are numbers 2, 5, and 7, which belong to the Evangelist Series. At the premiere of Silenzio, on November 16, 1991, marking Gubaidulina’s sixtieth birthday, Moser, with cellist Christoph Marks, also gave the first performance of a transcription of Gubaidulina’s In Croce from 1979, for cello and organ. This piece incorporates much religious symbolism, and is one of her most performed pieces. In Croce will be discussed thoroughly in the fourth chapter of this study.

With the exception of Silenzio, Gubaidulina produced fewer significant compositions for the bayan in the 1990s than in the periods before and after. Unlike the pieces from her early writing, these compositions rarely reflect the religious or spiritual character of the composer. An example, Tatar Dance (1992) is a trio for two double basses and bayan. Dedicated to Viktor Suslin, this trio was premiered in Hitzacker for his fiftieth birthday.62 The piece blends pentatonic scales characteristic of Tatar folklore, but also extended techniques, such as cluster glissandi and bellow-shake.

Zeitgestalten (1994), or Figures of Time, is Gubaidulina’s only composition that includes the bayan as part of a large orchestra. This symphony in four movements was commissioned and premiered by Simon Rattle and the City of Birmingham Orchestra on November 29, 1994. Owen Murray, renowned Scottish accordion performer and teacher at The Royal Academy of Music in London, performed the bayan part on button accordion manufactured by one of the Italian makers, likely Pigini from Castelfidardo.63 Though not religiously inspired, the piece does display the spiritual personality of the composer, specifically, her understanding of time: “Any artistic work is its own special form of time (just as river has its particular channel but flows along that channel in its own way). The nature of this form depends upon very simple and specific given factors; the relationship between the tempi, the types of motion and the richness of texture.”64

62 The world premiere of the chamber work Tatar Dance was given on 25 July 1992, by Elsbeth Moser (bayan), Wolfgang Güttler and Alexander Suslin (double basses).


Gubaidulina’s treatment of the bayan in this long cycle excludes the implementation of new techniques. Apart from several short solos, the bayan primarily merges with other orchestral instruments. However, the bayan part exposes a connection with her earlier pieces for the instrument. Throughout the symphony, Gubaidulina employs the evolving cluster that represents breathing, which is also used in her earlier pieces *De Profundis*, *Seven Words*, and *Silenzio*.

*Galgenlieder à 5 (Gallows Songs)*, a cycle for mezzo-soprano, flute, bayan, double bass and percussion from 1996, was inspired by fourteen humorous (for some, nonsense) poems by a German poet Christian Morgenstern (1871-1914). The quintet, premiered in 1997 in Hannover, is dedicated to the ensemble That, with Elsbeth Moser as bayanist. Gubaidulina’s experimentation with extended techniques in this cycle is demonstrated prominently throughout the score and especially in the bayan part. In the eighth movement, “The Prayer,” the composer further develops the technique adopted in *De Profundis* and *Seven Words* – pitch bending. Here Gubaidulina practices a reverse approach: in contrast to the descending glissando on a note, she creates an effect of ascending pitch movement. In order to execute this, a performer has to create a sound with slightly depressed key, which under firm bellow pressure creates a note a quarter to a half step lower. Slowly returning the key to the original position creates the uncommon effect of an upward glissando. Since this technique is also employed in the percussion and double bass parts, both of which require bowing, it is very likely that Gubaidulina’s intention was to replicate a bow-like effect on the bayan. The technique, however, will prove very important in one of her most significant creations for the instrument, concerto for bayan, percussion, and strings, *Fachwerk* from 2009.
2.3.3 The 2000s: Return to Instrument Symbolism and Various Collaborations

This period of Gubaidulina’s writing for bayan and accordion integrates nearly all of the ideas and concepts developed in the earlier periods. Her writing for the instruments at this time is marked by embracing large forms, especially concerti. Collaborating with different performers, Gubaidulina returns to the idea of instrumental symbolism and uses it frequently.

The first composition from this period is a concerto for bayan and orchestra, *Under the Sign of Scorpio: Variations on Six Hexachords* (2003). It was initiated by Friedrich Lips, Gubaidulina’s first bayanist collaborator who coincidentally shares the same zodiac sign and to whom the piece is dedicated. Initially, Gubaidulina’s idea was to write a concerto for bayan and choir, but Lips’s hesitation to this idea resulted in a piece for bayan and large ensemble.65 The dialogue about this concerto was begun long before its completion. Due to Gubaidulina’s many commitments, and importantly, lack of inspiration, its completion was delayed. On one occasion, the composer said to Lips: “Friedrich, to work on the concerto, I need new impulses. Refresh my memory with possibilities of the instrument!”66 Consequently, Lips provided Gubaidulina with a wide spectrum of new techniques including the bending of a full cluster of notes. Although she found this a very curious technique, she derived inspiration from several

65 Lips, 173.
66 Ibid., 174.
other technical particularities of the instrument. Exploring the bayan inside out, Gubaidulina established a new approach to composing for it. In particular, she used the spatial quality of the left-hand chord manual to create a foundation. This important segment of the concerto will be discussed in the following chapter.

The next piece for the bayan, *Fachwerk* from 2009, is for bayan, percussion, and strings. It represents Gubaidulina’s first compositional collaboration with Norwegian accordionist Geir Draugsvoll. The idea, established in the earlier concerto *Under the Sign of Scorpio*, that the mechanics of the instrument could be the centerpiece of compositional procedure, was further contemplated in *Fachwerk*:

> For a long time I’ve been fascinated by an architectural style called Fachwerk [timber framing], that is typical only in Germany. What appeals to me about it, especially, are the constructive aspects of the building itself. The constructs that is, are brought to the forefront and turned into aesthetic fact…

> In some of the styles [of timber framing], a higher aesthetic quality even appears. Some sort of essential quality, so that, for example, we perceive resemblances of St. Andrew’s Cross. I became interested in the connection between this feature of Fachwerk with what I’m doing because at the core of this piece is an instrument [bayan] that harbors with in itself actual constructs that prove to have simultaneously an aesthetic property. It is really the only musical instrument that possesses such a quality. That is, it makes a transition from the melodic manual of the instrument to the chordal manual. And the chordal manual conforms to the centre as if it were of the range of the middle register; and the melodic manual manifests something like striving upward and downward.67

This technical property of the instrument coincides with the execution of very specific elements of Gubaidulina’s compositional language, for example, chromatic and hexatonic

---

scales on the left-hand manual, and it has likely cemented the composer’s enthusiasm for the bayan.

The next piece from this period is *Cadenza* (2010), an independently published excerpt (the cadenza) from the concerto *Under the Sign of Scorpio*. Initiated by Spanish accordionist, Alberdi Iñaki, the piece includes minor corrections to the original concerto’s notation, which were approved by Gubaidulina. This atypical piece and the circumstances that led to its publication will also be further discussed in the following chapter.

Finally, on February 23, 2017, the Boston Symphony Orchestra conducted by Andris Nelsons premiered Gubaidulina’s *Triple Concerto* for violin, cello, and bayan, dedicated to the composer’s long-time friend and collaborator Elsbeth Moser, who performed the bayan part.68

Again, Gubaidulina explores instrument symbolism as the foundation for the piece:

> In this piece the bayan is a very important persona. I used the metaphor of the Trinity. The higher register of the violin, and the low register of the cello, are unified by the clusters of the bayan. The bayan part in this piece is the root from which the tree grows. From this root, melodic structure develops; from the breathing of the bayan, which is one of the most distinctive qualities of the instrument. The orchestral texture and fabric grows directly out of the bayan and its breathing. The concerto is not the piece in which the bayan has virtuosic part, but the part, however, provides the foundation that unites the violin, the cello, and the orchestra.69

The late period of Gubaidulina’s work is characterized by different sorts of instrument symbolism, which always serves as the foundation for her pieces. In addition to composing strictly large forms for the bayan and accordion, the composer worked with new and long-time collaborators.

---

68 Other soloists included Baiba Skride (violin) and Harriet Krijgh (cello). *Triple Concerto* was commissioned by the Boston Symphony Orchestra, Carnegie Hall, the NDR Radio Philharmonic Hannover and the Zurich Tonhalle Orchestra.

69 Sofia Gubaidulina, interview with author.
2.4 Conclusion

Investigation of Sofia Gubaidulina’s opus for the bayan and accordion illustrates the development of her writing for the instruments: from exploratory beginnings to the use of deep symbolic meanings inspired by their construction. Noticeably, Gubaidulina employed some of the accordion’s and bayan’s highly singular features, such as air-sounds (breathing) in practically every piece. This indicates her affinity for this organic characteristic of the instrument. In addition, Gubaidulina implemented different intellectual and religious ideas – predominantly religious and numeric symbolism – throughout her bayan and accordion opus.

Gubaidulina’s approach to the bayan resulted in an invaluable body of music, incomparable to any other contemporary composer and something that would make Zolotaryov and Lips truly proud. In his memoir, Lips observes that Zolotaryov, through his work and dedication to the instrument, brought the bayan to a sphere where it could be accepted by Gubaidulina. Through her status as a top composer, she further elevated its status to even greater heights. Curiously, Gubaidulina’s late opus includes only large forms for the bayan and accordion, which signals an important connection between her late language and the instruments’ enhanced reputations.

However, Gubaidulina’s oeuvre for the bayan and accordion would hardly be possible without assistance from other artists, especially performers. How their experiences and knowledge have informed Gubaidulina’s writing and also her approach to the instrument will be viewed through the prism of four collaborative processes.
Chapter 3
Creative Dialogues

This chapter focuses on the processes that led to the creation of some of Sofia Gubaidulina’s most important compositions for the bayan and accordion. Commentary from the collaborating performers will shed light on their conversations with the composer and reveal their creative input during the period of composition. The pieces will be discussed in a chronological order, starting from *De Profundis* (1978) and concluding with *Cadenza* (2010). My goal is to discuss various ways the performers informed Gubaidulina’s intentions during the compositional process. Exploration of Gubaidulina’s compositional procedures will reveal that her writing for the bayan and accordion emanated not only from dialogues with the four performing artists but also religion, her music for other instruments, number series, symbolism of various kinds, and even the construction of specific instruments. I will also showcase how certain actions by Gubaidulina’s publishers informed the production of her scores, and consequently, the communication of her intentions. All these aspects suggest the impact of an art world with Gubaidulina as the central figure. Indeed, she had specific ideas about how the pieces should sound (high level intentions), but the bayanists and accordionists provided her with technical knowledge of the instrument, which Gubaidulina then selectively utilized to realize her vision. My discussion will also reveal that the extent of the performers’ involvement in the compositional process varied because Gubaidulina became more familiar with the instrument over time and eventually explored it independently.

3.1 The Creation of *De Profundis* (1978)

Friedrich Lips and Gubaidulina’s discussion about the creation of *De Profundis* for solo bayan began shortly after the Lips performance at the Union of the Soviet Composers in the winter of 1974/75. Following that initial encounter, the artists met at Gnessin Academy and Lips’s home where, according to Lips, the composer worked meticulously on her exploration of the bayan. Lips briefly recalls the process: “It became some kind of a tradition for Gubaidulina and me to meet and explore the bayan together. Sometimes she would even play the instrument. Actually,
this happened before she wrote *De Profundis*, but also *Et Expecto, Seven Words*, and *Under the Sign of Scorpio* [see Plate 1].”

Gubaidulina told me that visiting Lips’s classes at Gnessin Academy was necessary in order to get deeply acquainted with the instrument, especially in exploring practical aspects. She added that for her, this was an invaluable experience. Lips also prepared for Gubaidulina a concise manual on writing for the instrument, a document which he often shared with other composers as well (see Appendices A1, A2, and A3).

Gubaidulina presented Lips with the first version of *De Profundis* in 1978 at Gnessin, where she performed the score on the piano. Asked to discuss the changes and modifications he suggested after the first presentation, Lips says: “Some composer’s writing requires a lot of changing, while other composers understand the possibilities of the instrument instantaneously. Gubaidulina belongs to the second group of the composers. I haven’t changed much of the first version; I rather adapted some sections for the bayan.”

However, Lips adds that the composer accepted his suggestion to incorporate two extended techniques in the piece. The first is the pitch-bend, produced by simultaneously depressing the indicated key and increasing the bellow pressure. This results in a lowering of the original pitch and is also known as a tone-glissando (Figure 5).

![Figure 5. De Profundis: m. 149. Pitch-bend technique originally suggested by Friedrich Lips.](Image)

The second extended technique suggested by Lips involves a rapid switching of the chin stops during a continuous cluster, resulting in a fast alteration of timbre (Figure 6).

---


71 Ibid.
In addition to the extended techniques he suggested upon hearing the piano version of the piece, Lips’s performance of Zolotaryov’s third sonata also familiarized Gubaidulina with the technique that would become the hallmark of *De Profundis*: the low-reed bellow tremolo (Figures 7 and 8).

Lips describes how this appealing technique was of interest to other composers at the time:

I performed Zolotaryov’s *Sonata No. 3* for Alfred Schnittke at Gnessin Academy because he wanted to write a concerto for the bayan. I also performed the same composition for Edison Denisov and Sofia Gubaidulina, and they were all really impressed by this effect… This very low sonority became embodied in *De Profundis*, which is based on Psalm 130, “Out of the Depths.” The composition is a cycle of episodes developing from a low to a

---

72 Used with kind permission of Karthause-Schmülling Edition, Musikverlag Ulrich Schmülling, Germany.
high register. *De Profundis* opens in a lowest possible register of the bayan and finishes in the highest.⁷³

Despite his important contributions to the composition, Lips told me that he does not consider himself to be a co-author but instead fully embraces the idea of his role as an advisor to the composer:

The word co-author is very strong. I think my role, as a performer, is to make composer’s creations bayan-friendly. Sometimes composers, and especially those unfamiliar with the bayan, think about the piano when they write for our instrument. My duty is to adapt their compositions and make them playable on the bayan. This sometimes involves changing of the text, but more in a manner of rearranging, rather than rewriting.

As Lips’s statement suggests, *De Profundis* does contain material that indicates that Gubaidulina was thinking about more conventional keyboard instruments. In addition to the bayan techniques Gubaidulina learned from Lips, her first composition for the instrument also exhibits influences from her early music for piano and organ. For example, *De Profundis* utilizes percussive clusters notated on the right and left-hand manuals interchangeably; a technique evident in the first movement of a fourteen-movement cycle for piano dedicated to children entitled *Musical Toys* (Figures 9 and 10). It is notable here, however, that while the medium is piano, there is some reference to the particularities of a bellows driven, free-reed instrument. The title of the movement is “Mechanical Accordion.”⁷⁴

![Figure 9. Musical Toys, I: mm. 16-18. Percussive clusters on the right and left hand.](image)

⁷³ Friedrich Lips, interview with author.

⁷⁴ The original title of the movement “Zavodnaya Garmoshka,” refers to the Russian folk instrument, garmon, not bayan.
De Profundis also shares similarities with Gubaidulina’s music for organ. For example, the bayan piece contains an extensive basso continuo accompanied by a slow chord progression reminiscent of the one heard in Detto I for percussion and organ, which was written the same year (1978) (Figures 11 and 12).

Another similarity between De Profundis and Gubaidulina’s music for organ is an intervallic system, in which sonorities evolve from narrow to wide range. This compositional tool is exemplified by the evolving clusters in Light and Darkness (1977), for solo organ (Figures 13 and 14).
After the completion of the score for *De Profundis*, Gubaidulina and Lips started working on its interpretation for performance. Lips told me that during this process, Gubaidulina was very open to his suggestions, willing to let him exercise a great deal of interpretive freedom: “Gubaidulina is very delicate. She is very thankful and appreciative when I perform her compositions, and she rarely interferes. That’s perhaps because our artistic senses often coincide. Also, her writing clearly represents her ideas; it does not require much of a dialogue.”

Lips premiered *De Profundis* on April 8, 1980, at the Moscow Musical Youth Club. At the time, he also performed the piece in other countries. This, however, placed Lips in a complicated situation with the Soviet authorities, who demanded that they approve the programming of the international performances in an effort to ensure that performers did not express any anti-Soviet ideas. Composed in untraditional language, *De Profundis* was certainly of a great interest for the administration because it reflected a rebellious character of the composer. As explained by Lips in his memoirs, he met with a highly positioned official at the Soviet Ministry of Culture of the Soviet Union, Valery Michailovich Kurshiyamsky, in order to explain certain elements of the composition, especially extended techniques, Kurshiyamsky had found potentially obscure.\(^{75}\) Eventually, Lips was granted permission to perform *De Profundis* abroad.

\(^{75}\) Lips, *Like It Was Yesterday*, 75.
Lips’s performances and the recording he made of *De Profundis* have served as important models for young bayanists and accordionists. Important here is that he often makes slight modifications of the score. In our interview, Lips referred to his rendition of a particular section of the piece: “When you listen to my interpretation of *De Profundis*, you will find that my performance deviates from the score in certain sections. For example, I perform the *recitativo* section [m. 151] contrasting indicated dynamics. What matters is the idea and music, which I always realize following my feelings.”

He told me, further, that he also encourages his students to do the same as long as they “demonstrate certain artistic taste.” This is in accordance with Gubaidulina’s thinking about freedom of interpretation, where she emphasizes creative insight of the performer. Indicative of Lips’s ideas about the relationship between the score and performance, authorship, and even the nature of the musical composition, the bayanist told me: “The piece cannot exist only as a text. One of the prominent Russian interpreters once said: ‘The performance is the second creation.’ Still, that does not make performers co-authors. It would be unfair to call us [performers] the co-authors of any piece by Gubaidulina. I personally don’t need that kind of recognition.” Interestingly, this is in contrast to Lips’s viewpoints expressed in his book *The Art of Bayan Playing* from 1991, where he states that the interpreter can undoubtedly be considered a co-author of the piece.

Lips suggests that the role of a performer in the creation of the composition is secondary, however, he acknowledges the importance of the performers, and the performance, for the existence of the compositions. This is in line with Nicholas Cook’s horizontal understanding of the musical work, which discusses the contributions of composers and performers as all contributing to its identity and meaning.

---

76 Lips’s interpretation of *De Profundis* is featured on his second studio release *De Profundis* from 1992. See Friedrich Lips, *De Profundis*, Lips CD 002.

Lips has continued to contribute to subsequent creations of *De Profundis*. In 2015 Gubaidulina’s publisher, Hans Sikorski from Hamburg, released a new edition of the score with Lips as an editor. Clearly, this indicates that his involvement in the production of the score did not stop with the initial collaboration with Gubaidulina. The new edition of *De Profundis* includes minor changes and additions to the edition from 1990 (Figures 15 and 16).  

![Figure 15. De Profundis (1990 edition): mm. 28-30. Missing tremolo marking between high A and Bb.](image)

![Figure 16. De Profundis (2015 edition): mm. 27-29. The missing tremolo marking included.](image)

Lips’s connection with *De Profundis* is thus heterogeneous: he initiated the writing of the piece and also assisted Gubaidulina in developing a better understanding of the bayan to support a more idiomatic composition. He also exposed her to Zolotaryov’s *Sonata No. 3*, in which she first heard the low-cluster tremolo effect that she later adopted and modified for her own use. Later, Lips’s connections with a high official of the Communist Party paved the way for international performances of the composition, which not only helped promote Gubaidulina’s work for the instrument, but also informed how subsequent accordionists have come to understand it. Again, as Nicholas Cook might say, his concerts and recording along with his teaching and the score itself all inform how we might understand *De Profundis* as a work. This

---

78 In the first official score of *De Profundis* published in 1990, by Musikverlag Ulrich Schmülling, Friedrich Lips was acknowledged only as a dedicatee.
process continued with the 2015 edition of the piece for which the bayanist slightly revised its score.

3.1.1 Formal Analysis and Compositional Language of *De Profundis*

*De Profundis* consists of thirteen short episodes, three of which are unmeasured (Introduction, Improvisation 1, and Improvisation 2). In our interview, Friedrich Lips notes that the composer structures each episode of *De Profundis* with material ascending in register, from low to high. In addition, Gubaidulina often builds intervals and sonorities by gradually expanding or reducing the material (Figures 13 and 14). These compositional techniques are important because they not only set the foundation for this piece, but they also characterize Gubaidulina’s early oeuvre.

The general structure of *De Profundis* is presented in the following diagram (Table 3.1). It should be noted that the first section of the piece, Introduction, is considered as a single measure. Measure 2, therefore, occurs on page 2, at the beginning of the 4/4 measure. For the purpose of easier identification of the material, the Timeline column provides the timing of Lips’s performance of the piece released as a recording in 1992.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>T/PT/CHR/TT/VT</th>
<th>Pitch centre</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>Expanding RH cluster in a low register † ‡</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bellow-shake, RH cluster glissando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>01:35</td>
<td>Ascending sequence (alternating M3rd, VT, m3rd...) †</td>
<td>CHR?, TT, VT</td>
<td>E, ?</td>
<td>LH clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>15-42</td>
<td>02:13</td>
<td>Slow major-chord progressions (LH) † and short quick passages (RH)</td>
<td>T?, CHR?</td>
<td>G, ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>43-65</td>
<td>03:41</td>
<td>Rhythmic chord sequence (RH →, LH ↓) and a descending glissandi sequence (RH †)</td>
<td>PT, CHR?</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>RH vibrato, glissando, bellow-shake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>66-81</td>
<td>04:31</td>
<td>Ascending sequence of expanding clusters (RH †)</td>
<td>CHR?, TT, VT</td>
<td></td>
<td>RH clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>82-92</td>
<td>04:50</td>
<td>RH-LH mirrored melodies †</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>04:59</td>
<td>= 2, evolving RH-LH chromatic sequence †</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td></td>
<td>RH clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-105</td>
<td>05:09</td>
<td>= e †</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106-113</td>
<td>05:16</td>
<td>Canon-like RH/LH material → CHR</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114-121</td>
<td>05:21</td>
<td>Continuous ascending chromatic trill on both hands †</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improv. 1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>05:37</td>
<td>Percussive improvisatory section † ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RH and LH clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>123-146</td>
<td>05:53</td>
<td>Ascending slow major chord progression (RH) † and ascending basso continuo (LH) †</td>
<td>T?, CHR</td>
<td>B...E</td>
<td>RH and LH clusters, bellow-shake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improv. 2</td>
<td>147-150</td>
<td>06:18</td>
<td>Diverse extended techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RH and LH cluster gliss. in contrary motion, air-sounds, pitch bending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>151-180</td>
<td>07:42</td>
<td>Ascending RH <em>recitativo</em> melody †</td>
<td>CHR, TT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>181-193</td>
<td>09:22</td>
<td>= 3 and 6, Alternating sequence of ascending slow chord progression and expanding clusters †</td>
<td>T?, CHR?</td>
<td>C...G</td>
<td>LH cluster gliss., rapid chin register changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>194-203</td>
<td>10:09</td>
<td>= 14 with a long sustained chord of the LH → 3 and 14, long continuous melody (RH) with the sustained chord of the LH →</td>
<td>T? CHR?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204-213</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
Intro = Introduction, Improv = Improvisation, RH = Right hand, LH = Left hand
T = Tonality, PT = Pentatomicism, CHR = Chromaticism, TT = Tritone, VT = Viennese Trichord
† = Ascending movement, ‡ = Descending movement, → = Static material

Table 3.1 Form diagram for *De Profundis.*
Although the central idea of the piece is the ascending movement (“Out of the Depths”), throughout *De Profundis* the material develops in various ways: it transfers from one hand to another maintaining its direction; hands move in opposite directions; the material in one hand moves while it stagnates in other hand (Figure 17). The hands also briefly cross over in register at the end of Section b (m. 42). However it is unlikely that this gesture represents a religious idea.

![Figure 17. De Profundis: mm. 42-59. The hand crossover (m. 42) and the segment of Section c.](image)

A comprehensive overview of the melodic tendencies is illustrated in the following diagram (Table 3.2).
Table 3.2 General melodic tendencies of *De Profundis*. 
In addition, Gubaidulina employs different techniques working with material. For example, In Introduction and Improvisation 1, she uses clusters to shape evolving wave-like textures (Figures 18 and 19).

![Figure 18. De Profundis: m. 1. The segment of Introduction.](image1)

In Improvisation 2 the composer incorporates a wide spectrum of extended techniques: cluster glissandi, air-sounds, and pitch-bend, cementing an experimental approach and the influence of Gubaidulina’s experience as an improviser with Astreya. However, this section also exhibits the linear movement of the material. For example, in m. 147, the right-hand cluster moves downwards, while the left-hand cluster heads upwards (Figure 20).

![Figure 19. De Profundis: m. 122. Comparable movement in Improvisation 1.](image2)

![Figure 20. De Profundis: mm. 147-148. Cluster glissandi in contrary motion and air-sounds.](image3)
The compositional language of the piece includes moderate tonality (major chord progressions), pitch assemblages (largely focusing on perfect fourth/fifth and minor second intervals) and clusters. Gubaidulina, however, often combines these elements (Figure 21).

**Figure 21. De Profundis: mm. 17-20.** Quick melodies based on minor seconds and perfect fourths and fifths (right hand), ascending major chord progression (left hand).

In her interviews, Gubaidulina often emphasizes the influence of Bach’s music in her writing. In *De Profundis* this is clearly exhibited in Section e through the employment of a baroque technique – mirroring melodies. Again, the composer uses ascending movement of the text (Figure 22).

**Figure 22. De Profundis: mm. 82-85.** Ascending mirrored melodies in the right and left hand.

In her later work Gubaidulina retains techniques characteristic of her early writing, although slightly modified. She utilizes the linear movement of melodies in contrary motion to symbolically suggest crossover, or the cross. This is especially important in her piece *In Croce* (1979) for cello and organ, which will be discussed at length in the following chapter.

Analysis of the compositional techniques used in *De Profundis* showcases various influences. The composition partially incorporates elements from Gubaidulina’s creations for other instruments, particularly piano and organ. Further writing will reveal that this influence was less significant in her later pieces for the bayan and accordion. Also, *De Profundis* displays the emergence in Gubaidulina’s writing based on religious ideas, which will become a central theme throughout her later oeuvre. Finally, the input of Friedrich Lips, although focused
primarily on extended techniques, will prove important later as Gubaidulina develops her knowledge of the bayan, utilizing and developing those techniques to actualize her religious and intellectual perceptions.

3.2 The Creation of Silenzio (1991)

After the completion of De Profundis in 1978, Gubaidulina composed three new pieces for the bayan. Since she withdrew one, only two of them, Seven Words (1982), for cello, bayan, and strings, and Et Expecto (1985) for solo bayan, belong to her official opus.

Gubaidulina’s next piece for bayan, Silenzio, would follow some time after De Profundis at the request of Swiss-born bayan performer Elsbeth Moser. The two initially met in Moscow in 1985, when Moser was part of a trio with violin and cello in which her bayan took a role similar to that of the piano. In our interview, Moser recalled her first encounter with Gubaidulina:

My first contact with Gubaidulina’s music was through De Profundis, in the beginning of the 1980s. With the help of Friedrich Lips, I was able to get an insight into the piece, which was really an exciting moment, although she [Gubaidulina] was not very well known in the West at the time… I first met her in Moscow in 1985, when I took my bayan there for repairing. We met at Gnessin Academy where she gave me the score for Seven Words. However, the next year, Gidon Kremer invited Gubaidulina to his festival in Lockenhaus. He also invited David Geringas and me to perform Seven Words with the Deutsche Kammerphilharmonie, and that was the first time Seven Words was performed in the West. That was also the first time Gubaidulina visited a western European country, which was a very important moment for her career.79

The next contact between the performer and Gubaidulina was of a different nature. In January 1991, Moser received a call from Musikverlag Hans Sikorski stating that Gubaidulina required help leaving the Soviet Union, which was in the midst of dramatic political and social

79 Elsbeth Moser, interview with author.
upheaval. Instantly, Moser reached out to her connections at the Ministry for Science and Culture of Lower Saxony; as a result of her effort, Gubaidulina was able to move to Germany later that year.\textsuperscript{80}

Gubaidulina completed \textit{Silenzio}, a five-movement cycle for violin, cello, and bayan, shortly after her relocation. With support from the Hannoverische Gesellschaft für Neue Musik, \textit{Silenzio} was Gubaidulina’s gift to Moser.\textsuperscript{81} The bayanist also told me that \textit{Silenzio} represents Gubaidulina’s reaction to the dramatic events that occurred on the streets of Moscow in 1991, thus its title.\textsuperscript{82}

During our interview, Moser discussed the modifications she made to the first version of the piece she commissioned. She stated, “There was not much to change.” This is unsurprising because the trio was Gubaidulina’s fourth piece for the bayan, and her knowledge of the instrument had expanded significantly since \textit{De Profundis}.

On the other hand, Moser told me that several changes were suggested by the composer as a result of hearing performances of \textit{Silenzio}:

For example, the bayan cadenza at the end of the first movement: we talked about the registration here because the original manuscript had no registration markings and Sofia wanted to make this descending movement of the register very clear. We eventually came up with the actual registration. We also concluded that the high Ab note should be held throughout the first five measures of the cadenza, and not repeated, as it stands in the score now [Figure 23].

\textsuperscript{80} Elsbeth Moser, interview with author.
\textsuperscript{81} Kurtz, 220-221.
\textsuperscript{82} Elsbeth Moser, interview with author.
Figure 23. *Silenzio*, I: mm. 73-87. Bayan Cadenza 1. According to Moser, the high Ab note should be held.

Moser further refers to another modification that was made as a result of her and Gubaidulina’s joint work on the piece: “Then in the third movement, at RN 31, we both agreed to double the first three notes of the left hand. If you play these notes only in the left hand, the sonority sounds empty [Figure 24].”

Figure 24. *Silenzio*, III: mm. 164-168. Notes doubled on both manuals.

Asked whether this was her suggestion, Moser replied that all the changes were made through a dialogue with Gubaidulina: “nothing alone.”

Moser also discussed the opening of the fifth movement of *Silenzio* as an example of their systematic process of preparing the piece for performance. In the score, Gubaidulina suggests simultaneous execution of a high C note and “air sounds” on the bayan (Figure 25), but Moser suggested exclusion of the air-noises due to a limitation in the construction of the instrument: pushing the air-button to create the air sounds diminishes the airflow necessary to activate the reeds.
Moser and I then discussed the fifth movement bayan cadenza, as another example of her collaboration with the composer. This time, the change was a matter of the performer’s personal aesthetic vision for the piece rather than the potential of the instrument:

This cadenza represents God’s anger. It is his narrative from the sky to the people on Earth, and that is why it contains predominantly descending movement. It should be performed in an energetic and convincing manner. The only segment we have modified here is the last part of the cadenza. Gubaidulina had originally notated clusters in the range of the seventh in the left hand, and I think that was a suggestion of Lips back in Moscow, but I think they are too thick and overpower the right hand. Also, it’s impossible to hear the sevenths, which is not good because these intervals are part of the number series constructing the whole cycle. We eventually decided to perform only the intervals in the left hand [Figure 26].

The fact that changes were made to the original manuscript of Silenzio based on Gubaidulina’s collaboration with the performer for whom the piece was composed invites the question of how receptive the composer was to suggestions. As might be surmised by her history of collaboration, she was, indeed, very open to them.
In our interview, Moser further reflected on the importance of composer-performer collaborations. She thinks that performers have an important place in a dialogue with contemporary performers writing for the bayan and accordion and that their little-known technical properties necessitate input from a performer who understands their capabilities and idiosyncrasies. Moser stated that performers have guided numerous contemporary composers, mentioning Berio, Hosokawa, Denisov, as well as Gubaidulina. She also noted her ideal vision for such consultation, emphasizing that changes to the score should happen only as part of a joined exploration and never as a result of a performer’s pretentious attitude. Rather, she placed a great amount of importance on conveying the composer’s intent. She added, however, that doing so can be challenging, but that knowing the composer’s work can be tremendously helpful. This knowledge, she told me, takes time to develop: “I have been performing Gubaidulina’s music for such long time; I know exactly what she wants. But when I was younger, it was different, of course. Now when I play for her, she makes choices. That helps me understand the way she thinks.” Indeed, close examination of Silenzio reveals a special relationship between Moser and Gubaidulina.

But what of performers who lack such insight developed over a long period of time? For instance, for her own performances, Moser has adapted some of the technical segments of the piece (registration, exclusion of air-sounds, and reduction of the left-hand clusters) originally suggested by the composer. However, some of these elements still appear unmodified in the official score, potentially resulting in confusion for performers unfamiliar with the dialogue between Gubaidulina and Moser. It is very likely that such performers will aim to perform these instructions as written in keeping with current conventions in contemporary music practice that privilege the score as the best expression of the composer’s intent. However, I hope that my discussion of Moser and Gubaidulina’s collaboration might lead to better-informed performances of Silenzio.

### 3.2.1 Formal Analysis and Compositional Language of Silenzio

This analysis addresses another aspect of the Gubaidulina-Moser collaboration, one that has partially informed the compositional language of Silenzio. According to Gubaidulina, Silenzio,
a five-movement cycle, was inspired by Moser’s personality. The piece indeed reflects a connection with performer’s personality, in particular her name. In addition, Gubaidulina honored the bayanist by incorporating five cadenzas for the bayan throughout the piece.

In her dissertation “The Rhythm of Form: Compositional Processes in the Music of Sofia Gubaidulina,” Jennifer Denise Milne reveals the pitch classes employed in Silenzio, referring to “Elsbeth Set,” among others. This set is a collection of pitches employed by Gubaidulina, derived from the first and last name of the bayanist. According to Milne, seven and five letters from the performer’s first and last name produce two groups of five and two pitches, respectively (Figure 27).

![Figure 27. “Elsbeth Set,” as presented by Milne.](image)

This sort of a musical cryptogram also reveals a connection with the work of J. S. Bach—namely the famous B-A-C-H motive, which has been used by a multitude of composers including Gubaidulina herself. Milne states that in addition to the pitches extracted from the letters in Moser’s name, Gubaidulina employs intervals generated by them throughout the piece, especially the minor second and tritone. The analysis of some of the cadenzas will, however, reveal that Gubaidulina employs all the intervals from Elsbeth Set.

Silenzio’s five movements reflect Moser’s influence to various degrees. The general form of the trio is exhibited in the following table (Table 3.3). The Compositional Techniques column has been supplemented with abbreviation ELS, which indicates the presence of the Elsbeth Set. The Number Series column describes the use of various number sequences in shaping the

---

85 In 2002 Gubaidulina composed a string quartet, Reflections on the Theme B-A-C-H.
movements. Timeline refers to the recording made by Elsbeth Moser, Kathrin Rabus, and Maria Kliegel for Naxos in 1995.

---


87 Label number: 8.553557
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mov.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>T/CHR/OCT/ELS</th>
<th>Number Series</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>00:00-00:30</td>
<td>9-note chromatic melody, a canon between the violin and cello, ≈ a, rhythmically varied</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Evangelist: 2, 5, 7, 12</td>
<td>Harmanics (cello)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>12-26</td>
<td>00:30-01:05</td>
<td>≈ a, p5↑↑ (violin)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a''</td>
<td>26-46</td>
<td>01:05-02:01</td>
<td>= a, augmented (violin)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'''</td>
<td>46-73</td>
<td>02:01-03:17</td>
<td>= a, OCT collections</td>
<td>CHR, ELS</td>
<td>2, 3 in 5, 7, 10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayan Cadenza 1</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>73-87</td>
<td>03:17-04:06</td>
<td>Descending sequence (bayan)</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 2, 3, 5, 8 + 9, 14</td>
<td>Vibrato (bayan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>88-90</td>
<td>00:00-00:08</td>
<td>CHR material (cello)</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Lucas: 3, 4, 7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>91-95</td>
<td>00:09-00:28</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96-98</td>
<td>00:29-00:50</td>
<td>Descending chromatic trill (bayan)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dev. 1</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>99-107</td>
<td>00:51-01:06</td>
<td>Canon-like development, section ‘a’ material</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 2, 3, 5 in 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a''</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>108-113</td>
<td>01:07-01:18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'''</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>114-117</td>
<td>01:18-01:30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sul ponticello (cello)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayan Cadenza 2</td>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>118-130</td>
<td>01:30-02:04</td>
<td>Arpeggio-like melody</td>
<td>CHR, ELS</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b'</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>131-138</td>
<td>02:04-02:28</td>
<td>= b, OCT collections</td>
<td>CHR, OCT</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b''</td>
<td>(-25)</td>
<td>139-143</td>
<td>00:00-00:27</td>
<td>A two-measure CHR motive (cello); free 5-note episode (cello); CHR motive (bayan)</td>
<td>CHR, ELS</td>
<td>Lucas: 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>144-150</td>
<td>00:27-01:08</td>
<td>CHR motive (violin); Bbm chord; free 8-note episode (violin); CHR motive + 5-note episode (violin)</td>
<td>CHR, (T), ELS</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a''</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>151-158</td>
<td>01:08-01:38</td>
<td>CHR motive (bayan)</td>
<td>CHR, ELS</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'''</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>158-163</td>
<td>01:38-02:00</td>
<td>CHR motive (cello); Db major chord (bayan)</td>
<td>CHR, (T)</td>
<td>Lucas: 3, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a''''</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>163-166</td>
<td>02:00-02:16</td>
<td>CHR motive (bayan)</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>167-168</td>
<td>02:17-02:28</td>
<td>Short bayan episode</td>
<td>Lucas: 4, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>169-173</td>
<td>02:29-02:44</td>
<td>Cello episode</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV a</td>
<td>174-177</td>
<td>00:00-00:03</td>
<td>5-note main motive (violin), CHR transposed up and down</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Evangelist: 2, 5</td>
<td>Pizzicato (violin, cello), vibrato (bayan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>256-311</td>
<td>00:00-03:14</td>
<td>High C (bayan); CHR motive violin (= 'a' of mov. I); violin moves up, cello moves down; tritone cluster (bayan)</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 2, 3, 5 + 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayan Cadenza 3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>03:15-03:51</td>
<td>Rhythmically free material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayan Cadenza 4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>312-321</td>
<td>03:52-04:18</td>
<td>Low-register cluster (bayan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td></td>
<td>63-66</td>
<td>322-339</td>
<td>04:19-05:24</td>
<td>Continuation of violin and cello movement from 'a' + low bayan cluster</td>
<td>Evangelist: 2, 5, 7, 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a''</td>
<td>67-71</td>
<td>340-360</td>
<td>05:23-06:47</td>
<td>= a'</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayan Cadenza 5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>361-375</td>
<td>06:48-07:44</td>
<td>Low-register cluster (bayan)</td>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>Fibonacci: 2, 3, 5 + 7, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
T = Tonality, CHR = Chromaticism, OCT = Octatonicism, TT = Tritone, ELS = Elsbeht Se!

Table 3.3 Form diagram for Silenzio.
The first movement is a theme and variation form. The 9-note melody exposed in the violin part is accompanied by a version of the same melody in the cello part, which is augmented with harmonics. Throughout the first movement, the rhythm of the cello part is shaped according to the numbers from the Evangelist Series: 2, 5, 7, and 12, while the violin part is rhythmically freer (Figure 28).

![Figure 28. Silenzio, I: mm. 1-7. The rhythm of the cello part is construed on the numbers from Evangelist Series.](image)

The first movement concludes with Bayan Cadenza 1, exhibiting an extreme decline in register similar to what was heard in *De Profundis*. In designing this cadenza, Gubaidulina employs numbers from the Fibonacci Series (3, 5, 8) as durations with added numbers 9 and 14, often called Bach’s numbers (see Figure 23). 88

The opening of the second movement is constructed on the numbers from the Lucas Series (3, 4, 7). Each instrument plays a quick chromatic phrase merging into a canon-like development at RN 14 and subsequently another Bayan cadenza at RN 20. This cadenza is also structured around the Fibonacci Series. Unlike Bayan Cadenza 1, this one contains an alternating register movement of the right hand based on the “Elsbeth Set,” which is accompanied by a narrow chromatic progression in the left hand: E, F, Gb, G, etc. (see Figure 29).

---

88 Number 9 corresponds to the position of letter “J” (from J. S. Bach) in the alphabet. Number 14 equals the sum of the numbers corresponding the position of the characters B (2), A (1), C (3), and H (8). See Valeria Tsenova, *Zahlenmystik in der Musik von Sofia Gubaidulina* (Bern: Verlag Ernst Kuhn, 2001).
The third movement is contrasting in character and generally consists of tranquil chromatic melodies interrupted by short, rhythmically free episodes (Figure 30).

Milne discusses the first chord in the bayan part as a transposition of the Elsbeth Chord, a chord that comprises intervals from Elsbeth Set. Milne further suggests the existence of two different motives in this movement. However, it is very likely that the second motive represents the first motive exposed in contrary motion, something Gubaidulina utilized in earlier pieces – for example, De Profundis (see Figure 22).

The fourth movement represents a long, linear gesture of the violin and cello, with the bayan marking rhythmic points constructed mostly on the Lucas and Evangelist Series (Figure 31).
Here Gubaidulina shapes the violin part, its dynamics in particular, employing Evangelist and Lucas series numbers. Drawing on Gubaidulina’s sketches exposes the way in which crescendi and decrescendi were construed according to the number series. For example, the opening crescendo and decrescendo in the violin part are 5 and 2 accents (eight-notes) long (Figure 31). Further comparison of Gubaidulina’s sketches interpreted by Milne and the score shows, however, that these expressive instructions are notated in rather inconsistent manner throughout the movement. For example, the diminuendo in the violin part at RN 33, according to Milne’s interpretation, starts at the rehearsal cue and lasts five accents. However, the score indicates diminuendo one measure later and is only one accent long (Figure 32).

The fifth movement suggests a complex compositional approach. Gubaidulina organizes the opening pulsating sonority of the bayan by structuring durations according to the numbers from Evangelist Series: 2, 5, 7, 12 (see Figure 25). At the same time, the material for the violin and cello is slightly reminiscent of the first movement’s canon.
This movement includes three cadenzas for Moser’s instrument: Bayan Cadenza 3, Bayan Cadenza 4, and Bayan Cadenza 5. In Bayan Cadenza 3, which occurs at RN 61, Gubaidulina employs all the intervals originating from Elsbeth Set. For example, the chord at the end of the second phrase of the cadenza incorporates minor and major seconds, major third, perfect fourth, and tritone (Figure 33).

Bayan Cadenza 4 marks the beginning of the second section of the movement. It begins with low clusters in the range of an E/Bb tritone (Elsbeth Set), with durations organized according to the Evangelist Series. As in the introduction of the movement, this material integrates pulsating sonorities. These breath-like textures in the bayan part are defining characteristics of Gubaidulina’s writing for both bayan and accordion, occurring in the majority of her compositions for the instruments (Figure 34).

RN 63 introduces the continuation of the melodic movement of the violin and cello from m. 310. The instrument parts now progress in contrary motion, portraying an idea of a crossover. The movement concludes with Bayan Cadenza 5 (RN 72), analogous to Bayan Cadenza 4.

An examination of the form and language of Silenzio exhibits the strong connection between the piece and its dedicatee. In the cycle, Gubaidulina employs a pitch set formed of the letters from bayanist’s first and last name. Also, Silenzio incorporates only cadenzas for the bayan. However, Moser’s influence is further reflected in adaptations in performance that might not
be evident in the score. Moser suggested exclusion of the air-sounds at the opening of the fifth movement; she also suggested reduction of the left-hand clusters in Bayan Cadenza 3. Interestingly, in our interview Moser referred to possible input by Friedrich Lips during the compositional process. This, however, has not been confirmed. Omission of modifications in the score suggested by Moser can potentially result in confusion for the performers studying the piece. This also raises the question of what effect multiple contributors have on a score, if their different intentions leave room for contrasting interpretations.

3.3 The Creation of Fachwerk (2009)

Dedicated to Geir Draugsvoll, the Norwegian accordionist, Fachwerk is Gubaidulina’s second concerto for the bayan or accordion. Unlike her first concerto from 2003, Under the Sign of Scorpio, in which she employs the entire apparatus of the symphony orchestra, Fachwerk features a smaller ensemble consisting of bayan, percussion, and strings. According to the composer, the idea for the piece comes from an architectural style also known as Fachwerk, or timber framing that is characteristic of a number of German provinces. Consistent with Gubaidulina’s compositions that sonically represent the cross (e.g., In Croce), the title of her second concerto also refers to this image since Fachwerk framing often involves large and very visible pieces joined perpendicularly (in the shape of crosses). Her reference to an architectural style in the title of a concerto for bayan, further, can be taken as an expression of her keen interest in the construction of the instrument and its influence on her compositional approach.

Draugsvoll spoke to me at length about his first encounter with Gubaidulina:

I met Gubaidulina first time back in 1994. She was a composer-in-residence at the Danish festival for contemporary music [Lerchenborg Music Days]. The focus of the festival was the Russian female composers and she was there with Elena Firsova and Katia Tchemberdji. My task at the festival was to play De Profundis and Silenzio, maybe also In Croce. That was the first time I had an opportunity to work with her, which was, of course, a great privilege. Immediately we both felt related through her music, and she was particularly delighted about my interpretation of Silenzio. She thought that I
had some kind of an embracing role in the ensemble – keeping the group together and leading it in a way.\textsuperscript{89}

After their collaboration at Lerchenborg Music Days in 1994, the artists communicated at festivals and concerts, but also through a written correspondence. At the end of the 1990s, Draugsvoll initiated the idea of commissioning an accordion concerto. However, around this time Gubaidulina was already working on \textit{Under the Sign of Scorpio}, the concerto she wrote for Lips.

The first meeting between Gubaidulina and Draugsvoll regarding the creation of \textit{Fachwerk} occurred in April of 2009 in Copenhagen. This was shortly before the composer was awarded an honorary doctorate from Yale University.\textsuperscript{90} Draugsvoll recalls this meeting and notes how attentive Gubaidulina was to the specifics of his specific instrument:

\begin{quote}
We met late at night and she was so preoccupied with which tones were in my chord construction [of the left-hand manual]. She wrote down, she made a sketch of every single note in every single register; she was very intense about it. Then she wanted to know exactly what kind of system I have on the instrument [left and right manual layouts]. I know she did the same with Friedrich for \textit{Under the Sign of Scorpio}, but at that time I didn’t understand why she was doing this, why it was so important. Then I learned that she wanted to use the major and minor chords of the left hand. When she went back from Copenhagen she first wrote the main cadenza for the accordion, based on this principle. The complete piece derives from this cadenza.
\end{quote}

Later, Gubaidulina stated that the main cadenza of \textit{Fachwerk} “was written by the instrument itself.”\textsuperscript{91}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{89} Geir Draugsvoll, VoIP interview with the author, June 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2016.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
This direct link between the specificities of Draugsvoll’s instrument and Gubaidulina’s composition becomes apparent when analyzing the composer’s approach to the main cadenza of *Fachwerk*. Here, she employs a sequence of chords on the left-hand manual, which, when transformed by the convertor switch, results in a single-note octatonic row. In addition to these two collections, the composer utilizes an additional octatonic collection, which occurs as a result of the same gesture transferred to the right-hand manual of Draugsvoll’s instrument. For easier discussion, these two collections will be labeled as Type 1 and Type 2 (Figure 35).

![Figure 35. The foundation of *Fachwerk*. Major/minor chord sequence as an upward motion of the left hand (figure on the left); F/F# octatonic scale (Type 1) produced through a contrary motion on the transformed manual (figure in the middle); F#/G octatonic scale (Type 2) resulting from the gesture transferred to the right-hand manual (figure on the right). Sketches based on Geir Draugsvoll’s Pigini Mythos accordion model (C system).](image)
A striking use of this instrument-specific approach to composition occurs in the simultaneous exposition of a major/minor sequence and the Type 2 octatonic collection exposed during the main cadenza, resulting in contrary movement of the hands, thus, creating visual representation of the cross, or crossover (Figure 36).

Figure 36. Fachwerk: mm. 477-484. The main cadenza (beginning). Type 2 octatonic collection on the right hand and the major/minor chord sequence on the left hand.

Draugsvoll’s input with respect to the technical possibilities of his instrument were also important to Gubaidulina’s refining of other accordion cadenzas:

We changed immediately some of the original cadenzas that were written. She [Gubaidulina] would say: “That it is not what I had in mind, we have to find something else.” The cadenza at RN 119 originally had a lot of air-sounds, but Gubaidulina didn’t get the intensity she wanted, and we changed it into something different. Also, cadenzas at RN 56 and RN 58 changed a lot. For example, at RN 56 she asked if I can bend the notes upwards. She wanted me to bend the chord in the left hand upwards, and the chord in the right hand in the opposite direction, to create the crossover. As you know, that might be risky in the concert. I hesitated about it a little. But she was happy with the result, and we decided to keep this idea [Figure 37]. In general, we always talked about sounds, not construction. I see it as one ingredient to her music.92

---

92 Geir Draugsvoll, interview with author.
Gubaidulina completed the concerto in October 2009, and it was premiered two weeks later in Ghent, Belgium. In our interview, Gubaidulina stated, however, that the premiere of the piece was, in fact, delayed in part due to requests from the performer:

> Usually, when I compose a piece, I compose it completely and then give it to the performer. When I finished *Fachwerk*, I gave it to Geir, and after studying it for a while he came back and said, “It would be really nice if there were a couple of places where bayan remains alone, solo.” I wanted to fulfill his desires but it put me in an awkward position because the piece was already carefully constructed. So I redid the concerto. I found a couple of moments where it would be possible to expose the bayan, but that required the restructuring of the piece.

Both Gubaidulina’s attention to the specifics of Draugsvoll’s bayan in conceptualizing *Fachwerk* and the composer’s statement about adapting it based on his feedback clearly shows how the ideas of the performer and composer intertwined during the compositional process, and also how the performer shaped some of the important intentions that might be assumed to be only those of the composer, such as the piece’s form. This is in contrast with the previously discussed Gubaidulina’s collaborations with Lips and Moser, where the bayanists mostly provided their knowledge of the technical possibilities of the instrument.

Draugsvoll and Gubaidulina’s collaboration on *Fachwerk* continued after the premiere, and the piece continued to be developed through subsequent performances, both live and on one recording. For example, Draugsvoll told me that the cadenzas at measure 144 and RN 44 were added just after the premiere. He further recalls the moments outside the accordion cadenzas.
that required modifications. For example, he said that the quick accordion passage at RN 51 originally included a bellow-shake. Familiar with the challenge of the sound production during a simultaneous high-pace bellow tremolo and the rapid finger movement of the right hand, Draugsvoll suggested that this bellow technique be omitted. Following the performer’s request, Gubaidulina replaced the bellow-tremolo with a sequence of quick octaves (Figure 38).

![Figure 38. Fachwerk mm. 259-261. The quick passage in the accordion part originally included a bellow-tremolo and excluded quick successive octaves.](image)

Draugsvoll also told me that the accordion passage between RN 61 and measure 304 was originally notated for the left-hand manual but was then transferred to the right side of the instrument in order to retain the consistency of the sound projection. He suggested a similar modification at measure 450, where the high-register octaves in the right hand were originally written for the left-hand manual. Draugsvoll also discussed an important issue regarding the sound presence of the accordion, especially in a large ensemble, which occurred during the pre-premiere performance of *Fachwerk* in Ghent. He said that for the following performance in Amsterdam, which was the official premiere of the concerto, Gubaidulina suggested the use of microphones on his instrument.³

Two new cadenzas (m. 144 and RN 44) that were not part of the piece during the premiere of the concerto were added during the recording of *Fachwerk* in 2011 with the Trondheim Symphony Orchestra strings under Øyvind Gimse and with Anders Loguin on percussion. The studio setting allowed for even more personal communication between Draugsvoll and Gubaidulina. Draugsvoll describes this event:

³ Geir Draugsvoll, interview with author.
Gubaidulina always wanted to sit in the control room but I insisted on having her right in front of me. I wanted to play the main cadenza only for her because I am very grateful that she wanted to write this piece for me. For me she is such a wonderful inspiration, it always feels special to perform in her presence…Working with her and performing Fachwerk with many high-profile conductors and ensembles, I think I have developed as a musician. I think I have become a sharper performer with orchestra.94

In the years following the premiere of the concerto, Draugsvoll gave numerous performances of Fachwerk. This concerto is likely the composer’s most significant composition for the bayan and accordion to date. Beyond treating the bayan or accordion as the central instrument in the ensemble, Gubaidulina allows the nature of the instrument to shape the landscape of the composition. I will discuss this in more detail in the following section.

3.3.1 Formal Analysis and Compositional Language of Fachwerk

The following section will further analyze the form of the final version of Fachwerk published in 2011, as well as the compositional means derived from the Gubaidulina-Draugsvoll dialogue. In particular, I will discuss how the spatial properties of the accordionist’s instrument shaped material of the concerto. I will also reflect on the remaining cadenzas of the concerto, as they illustrate Draugsvoll’s involvement in the compositional process.

The concerto Fachwerk, as it came to be performed following years of modification culminating in a recording that for all intents and purposes fixed the score, comprises of three sections: A (RN 0-43), B (RN 44-110), and A’ (RN 111-140). Section A exhibits the most significant material and techniques, which are then developed throughout sections B and A’.

The following diagram provides the form of the concerto (Table 3.4). Names of the subsections include the material they generate (Unison, Development, etc.). The timeline column refers to the performance by Geir Draugsvoll, released by Naxos in 2011.95 Compositional devices,

---

94 Geir Draugsvoll, interview with author.

95 Label number: 8.572772.
exact or approximate pitch centers, and performance techniques are presented in individual columns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Subsec.</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>T/CHR/TT/OCT</th>
<th>Pitch Centre</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>00:00-03:00</td>
<td>Slow chord progressions (bayan), Cross-motive (strings): mn 4-5, 10-11, 19-20, 25-26, 44-45</td>
<td>(T), TT</td>
<td>F...D/Ab</td>
<td>Marinba and string glissandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>16-13</td>
<td>03:00-05:58</td>
<td>F/F# octatonic scale based melody (1st violins), quick chord progressions (strings)</td>
<td>CHR, OCT 1, TT</td>
<td>Ab, C, Ab</td>
<td>String tremolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>05:58-04:31</td>
<td>Ascending tutti run (G/A octatonic scale)</td>
<td>OCT 2, T(G#67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>String tremolo, accordion vibrato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a&quot;</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>04:32-05:21</td>
<td>Same as a</td>
<td>Same as a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marinba glissando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b&quot;</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>05:21-06:24</td>
<td>Same as b</td>
<td>Same as b</td>
<td></td>
<td>String tremolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>06:25-06:58</td>
<td>Unison 1, (E/F# octatonic scale)</td>
<td>OCT 2, T(E#67)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Same as Unison 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>06:58-07:48</td>
<td>M/m accordion sequences</td>
<td>(T), CHR</td>
<td>G...D</td>
<td>Cello harmonics and tremolo, accordion bellow-shake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28-37</td>
<td>07:48-08:29</td>
<td>Chromatic sequences of triads</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>D...G/F#</td>
<td>Acc. bellow-shake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-42</td>
<td>10:18-11:23</td>
<td>Development of the material from subsec. a, b</td>
<td>(T), CHR, OCT 1</td>
<td>Db...C/F#</td>
<td>String glissando, pizzicato, accordion vibrato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11:24-11:43</td>
<td>Rhythmic M/m sequence, canonic-like exhibition</td>
<td>(T), CHR</td>
<td>Bb...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11:44-13:35</td>
<td>Quick M/m sequence and F/F# octatonic scale, cluster glissandi</td>
<td>(T), CHR, OCT 1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Accordion clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marimba</td>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>13:36-14:08</td>
<td>Evolving marimba solo</td>
<td>(T), CHR, TT</td>
<td>F#/C, Db/G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accordion</td>
<td>49-54</td>
<td>14:08-15:46</td>
<td>Descending CHR rows (acc.), subs. b material (strings)</td>
<td>CHR, (OCT)</td>
<td>D...?</td>
<td>Accordion cluster glissandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solo 1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15:46-16:07</td>
<td>E-Bb glissandi (cross-motive?)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15:46-16:07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solo 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16:08-16:40</td>
<td>E-Bb gliss. (cross-motive?), pitch-bend of the right and left hand chord (Dm) - crossover</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>E, D</td>
<td>Fitch-bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double Bass</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16:41-16:50</td>
<td>Short (two-measure) episode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solo 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cadenza 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16:51-18:02</td>
<td>Same as a, slow low-register episode, opening chords of the concerto (F, Gb, Dm)</td>
<td>(T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4 Form diagram for Fischbeck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double Bass</strong></td>
<td><strong>Solo 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Solo 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accord</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>String tremolo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chromatic tone clusters</strong></td>
<td><strong>String tremolo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timpani</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>61.65</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>18.13-18.32</td>
<td>Gradually ascending CHIR material (acc., major</td>
<td>20.85-20.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dev.</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>61.65</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>18.13-18.32</td>
<td>Chromatic tone clusters</td>
<td>20.85-20.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unison</strong></td>
<td>90.92</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>22.12-22.33</td>
<td>Evolving fast-leaning unit lines transforming in</td>
<td>22.12-22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadenza 2</strong></td>
<td>93.98</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>22.26-22.7</td>
<td>Rhythmic M sequence in the strings</td>
<td>22.26-22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dev. (c)</strong></td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>27.13-28.7</td>
<td>Slow M sequence (2c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unison 5</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>28.27-27.04</td>
<td>Bb, A, G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>34.40-36.02</td>
<td>Coda, return to F major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **sec.** = Section, **subsec.** = Subsection, **dev.** = Development
- **T** = Tonality, **CHR** = Chromaticism, **TT** = Troller, **OCT** = Octonism, **OCT 1** = Octonemic Collection Type 1, etc.
The opening of the concerto does not suggest compositional tools originating from the spatial characteristics of Draugsvoll’s instrument. Instead, Gubaidulina utilizes musical symbolism typical for her opus in general. The first sonority of the slow chord progression in accordion part (F-major chord) coincides with the first letters from the title of the piece – F, A, C (Figure 39). This short episode is then interrupted by the cross-motive represented through the string and marimba glissandi in contrary motion (same figure).

**Figure 39. Fachwerk: mm. 1-6.** Opening. The F-major chord and slow chord progressions in the accordion part followed by the cross-motive in the string ensemble and marimba.

Subsection a (mm. 30-57 of Section A), introduces rhythm variations based on D-major and Ab-major chords, a tritone relationship also characteristic of Gubaidulina’s writing. As Section A develops, however, the instrument-derived techniques are introduced. In subsection b (RN 10), Gubaidulina exhibits a fragment of the Type 1 octatonic scale for the first time. The fragment appears as an ascending melody starting on A in the first violins. This melody is accompanied by the ascending chromatic movement of other string instruments, which creates a sequence of (predominantly) major triads (Figure 40).
The following subsection, Unison 1 (RN 14-15), incorporates the Type 2 octatonic scale, which derives from the right-hand manual of Draugsvoll’s instrument; it has an ascending unison movement across the entire ensemble beginning on low G (Figure 41).

The major/minor chord sequence is also used at RN 26 and RN 27, now and for the first time, in the accordion, which, oscillates between C, G, D, A, and E major and minor chords (Figure 42).
The composer uses this short sequence to introduce Cadenza 1 (m. 144), which consists of minor chords developing through a chromatic movement (right hand) against major and minor triads (left hand) (Figure 43). In the score, Gubaidulina provides the approximate duration of this cadenza (45 sec).

![Figure 43. Fachwerk: m. 145. Cadenza 1 (segment). Chromatic sequence of minor chords (right hand) and major and minor chords (left hand).](image)

Subsection c (RN 43) occurs after extensive development of subsections a and b. In subsection c, Gubaidulina employs a segment of the major/minor chord sequence of the accordion to create striking rhythmic sonorities in the strings. The sequence of the chords includes Eb/Ebm, Bb/Bbm, C/Cm, and G/Gm. Here Gubaidulina also incorporates a canon-like technique, initiating the sequences from different accents in various groups of instruments (Figure 44).
Figure 44. Fachwerk: mm. 217-222. Subsection c. Rhythmic sonorities based on the accordion major/minor sequence (Eb/Ebm, Bb/Bbm, C/Cm, G/Gm).
Section B begins with Cadenza 2 (RN 44), which provides a complete major/minor sequence, as well as a matching Type 1 octatonic collection. These segments are exposed separately (Figure 45).

The Marimba Solo that follows Subsection c (RN 45-48) and subsequent Accordion Solo (RN 49-54) are both episodes featuring wide leaps that incorporate chromaticism and octatonicism.

Cadenza 3 (RN 56) and Cadenza 4 (RN 58) were both shaped through Gubaidulina’s dialogue with Draugsvoll. Cadenza 3 is preceded by a short Timpani Solo 1 (RN 55), and highlights glissandi in the range of a tritone (E-Bb). Both cadenzas incorporate ascending and descending pitch bends. In Cadenza 3, Gubaidulina employs these techniques to illustrate another crossover (see Figure 37). However, in Cadenza 4 she also utilizes the pitch bend to modify the chords from the opening of the concerto (Figure 46). Both cadenzas are improvisatory in character as they lack a strict tempo.
After Timpani Solo 2 (RN 61), which is identical to Timpani Solo 1 at RN 55, Gubaidulina develops the material from the first part of the concerto throughout a second Accordion Solo (RN 61-65). In this passage she further merges different motives constructed on the accordion major/minor chord sequence and its octatonic scales. For example, beginning at RN 73 the accordion part exhibits them simultaneously while the strings perform a rhythmic pattern based on the major/minor sequence of the accordion, similar to those in Subsection c (RN 43). This time, however, the chord progression incorporates G/Gm and D/Dm (Figure 47).
This extensive development subsection is followed by another development of subsections a and b (RN 78-89), as well as Unison 3 (RN 90-92) and development of subsection c (RN 93-98), which concludes with the major, Cadenza 5 (RN 99) that is the only entirely measured cadenza in the concerto.

Section A’ begins with the transposition of the concerto’s opening up a tritone and represents a modified reprise of section A. Gubaidulina again uses compositional processes derived from her dialogue with Draugsvoll. For example, the final accordion cadenza, Cadenza 6, occurs at RN 119 and is a 14 second improvisatory episode during which the accordion plays low register clusters in the right hand and a long, drone-like cluster in the left hand. In our interview, Draugsvoll said that Gubaidulina originally intended to use air-sounds, instead of clusters; however, the effect was not striking enough for her. Draugsvoll also noted the similarity between the wave-like dynamics of the left-hand cluster, and the sonority during the closing section of Silenzio (see Figures 34 and 48).

Close analysis complemented by interviews with Draugsvoll and Gubaidulina reveals that the accordionist shaped the creation of Fachwerk in various ways. Draugsvoll’s request for a larger number of soloistic sections throughout the piece necessitated major adaptations by Gubaidulina. In addition, the composer’s research on the manual layouts of the performer’s instrument inspired a great deal of her compositional language. Finally, Draugsvoll’s input was crucial for shaping the cadenzas. Such attitudes of the artists make Gubaidulina-Draugsvoll collaboration the prime example of the creative dialogue, from which both artists benefit.
3.4 The creation of Cadenza (2010)

*Cadenza* is an independent composition deriving entirely from the main cadenza of Gubaidulina’s first concerto for bayan and orchestra, *Under the Sign of Scorpio*. Thus, the creation of *Cadenza* was quite protracted and involved, for all intents and purposes, the composer and two performers. According to Lips’s memoir, it took Gubaidulina almost fifteen years to develop the artistic impetus for the concerto, which she began at his request at the end of the 1980s. On the initiative of Valery Gergiev and the Rotterdam Philharmonic in 2002 along with the Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra as a co-commissioner, the composer was able to finally realize the project. The Russian bayanist premiered the concerto on October 10, 2003, in Stockholm, with the Swedish ensemble under the baton of Manfred Honeck. Years later, in 2010, Alberdi Iñaki, a former student of Lips, performed the same piece and also initiated the creation of *Cadenza*. His interest in her music, however, predated his collaboration with her.

In our interview, Iñaki reflected on his early exposures to Gubaidulina’s work:

> My first contact with Gubaidulina’s writing occurred in September 1995, when I was working on *De Profundis*, with Friedrich Lips. At that time there were not many pieces for the accordion written by established composers, and the experience of discovering her writing was unique and inspiring. Then, in 1996 I performed Gubaidulina’s *Seven Words* at Festival de la Quincena Musical de San Sebastian with Basque National Orchestra under Enrique Ugarte and Miren Zubeldia on the cello. I remember, Friedrich [Lips] came to Spain around that time and we worked on the piece. In the first years of my studying and performing of Gubaidulina’s compositions, Friedrich was always around me.\(^{96}\)

Finally, in 2010 Iñaki had the opportunity to meet the composer when he was invited to perform *Under the Sign of Scorpio* with the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra led by Vasily Petrenko at Festival de la Quincena Musical de San Sebastian, with Gubaidulina in

---

\(^{96}\) Alberdi Iñaki, VoIP interview with author, June 11\(^{th}\), 2016.
attendance. The festival week was filled with conversations between Iñaki and the composer. And for good reason: he also recorded her Seven Words with the Basque National Orchestra conducted by Jose Ramon Encinar, and the cellist, Asier Polo, as well as other Gubaidulina’s pieces such as In Croce. In addition, Iñaki gave a solo recital that included her compositions De Profundis and Et Expecto. Iñaki described his dialogues with the composer as “honest and sincere,” but also emphasized the clarity of her suggestions and ideas. The Spanish performer also characterized his relationship with the composer as “deep and shared.”

During the 2010 festival, the artists spent considerable time discussing Under the Sign of Scorpio. In the composer’s words, the idea of the concerto also subtitled Variations on Six Hexachords for Bayan and Large Orchestra, draws from the construction of the instrument, as did Fachwerk. The layout of the chord keyboard of the left-hand manual allows for simultaneous execution of major and minor chords, thus resulting in hexachords. These sonorities served as the main compositional tool in Under the Sign of Scorpio. But where the use of the octatonic scales in Fachwerk emerged from the specifics of Draugsvoll’s accordion, in Under the Sign of Scorpio, hexachords were the result of Gubaidulina’s exploration of Friedrich Lips’s bayan. These two examples clearly show how Gubaidulina’s collaborations with the performers extended to the very specifics of their instruments, informing the compositional language of the composer’s pieces. This is important because it not only emphasizes the importance of the dialogues with the performers but also points out issues related to the realization of such pieces across various types of bayans and accordions. This will be addressed in more detail in the following chapter.

In the case of the dialogue between Gubaidulina and Iñaki, however, the focus was on the performance aspects of Gubaidulina’s pieces. In our interview, Iñaki recalled some of the composer’s suggestions regarding the main cadenza of Under the Sign of Scorpio:

In the opening of the cadenza, she was talking about the different sound of every instrument. She was aware that in addition to the range and selection of stops, individual instruments can differ in sound significantly. She noticed

---

that my instrument sounds similar to Friedrich’s, but quite different from Draugsvoll’s instrument. She then suggested shifting parts between the right and left hand, so that the melody projects with more clarity on the right-hand manual. She also suggested substituting the hexachords with clusters [Figure 49].

Figure 49. Cadenza: m. 1. Opening. Reversed parts on the right and left hand, clusters in place of the hexachords.

According to Iñaki, rearranging the right and left-hand material was the most important suggestion by the composer. Upon performing the entire concerto, the accordionist was so fascinated by the expressivity of the hexachord-based melodies that he suggested the creation of an independent solo accordion piece that “possesses all the elements of the concerto but does not require a large ensemble.” At the same festival, Iñaki performed the cadenza for Gubaidulina, modifying its ending and structuring a new piece (Figure 50).

---

98 Alberdi Iñaki, interview with author.
According to the performer, the composer was fond of his initiative. She suggested that her publisher, Sikorski, might be interested in publishing the modified cadenza from Scorpio as a stand-alone piece. In 2014 Sikorski published the score for the piece, now titled Cadenza, and Iñaki was acknowledged both as a dedicatee and an editor.

In our interview, I asked the accordionist to elaborate on his experience of working with composers during the compositional process and to describe the role of a performer. Iñaki stated:

> When I meet composers who are writing for the instrument for the first time, I give them a manual on writing for the instrument. However, this is just a starting point. Ideally, a performer should get familiar with the style of the composer, and vice versa, composer should know the style of a performer. Only in such a situation is it possible to use the full potential of the collaboration and make something very interesting. However, there are some pieces which I reviewed and changed significantly in the early stage of composing and where composers acknowledged my contribution. My view is that composers have delivered idea, which I have developed; or the opposite, sometimes we share ideas and composers work on them.
Although Iñaki stated that input from a performer can be crucial for the creation of a composition, he added that he does not consider himself a co-composer.

Gubaidulina’s and Iñaki’s collaboration, which began with the goal of interpreting an existing composition to ready it for performance and solve certain performance challenges eventually resulted in the creation of a new piece for solo accordion. The accordionist’s exquisite interpretations of Gubaidulina’s music, composer’s appreciation of them, and their collaboration resulted in an ongoing relationship and an outstanding contribution to the accordion and bayan repertoire.

3.4.1 Formal Analysis and Compositional Language of Cadenza

*Under the Sign of Scorpio* (2003) is the first of Gubaidulina’s compositions for the bayan in which she utilizes the spatial attributes of the instrument in shaping the compositional language of the piece. Exploring the instrument together with Friedrich Lips (see Plate 1), the composer discovered a pattern according to which major and minor chords from two different rows of the left-hand manual can be merged using a single position of the hand, thus, creating a sequence of hexachords. The following diagram illustrates the pattern according to which Gubaidulina created hexachords originating from the left-hand manual of Lips’s instrument (Figure 51).
Figure 51. The foundation of Under the Sign of Scorpio and Cadenza. The combination (pattern) of major and minor chords on the left-hand manual of Lips’s instrument (figure on the left) and the resulting hexachords (figure on the right).

Close inspection of the above combinations of major and minor chords reveals six different types of hexachords, categorized according to their intervals measured in half steps. For example, the hexachord formed of F-major and Eb-minor triads, incorporates the following order of half steps: 12321(3). According to Ul’yana Mironova from The Gnessin Russian
Academy of Music, Gubaidulina varies the six types of hexachords by generating their “symmetrical” matches, which combined comprise the number 4.\(^9^9\)

\[
\begin{align*}
&1 2 3 2 1 \quad \text{(Type I hexachord)} \\
&+ 3 2 1 2 3 \quad \text{(Variation of type I hexachord)} \\
\hline
&= 4 4 4 4 4
\end{align*}
\]

Mironova further discloses two groups of rows: main hexachords (type I hexachords) and their variations (further called type II hexachords):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
I1 & 1 2 3 2 1 (3) & \leftrightarrow & II1 & 3 2 1 2 3 (1) \\
I2 & 2 1 3 1 2 (3) & \leftrightarrow & II2 & 2 3 1 3 2 (1) \\
I3 & 1 3 1 2 3 (2) & \leftrightarrow & II3 & 3 1 3 2 1 (2) \\
I4 & 3 2 1 3 1 (2) & \leftrightarrow & II4 & 1 2 3 1 3 (2) \\
I5 & 3 1 2 3 2 (1) & \leftrightarrow & II5 & 1 3 2 1 2 (3) \\
I6 & 2 3 2 1 3 (1) & \leftrightarrow & II6 & 2 1 2 3 1 (3)
\end{array}
\]

Gubaidulina’s work with hexachords based on a unique feature of the bayan and accordion was utilized across *Under the Sign of Scorpio* and consequently, *Cadenza*.\(^1^0^0\)

As Iñaki stated in our interview, *Cadenza* incorporates the main elements of the concerto and it represents, in many ways, a condensed version of it. *Cadenza* comprises three sections: Section I (mm. 1-3), Section II (mm. 4-16), and Section III (mm. 17-32). The form of the piece is exhibited in the following diagram (Table 3.5).\(^1^0^1\)

---


\(^1^0^0\) It should be noted that the layout of chord manual on accordions and bayans has been standardized. This is in contrast with Gubaidulina’s collaboration with Geir Draugsvo, where the transformation of the left-hand manual on the accordionist’s instrument and the layout of his right manual led to the creation of specific octatonic collections.

\(^1^0^1\) The timeline column relates to the performance by Alberdi Iñaki, released in 2011 for Etcetera.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>CHR/WT/TT/VT</th>
<th>Hexachords</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00:00-00:23</td>
<td>Descending and ascending melodies based on type I and III hexachords. Quotation of the RN 20 of the concerto.</td>
<td>I, III</td>
<td>Left hand clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dev. a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>00:24-00:47</td>
<td>a developed</td>
<td>CHR, WT</td>
<td>Left hand chromatic clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>00:48-01:12</td>
<td>Quick chromatic motives</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Left hand cluster glissandi, right hand vibrato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>01:13-01:38</td>
<td>≈a, starting from F</td>
<td>I, III</td>
<td>Left hand clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>5-12</td>
<td>01:39-02:13</td>
<td>Slow melody, transposed material from m.146 of the concerto (accordion part). Quotation of the RN 35 of the concerto. Material of subsection a developed + step changes during cluster glissandi and air-sounds (De Profundis)</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Contrary motion of the hands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dev. a’</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>02:13-05:12</td>
<td>≈a, starting from Fb, melody accompanied by chords based on the Viennese trichord (0,1,3,6)</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Contrary motion of the hands, air-sounds, wave-like glissandi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a’’</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>05:13-05:38</td>
<td>Development of the material from subsections a and b. Inverted Viennese trichord (0,1,3,6) in m. 18. Groups of 3, 5 and 8 notes prevail (Fibonacci). Contrary motion of the hands – cross motive (m. 20)</td>
<td>TT, VT</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dev. a/b</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>05:39-06:36</td>
<td>Clusters representing the cross-motive: 3 attacks in m. 22, 5 attacks in m. 24, 8 attacks in m. 20 (Fibonacci). Short chromatic motives.</td>
<td>CHR, WT, TT, VT</td>
<td>Right and left hand cluster glissandi in contrary motion, bellow-shake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culmination</td>
<td></td>
<td>06:36-07:00</td>
<td>Material modified and added by Alberdi Inaki</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Right hand glissandi in contrary motion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>07:01-07:39</td>
<td>Material modified and added by Alberdi Inaki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Right hand glissandi, low drone-like cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
Dev. a = Development of Subsection a, etc.
CHR = Chromaticism, WT = Whole-tone scale, TT = Tritone, VT = Viennese Trichord, I = Hexachord Type 1, II = Hexachord Type 2

Table 3.5 Form diagram for Cadenza.
Each section of the piece starts with a quotation of a melody from *Scorpio*. Section I of *Cadenza* opens with such a melody, and is based on hexachord type I1 in a descending motion, followed by its parallel, hexachord type III1 in a contrary motion. This melody occurs at RN 20 of the concerto (Figure 52).

![Figure 52. Cadenza: m. 1. Opening. Melody based on hexachord type I1 and III1.](image)

The following Subsection b introduces contrasting virtuosic material based on chromatic collections (Figure 53).

![Figure 53. Cadenza: m. 3. Subsection b (beginning). Quick chromatic motives of the right hand are accompanied by chromatic clusters in the left hand.](image)

The opening of Section II (m. 4), introduces the melody (quotation) from the beginning of *Cadenza*, transposed a half step lower, starting from the note F (Figure 54).

![Figure 54. Cadenza: m. 4. Section II (opening). Quoted melody is transposed a half step lower (F) and accompanied by left-hand clusters.](image)
This subsection is followed by Subsection c, which incorporates another quotation from the concerto, this time the slow accordion episode from m. 146 of Scorpio (Figure 55).

In the following development subsection (Development a’) in m. 13, Gubaidulina exposes types I2 and II2 hexachords and modifies their directions. This subsection also includes a variety of the extended techniques, such as air-sounds and a rapid activation of the chin stops on a cluster, resembling the character of De Profundis, which was also composed in collaboration with Friedrich Lips (Figure 56).

Later, in m. 16 of the same subsection, Gubaidulina develops the hexachord type I1, but also adds other collections deriving from hexachords I3 and I5, creating wide-leaping sonorities (Figure 57).
The beginning of Section III (m. 17) incorporates another transposition of the quotation from the opening, beginning from Fb. Unlike previous expositions of this melody in Section I and Section II, this variation does not incorporate Iñaki’s suggestion that the chords of the left hand be substituted with clusters. Instead, the melody is accompanied by variants of the Viennese Trichord, matching the original idea exhibited in Scorpio (Figure 58).\textsuperscript{102}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure57.png}
\caption{Cadenza: mm. 15-16. Development a’ (segment). Evolving sonority incorporates hexachords type I1, I3, and I5.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure58.png}
\caption{Cadenza: m. 17. Section III (beginning). The transposed melody is accompanied by Viennese Trichords type 0,1,3,6 and 0,3,5,6.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{102} Viennese Trichord is a chord which contains an augmented and a perfect fourth (e.g. C-F-B, C-F#-B).
Section III also incorporates a significant number of the cross-motive representations, specifically contrary motions of the hands. This is particularly emphasized in the Culmination subsection (mm. 22-26), through rapid cluster glissandi on both manuals. These gestures are exposed in groups of three, five, and eight accents respectively, corresponding to the numbers of the Fibonacci series (Figure 59).

![Figure 59. Cadenza: m. 24. Culmination subsection (excerpt). The group of five cluster glissandi in contrary motion symbolizing the cross.](image)

The compositional process that gave rise to *Cadenza* utilizes the influence of two performers. Gubaidulina first collaborated with Friedrich Lips on the creation of the concerto *Under the Sign of Scorpio*, and through a dialogue with him she acquired a deeper knowledge of the technical aspects of the bayan, especially the left-hand manual, which she then utilized to create hexachord-based melodies. Also, the extended techniques such as air-sounds and rapid chin-register altering are rooted in Gubaidulina and Lips’s collaboration on the composer’s first creation for the bayan, *De Profundis*. However, it was through a dialogue with Alberdi Iñaki that the idea of *Cadenza* as an independent piece was initiated and its closing section was altered. This set of circumstances in the creation of *Cadenza* displays a complex relationship between a single composer and various performers, resulting in an important addition to the bayan and accordion literature.

### 3.5 Conclusion

The processes behind the composition of these four compositions demonstrate different approaches to collaboration between Gubaidulina and various performers. Friedrich Lips equipped the composer with some basic performance techniques particular to the bayan, which
she then implemented in her first composition for the instrument, *De Profundis*. Elsbeth Moser’s input in *Silenzio* was less explicit during the compositional period; however, her suggestions for performance made during the piece’s preparation for premiere resulted in modifications to some of Gubaidulina’s original instructions. In *Fachwerk*, Geir Draugsvoll’s imprint was more significant. His request for more soloistic cadenzas resulted in an extensive modification of the form of the concerto. He also assisted Gubaidulina greatly in the production of those cadenzas. Alberdi Iñaki ultimately suggested the creation of *Cadenza* as a composition independent from its original purpose, which was warmly accepted by Gubaidulina. His suggestions were variously employed in the published score.

The four collaborations reveal that the composer had pre-conceived ideas about her compositions and that the performers’ input often related to the particularities of the instrument, notably its construction and related performance possibilities. Clearly, Gubaidulina was making constant choices as to how her compositions should sound. However, since choices were presented to her by the performers, one can surmise that these same pieces would sound distinctly different if they were created through a dialogue with another performing artist.

These collaborations also add to my previous discussion of the development of Gubaidulina’s writing for the bayan and accordion. Her first composition incorporates elements characteristic of the pieces she composed previously, in particular for organ and piano. In contrast, the bayan part in the trio dedicated to Moser is economized and assimilates the violin and cello parts. In her two concerti, *Under the Sign of Scorpio* and *Fachwerk*, the composer’s writing derives from the mechanized apparatus of the instrument. Several idiosyncrasies pervade Gubaidulina’s work with the instrument: air-sounds, clusters, and pitch-bend. Importantly, a performer, Lips, initially introduced all of these techniques and the composer intended to employ them in most of her bayan or accordion compositions. Yet in *Silenzio*, Moser suggested that the writing did not allow for the production of air-sounds, and in *Fachwerk*, Draugsvoll suggested a more expressive solution. Clusters occur in different forms throughout all of the pieces. They often merge with chords and melodies (*De Profundis, Cadenza*), or serve as autonomous gestures, often representing the cross motive (*Fachwerk, Cadenza*). Gubaidulina also employs them as pulsating sonorities (*De Profundis, Fachwerk, Silenzio, Cadenza*). The
pitch-bend introduced by Lips as an extended technique on a single note in *De Profundis* evolved into a symbolic representation of the cross in *Fachwerk* with Draugsvoll.

This overview of the four collaborations reveals that Gubaidulina, with input from elite performers, has expanded her knowledge of the potential and limitations of the bayan and accordion over time. Clearly, the art world surrounding Gubaidulina’s music for these instruments was changing. This was crucial for her composing for the instruments; however, it has also informed her intentions regarding the performance of her music. This matter will be discussed in the following chapter through the lens of Gubaidulina’s dialogues with the same bayanists and accordionists in their work on a single piece.
Chapter 4
Performance Analyses

This chapter examines how four bayanists and accordionists who recorded versions of *In Croce*, which was initially composed for cello and organ, contributed to the realization of ideas that Gubaidulina conveyed in the score. The recordings I analyze here were made over a span of more than fifteen years and they expose collaborative links of various kinds: transcription, teacher student relationships, and direct collaboration with the composer. In our interviews, the performers explained their interpretative decisions and intentions, as well as the contexts in which recordings were created. Importantly, this section will show that some of the composer’s ideas about performances of *In Croce* on the bayan and accordion have changed and developed over time through dialogues with different performers involved in the art world of this piece.

The chapter opens with an analysis of the form and compositional tools of *In Croce*, which is important for a better understanding of Gubaidulina’s intentions and ideas. The two editions of the piece—the original published in 1979 and the transcription for cello and bayan undertaken by Elsbeth Moser in 1991 and published in 1996—will then be juxtaposed in order to show how the performers on the four recordings borrow ideas, albeit to different extents, from both editions. Finally, informed by my analysis, the different versions of the score, and comments by the performers as well as Gubaidulina herself, I examine the four recorded performances of it.

4.1 *In Croce*: Formal and Symbolic Analysis

Dedicated to Russian cellist Vladimir Tonkha, *In Croce* was premiered on March 27, 1979 in Kazan, USSR by Tonkha himself and accompanied by prominent Russian organist Rubin Abduillin. It features bidirectional movement of the cello and organ parts, evoking the cross for which it is named. Gubaidulina utilizes crossover in several instances throughout the piece.

*In Croce* consists of four Sections A (RN 1-23), B (RN 24-35), C (RN 36-47) and A’ (RN 48-50), of which Sections A, C, and A’ utilize cohesion of material, while Section B predominantly consists of short episodes and sequences, two of which are aleatoric in nature.
These segments will be described below as subsections Improvisation 1 and Improvisation 2. The form of the composition is provided in the following chart (Table 4.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsec.</th>
<th>RN</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>T/CHR/OCT</th>
<th>Pitch Centre</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-23</td>
<td>Instrumental parts develop in contrary directions: organ ↓, cello ↑.</td>
<td>(T), CHR</td>
<td>E (A)</td>
<td>Cello: glissandi and quartertones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trill-like main motive in the organ part + A-major chord arpeggio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(fanfare motive) and descending major scale. Register crossover at m. 178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improv 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cello: quick chromatic and octatonic collections; organ: simultaneous</td>
<td>CHR, OCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cello: sul ponticello,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clusters and runs (arbitrary pitch collections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organ: cluster glissandi and improvised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dev./Cul.</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>Cello: ascending trill sequence; organ: descending cluster tremolo</td>
<td>CHR, (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cello: ricochet glissandi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(the crucifix symbol). Culmination of the piece at RN 27. Main motive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pizzicato tremolo, sul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the cello part; exchanging of the chords between the right and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ponticello; organ: cluster glissandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left hand on the organ (the crucifix symbol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improv 2</td>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>Ascending and descending cello ricochets, accompanied by cluster</td>
<td>CHR, OCT</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>glissandi on the organ. CHR/OCT motives of the cello, expanding and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>narrowing clusters on the organ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cello Solo</td>
<td>32-35</td>
<td>Sequential ascending recitative</td>
<td>(CHR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Touch-fourth harmonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>36-47</td>
<td>Organ: cascading sequences based on harmonic minor scales (m.245</td>
<td>T, CHR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebm, m.247 Dbm, m.248 Cm, etc.), cello: material based on the main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>motive. Instruments move sequentially in the contrary motion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(organ ↓, cello ↑)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>48-50</td>
<td>Main motive in the cello part (high register), white-key cluster in the</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Cello: open harmonics, glissandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organ part (low register)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

Improv = Improvisation, Dev. = Development, Cul. = Culmination

T = Tonality, CHR = Chromaticism, OCT = Octatonicism

*Table 4.1 Form diagram for In Cerce.*
Section A is the most extensive and supplies the main thematic material for the piece. This section contains long, linear movement of the instrumental parts in contrary motion (the organ part moves downwards, cello part upwards). The instrumental lines cross over in m. 178 (five measures after RN 23), towards the end of Section A. Section A, written in 6/8 meter, has a neutralized pulse which only partially occurs through presentation of the main motive (Figure 60).

![Figure 60. In Croce: mm. 1-4. The main trill-like motive in the organ part (right hand).](image)

This motive contains quick oscillating E and F# notes in the right-hand manual, accompanied by a chromatic cluster (E, F, Gb) in the left hand in the same register—a striking sonority fragment. Another important moment from this section is an A-major triad arpeggio in the right hand, which emerges occasionally from a chromatic sonority like an abrupt ray of light. Andre Pirro discusses similar elements in the music of J. S. Bach, who was one of the most important sources of inspiration for Gubaidulina, positing them as symbols of joy or triumph (Figures 61 and 62).

![Figure 61. Bach, Cantata “Where the Lord God does not stand with us,” BWV 178/5, mm. 10-11.](image)

![Figure 62. Gubaidulina, In Croce: mm. 5-9. Fanfare-like motive based on A-major triad.](image)

---

This fanfare-like motive gradually transforms into a descending row built on an A-major scale, occurring first in m. 81 (five measures after RN 8). According to Pirro, such rows in the music of J. S. Bach represent “the idea of liberation and feelings of intense joy” (Figures 63 and 64).

Figure 63. Bach, Cantata “Sweet comfort, my Jesus comes,” BWV 151/2: mm. 1-2. Opening.

Figure 64. Gubaidulina, In Croce: mm. 78-81. Fragment based on A-major scale.

The cello line of Section A is based on the gradual movement – micro intervals, major and minor seconds, and later their inversions, sevenths, all connected by long glissandi. The organ part is characterized by a continuous flow of the material, while the cello appears as narrative utterances of short expressive figures separated by breaks (Figure 65).

Figure 65. In Croce: mm. 58-62. Expressive cello part (the upper staff).

In m. 178 of Section A the instruments cross over in register. The cello provides an F# note which sits atop F natural in the organ part, and the instruments further diverge throughout m. 179 (Figure 66).

104 Armstrong, 51.
The beginning of Section B (Improvisation 1), RN 24, utilizes a high degree of ensemble unity, a marked contrast to Section A, where instruments perform with a sense of disengagement. The cello exposes short, notated motives with abrupt dynamic changes. On the other hand, the organ part includes short fragments notated graphically: the right hand performs short lines of unspecified pitches, while the left hand simultaneously performs moving clusters (rectangular notation) accompanied by a long sustained chromatic pedal (Figure 67).

After this improvisatory episode a development subsection occurs, opened by a short ascending sequence of solo cello and developing from a lower to a higher register (RN 25-26). This short episode ends with instruments moving in contrary motion: the glissando trill of the cello moves up, while the organ cluster tremolo between the hands moves to the lowest register of the manuals – another representation of the cross. The culmination of the composition follows at RN 27 (Figure 68) and discloses the symbol of the cross in several ways. First, Gubaidulina assigns the main motive from the organ to the cello (transposed up a major ninth), and moves the central tone of the opening cello material (E) to the organ part, in the form of minor triads in a relationship of a minor second (Em-Ebm). Also, in m. 198 (three measures after RN 27),
Gubaidulina exchanges these chords between the right and the left hand on the organ, maintaining textural consistency with another cross over. The culmination (RN 27) is characterized by dramatic dynamics, \textit{fff} and \textit{ff}, underlined by \textit{tutti} registration of the organ (to be discussed in more detail later in this chapter).

![Image](image.png)

\textbf{Figure 68. In Croce: mm. 192-198. Contrary motion of the instruments, Culmination (RN 27).}

Following the culmination, Improvisation 2 introduces more graphic notation (RN 30-31). We witness upward and downward ricochet glissandi of unspecified pitches on the cello, and bidirectional cluster glissandi on the organ. As in Improvisation 1, Gubaidulina includes a cluster pedal for the organ, this time in a significantly lower register (see Figures 67 and 69). Also, for the first time in \textit{In Croce}, she provides the timing of the sections – the first half of Improvisation 2 (RN 30) lasts 20”, while the second part of the improvisation (RN 31) is approximately 60” long.
Improvisation 2 is followed by the last section of Section B, Cello Solo (RN 32-35), which contains an ascending recitative-like episode. It begins with low pizzicati and focuses on minor sixth and minor second intervals throughout, concluding with arco harmonics four octaves higher than at the start of the phrase (Figure 70).

Section C of the composition begins at RN 36. Like Section A, Section C opens with material in the organ’s high register. The organ part consists of cascading lines: descending scales (such as Eb harmonic minor) followed by a leap up to another descending scale (Figure 71). Also, Gubaidulina modifies the rows of the right hand by sustaining certain notes, producing clusters.
Like Section A, the cello opens in a lower register, exposing a varied main motive of the composition, sequentially ascending in register throughout Section C. Simultaneously, the scale-like lines of the organ part transform into chromatic and octatonic collections, accompanied by a descending sequence of minor triads in the left hand.

Finally, RN 48 introduces shortened, modified repetition of Section A, or Section A’. Here the cello exposes the original main motive (E-F#). The cello part further introduces periodic untempered glissandi timed 8”, 10”, and 50” respectively. The organ part requires a low white-key cluster, in the range of a major seventh (F-E) (Figure 72).
4.2 *In Croce*: Two Editions

According to Moser, the idea to transcribe Gubaidulina’s work came after attending a live performance of the composition by Vladimir Tonkha, the cellist and dedicatee of *In Croce*. Moser was concerned with the dynamic domination of the organ, as well as the physical separation of the performers (cellist in front of the altar, the organist on the gallery), which prevented communication between the artists.\(^{105}\)

The extent of Gubaidulina’s involvement in the process of transcribing the piece for the bayan remains somewhat unclear. In my interview with Moser, she stated that Gubaidulina herself suggested some of the modifications. The composer, in contrast, told me that she was not directly involved in the process. Gubaidulina also added that different performers create different transcriptions, and that “it would be ideal if the publisher would agree to publish several versions of the piece.” However, Gubaidulina had certainly approved Moser’s adaptation from 1991, published by Sikorski in 1996.

Gubaidulina’s thinking about performers constantly making new transcriptions of her composition is important from the perspective of the art world concept. As previously discussed, Becker suggests that various choices made by art world participants, for example, editing, are integral to an art work’s creation. This was demonstrated in the previous chapter apropos of Gubaidulina’s compositional processes; however, this also applies to the performances of her music. Performers preparing for performances have to make numerous decisions, often editing scores and adjusting them to their possibilities and their instruments. Even Moser, whose transcription of *In Croce* was published and approved by Gubaidulina in the 1990s, made additional changes for her performance. Gubaidulina’s acknowledgement of the importance of performer’s actions for a successful presentation of her work certainly suggests her openness to some degree of malleability (see Chapter 1). More importantly, performers modify pieces for different types of bayans and accordions in manners that are in constant flux; thus the actualization of pieces constantly changes.

\(^{105}\) Elsbeth Moser, interview with author.
In our interview, I asked Gubaidulina to discuss transcribing *In Croce* for the bayan and accordion. In addition to addressing the issue of adapting the original organ part, she referred to a particular section in the piece, the beginning of Section C (RN 36), as crucial for success. In this section, the main melody was originally placed in the left-hand manual, which on the organ projects with more clarity than on the bayan and accordion. Gubaidulina told me, “Every time I come in contact with a performer [bayanist or accordionist] I suggest that they transfer the melody [from the left to the right-hand manual]. It’s a critical moment. The right hand has more sound. In cases when I have attended performances without being able to rehearse with performers, I always notice that you can’t hear the melody. That’s very hard to take.”

In order to make sense of the challenges in adapting an organ part for the bayan or accordion, it is important to understand the technical characteristics and differences between the instruments. As aerophones, both instruments use air to produce sound. Modern organs have an electric blower, which delivers air to a series of bellows and wind chests, allowing for a continuous airflow through the pipes, and thus an uninterrupted sound. The bayan, like the accordion, possesses a manually operated bellows of limited length, located between the two manuals. Although its size and proximity to the hands of the performer allows refined shaping of the sound, the bellows provide equal amount of air pressure to both manuals of the instrument, making dynamic separation challenging. Unlike the organ, where air flows through the pipes of different shapes and sizes, on the bayan and accordion, air flows through wooden chambers with attached reeds that oscillate. Large modern organs, in contrast, are frequently equipped with several thousand pipes, providing diverse timbre and dynamic combinations.

What both organs, bayans, and accordions have in common is timbre organization according to ranks, which are activated and combined through the manipulation of stops. The main ranks of the organ are marked according to the approximate length of their longest pipe. These typical ranks are: 8’ (notes sound at their normal octave), 4’ (notes sound an octave higher than usual), and 2’ (two octaves higher). Following the same principle, 16’ rank sounds an octave lower than 8’, 32’ two octaves lower, etc. Depending on the size of the instrument, there can be hundreds of stops as well as stops that singly provide combinations of multiple stops, called “mixtures.” On the other hand, bayan and accordion provide a significantly narrower selection
of ranks, often limited to the actual pitch rank (8'), one an octave higher (4'), and one an octave lower than the actual pitch (16'). Concert instruments include additional sets of 8’ and 16’ ranks, called cassotto (ital. tone chamber), placed inside the isolated chamber of the instrument, reducing harmonics and producing a soft, round sound. Marking of the ranks and stops on both instruments can be done either by providing the above-discussed registration in feet-length, or by providing descriptive names of the ranks, often referring to the sound of various musical instruments (flute, bassoon, violin, etc.) they are intended to evoke. Newer bayan and accordion models, however, have stops marked only with graphical representations of the ranks and their mixtures. This way of marking has been a standard in the contemporary bayan and accordion literature.

The first noticeable difference between the original text of *In Croce* and its adaptation for the bayan relates to the registration. In the original version, Gubaidulina provides a mixture of the ranks (8’+4’+2’) for the left-hand manual, with the use of the tremulant device, and another mixture (8’+4’) for the right-hand manual, which results in a bright timbre. On the other hand, Moser registers the right-hand part with the bright 8’ rank, and the left hand with the mixture of the two 8’ ranks, which, because of a slight difference in tuning, results in a gentle tremolo, equivalent to the two, slightly de-tuned ranks of the *Voix celeste* stop on the organ (Figures 73 and 74).

![Figure 73](image1.png)  
*Figure 73. In Croce* (original), mm. 1-3: Registration for the organ.

![Figure 74](image2.png)  
*Figure 74. In Croce* (transcription), mm. 1-3: Registration for the bayan.
Moser has likely used her own instrument as a reference for the registration, but other registration possibilities, which might result in a sound closer to the original, are possible. For example, the right-hand part can also be registered with added 4’ rank (8’+4’), which coincide with the organ registration and eventually result in a brighter sound. Also, a mixture of the cassotto and non-cassotto 8’ ranks, which produce a slight vibrato, and the 4’ rank, on certain instruments can potentially result in a sound that more closely resembles the original registration.

Figure 74 illustrates further differences between the two versions of the score. First, the tempo provided in the original is \( \frac{1}{x} = 100 \), while the initial tempo of the adaptation is \( \frac{1}{x} = 84 \). Moser also introduces \( p \) dynamics, something that the original text does not provide. Other modifications in Section A include the bellow changes added by Moser, albeit somewhat inconsistently. In m. 146 (four measures after RN 18), the transcription includes the stop alteration of the original organ part (2’ rank off), uncommon in the bayan and accordion literature. This is likely due to use of the original print for generating the new version of In Croce (Figure 75).

![Figure 75. In Croce (transcription): mm.146-149. Organ registration (-2’) in the version for the bayan.](image)

This atypical marking can be confusing for performers unfamiliar with the registration for the organ. On the other hand, it is questionable whether the application of this stop change would be possible on bayan and accordion. First, Russian bayans often have only one stop for the single-note manual (also known as a free-bass manual) and adding or removing additional ranks is impossible. In the case of Italian instruments, which often include several stops for this side of the instrument, the physical placement of the stops requires an interruption of the musical flow in order to be manipulated. This problem has been successfully resolved on the
right side of the instrument, with the introduction of duplicated chin-stops placed on the top of the instrument and activated by the performer’s chin.

In contrast to Section A, which with the exception of the registration and tempo changes leaves the material of the original score intact in the transcription, Section B (RN 24) and its first subsection, Improvisation 1, bring considerable changes. First, the pedal cluster connecting Sections A and B, in the range of C#-E, has been shortened in Moser’s version and no longer extends over the subsection. Furthermore, Moser reduces the material for the hand manuals, providing only glissando clusters, and removing the short improvised motives that occur simultaneously in the original text (Figures 76 and 77).

Figure 76. In Croce (original): m. 180. The beginning of Improvisation 1.

Figure 77. In Croce (transcription): m. 180. The beginning of Improvisation 1.

Given the lack of the third (pedal) manual on bayans and accordions, Moser’s decision to reduce the material in this subsection is somewhat understandable. However, it is not clear why she excludes the fast figures. Also, an important feature of Gubaidulina’s writing, the linking
of sections with overlapping sonorities (the pedal cluster), was eliminated. Another important modification is related to the placement of the cello and organ/bayan motives. Even though they occur simultaneously in the original, in Moser’s adaptation they emerge interchangeably (see Figure 77). Moser explains these two significant modifications (exclusion of the pedal, and rearrangement of the instruments) by referring to the technical constraints of the instrument and the idea of the cross in *In Croce*. According to her, the shaping of the short phrases would disrupt the secondary nature of the long pedal. In addition, Moser states that the alternating appearances of the instruments coincide with the idea of the piece, the cross or crossover.¹⁰⁶

Another Moser adjustment occurs in m. 187 (five measures after RN 26), where the cluster tremolo between the right and left-hand manuals provided in the original score has been replaced by a rapid tremolo-like movement of the bellows (bellow-shake), creating a similar, dramatic gesture. Improvisation 2 (RN 30) brings another significant adaptation of the original text. Like in Improvisation 1, Moser reduces the pedal between subsections. She also modifies direction of the cluster glissandi in m. 212 (Figures 78 and 79).

![Figure 78](image)

**Figure 78. In Croce** (original): mm. 211-213. The beginning of Improvisation 2.

¹⁰⁶ Elsbeth Moser, interview with author.
Figure 79. *In Croce* (transcription): mm. 211-213. The beginning of Improvisation 2. Modified direction of cluster *glissandi* and reduced and displaced cluster pedal.

Moser argues that the exclusion of the long pedal, as was the case in Improvisation 1, is based on the technical limitations of the instrument. Thus, this example exposes yet another issue in the construction of the bayan and accordion: namely, that the low reeds often require significantly stronger, forceful manipulation of the bellows in order to be activated, thereby increasing the volume of both manuals significantly. In her interview, Moser described the character of Improvisation 2 as “heavenly,” thus, her decision to reduce the pedal and preserve this quality.

The second part of Improvisation 2 (RN 31) introduces another compelling modification. Moser replaces the original organ line, which includes clusters with the note C as their starting point and resolution, with a long fluctuating cluster (Figures 80 and 81). According to her, this new modification results in a gestural cross, when the hand moves upwards and downwards over the keyboard. This modification, however, conceals the idea provided in the original score, according to which the cello and organ parts gravitate towards the central note C.

Figure 80. *In Croce* (original): m. 213. Second part of Improvisation 2.
The only modification affecting the Cello Solo (RN 32-35), following Improvisation 2, is the exclusion of the original tempo marking (\( \text{\textbullet}=72 \)). However, the expressive instruction \textit{rubato} has been retained. In Section C (RN 36), which Gubaidulina describes as crucial for the transcription, Moser retains the original arrangement and the important melody remains in the quieter, left-hand manual. However, like Gubaidulina in the original, Moser provides registration that emphasizes the melody (Figures 82 and 83).

Moser’s registration for the rest of Section C deviates from the instructions in the original score. While Gubaidulina provides a single combination of stops for the entire section, Moser...
introduces several changes, which result in the gradual brightening of the bayan part. For example, in m. 265 (one measure after RN 39), Moser suggests 4’ rank in combination with 16’ rank. Also, in RN 44, she adds cassotto and non-cassotto 8’ ranks to the mixture, utilizing all the available ranks on the instrument simultaneously. Moser’s continuous registration brings the bayan part closer to the ascending cello part, which creates more drama. However, the result is contrary to Gubaidulina’s intent as conveyed in the original score, which was for the instruments to diverge in register.

Further modifications in Moser’s version occur in Section A’ (RN 48-50). While the original suggests a cluster on the white keys in the range of a major seventh (F-E), across two manuals, Moser reduces this sonority and proposes a cluster in the range of a tritone (E-Ab) on one manual (Figures 84 and 85).

She explains this modification by discussing new circumstances in the version for bayan and cello in which instrumentalists sit closer together and execution of the full original cluster on
the bayan can overwhelm the melody in the cello part. She also stated that Gubaidulina suggested the lowest pitches of the right-hand manual for this cluster.

Near the end of the composition (m. 345), at the beginning of the long quasi coda glissando of the cello, the original score suggests deactivation of the organ motor that propels the air-turbines (Motor ausschalten). This action disrupts the constant air-pressure in the pipes, decreases volume of the instrument, and modifies quality of the sound (Figure 86).

![Figure 86. In Croce (original): mm. 343-344. Instruction to switch off the motor of the organ (Motor ausschalten).](image)

However, this instruction has been omitted in the transcription, and its alternatives include either an abrupt dynamic change (subito p or subito pp) or a reduction of the continuous cluster.

In transcribing Gubaidulina’s composition, Moser applies three approaches to the original score. The first is a direct transfer of text to the new medium. Moser uses this approach in Sections A, C, and in the Development Subsection of Section B. The second approach involves modification of the original text as a way to preserve the composers’ original intended meaning of the piece in the new medium. Moser takes such a course in Improvisation 1, the first part of Improvisation 2 (exclusion of the pedal) and Section A’ (reduction of the cluster). Finally, in her third approach Moser considerably changes the original text, arguably modifying even higher-level intentions presented in the original score (Improvisation 1, second part of Improvisation 2). The final set of modifications also includes the exclusion of one of Gubaidulina’s most important compositional tools: linking sonorities. These elements are erased in Moser’s transcription between Sections A and B (see Figures 76 and 77), Development and Improvisation 2 (see Figures 79 and 80), and Improvisation 2 and Cello Solo (see Figures 87 and 88).
The transcription of *In Croce* made by Moser allows for a manageable execution of the original organ part on the bayan or accordion, which is one of the main concerns expressed by Gubaidulina. However, Moser’s version of the piece represents her particular understanding of the Gubaidulina’s work and the technical possibilities of her own instrument. Despite the changes imposed by Moser, the larger idea of the cross, or the crossover, prevails. The following section will discuss four performances of the piece, including performers’ reasoning for transcribing and performing *In Croce*.

### 4.3 Performance Analyses

In this section I analyze four recorded performances of *In Croce* focusing on how the bayanists and accordionists treat the main parameters of the composition (tempo, dynamics, time, phrasing). The four recordings will be discussed in chronological order of their release—oldest to newest—and their analysis will address the varying degrees of Gubaidulina’s involvement in the performances. The four performances also exhibit similarities that occur as a result of interrelationships between the performers themselves, such as studying each other’s work, teaching, etc. Much like analysis of the compositional processes described in the previous chapter, the performance analyses illustrate how Gubaidulina’s knowledge of the instrument has developed through a dialogue with the performers. For easier identification, the discussed modifications documented on the recordings will be accompanied by a corresponding timeline in the square brackets.

### 4.3.1 Observations on the Interpretation by Maria Kliegel and Elsbeth Moser

Maria Kliegel and Elsbeth Moser released their recording of *In Croce* in 1996.\(^{107}\) This release on the Naxos label features Gubaidulina compositions exclusively, in particular *In Croce*, *Seven Words* and *Silenzio*.\(^{108}\) Kliegel is a highly acclaimed German cellist, the winner of the....

---

\(^{107}\) Moser also recorded *In Croce* in 2011 with Martin Heinze, the renowned German double bassist. For the purpose of maintaining consistency with other ensembles in this analysis, that is, bayanists/accordionists and cellists, this recording will not be discussed. For additional information, see *Sofia Gubaidulina: Chamber Music with Double Bass*, Martin Heinze, KlangArt Berlin, and friends, NEOS Music NEOS11106-08, 2011, 3 compact discs.

\(^{108}\) Catalogue number: 8.553557.
international Rostropovich Cello Competition in 1981. For their interpretation, Moser and Kliegel use Moser’s transcription of the composition.

When we spoke about her treatment of the score in general, Moser began, “I think that the text is the number one priority, because it provides the basis of the piece. It’s fundamental. Of course, it is hard and it requires time and effort to master it, especially in complex contemporary compositions, but eventually the progress becomes apparent.”

Moser also discussed matters of freedom in interpretation:

I think that music of big composers comes from a deep, fantastic, and often lengthy work, and we [performers] have to respect that. I entirely respect what is written in the score, but after I familiarize myself with the text, of course, we have emotions, we have spirit, and we will eventually change certain elements of the performance. Still, when it comes to the form, or material of the piece, I am inclined to execute them very precisely.

Moser does not elaborate on the elements of the performance that she is willing to change, but she does discuss emotions and spirit as the basis for certain alterations. Thus she is clearly referring to aspects of the score that affect expression.

The opening section of the piece is executed in close conformity with Moser’s edition. The tempo is consistent with the instruction (\( \frac{\text{d}}{=84} \)) and Moser’s choice of stops matches the provided registration. Dynamically, Moser executes Section A in a steady manner, adding a pulsating character to the main motive only between measures 51 and 58 [01:12-01:22]. Such delicate phrasing requires a quick and flexible treatment of the bellows, impossible on the originally intended medium, organ. Moser applies a similar approach in measures 114 and 115 [02:42-02:45]. She does not, however, emphasize the important A-major triad arpeggios, although in our interview, she referred to them as a “heavenly Hallelujah” (see Figures 61 and 62). Overall, Moser’s control of the dynamics in Section A parallels the steady sound of the organ.

Kliegel and Moser begin Improvisation 1 of Section B (RN 24) according to Moser’s transcription, and the instruments occur consecutively [04:23]. The performance soon deviates
from Moser’ notation, however. Although in her version, Moser suggests “sich bewegender Cluster” (moving cluster), on the recording she interchangeably performs both linear and vibrating cluster glissandi as indicated in the original version. In phrasing these clusters, Moser applies the instructions from the cello part; she plays ascending clusters with abrupt crescendo and descending clusters in an opposite manner. Such phrasing indicates a communicative relationship between the performers, as she suggested is an important aspect of her approach to performance: “For me, each person is so different and I always try to understand them on the stage. And then I try to follow them and establish a good connection, hoping for the best possible result… Performance is about communication. Performance is in fact, the most universal kind of communication.”

In the development of Section B (RN 25) the artists follow the text of Moser’s transcription closely, as exemplified by her bellow-shake in measure 187 [05:02]. In RN 27, the culmination of the composition, Moser maintains the relationship of the written dynamics (cello fff, bayan f), ensuring the dominance of the cello part [05:12]. In measure 212, however, she deviates from her version of the text. Here she performs only the right-hand glissando downwards ending in the lowest possible register of the manual and excluding the sustained cluster in the left hand (see Figure 79) [05:43]. Also, during the glissando Moser changes the stop from 16’+4’ mixture, to 16’ stop only, likely using the chin stops.

In Improvisation 2, like Improvisation 1, Kliegel and Moser exhibit improvisatory tendencies [05:54]. Kliegel modifies the directions of the ricochet glissandi, while Moser often substitutes notated cluster glissandi in a high register with groups of quick notes, similar to the cello part. In the second part of Improvisation 2 (RN 31), the two performers deliver Moser’s text faithfully [06:36]. Moser here focuses on the phrasing of the continuous cluster, which as she has previously explained, represent the idea of the cross (see Figure 81).

Unlike in the original version, the final part of Section B, Cello Solo (RN 32) of Moser’s edition does not include the tempo marking (♩=72). This makes the rubato instruction the only suggestion for performance, resulting in Kliegel’s considerably elastic performance [07:44-09:27] (see Figures 87 and 88).

---
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Kliegel and Moser perform Section C (RN 36) somewhat slower than the indicated tempo ($\underline{q}=60$). Moser’s arrangement of the material here does not coincide with Gubaidulina’s suggestion for this moment in the piece (she said that the right and left-hand parts should be reversed for a clear projection of the main melody). In our interview, the bayanist suggested a different solution – the right-hand manual line is to be executed with keys half pressed. According to her, this prevents an excessive projection of the counterpoint on this manual and emphasizes the melody on the left-hand side of the instrument. This half-pressed key technique, however, can be challenging to apply at a faster tempo.

Unlike Section A, in Section A’ [13:00], Moser employs distinct crescendi and decrescendi on a sustained low-register cluster, reproducing instructions from Gubaidulina’s original score. However, such long sonorities cannot be executed on the bayan and accordion without disruptions. Moser, however, operates the bellows effortlessly, contributing to the mystical character of this section. This mastery of the breathing apparatus (bellows) is not easily achieved.

4.3.2. Summary of the Interpretation by Maria Kliegel and Elsbeth Moser

Kliegel and Moser realize a version of In Croce that differs considerably from the 1979 edition of the piece. Moser adapted the organ part for the bayan principally by reducing it. Interestingly, through performance Moser slightly modified even her own published transcription. This is, however, in line with Moser’s statement in our interview: that becoming
familiar with the score can result in spontaneous changes to it. From the perspective of ensemble roles, Kliegel’s and Moser’s intentions are transparent; in Sections A, C, and A’, Moser provides a subtle and unobtrusive accompaniment for Kliegel’s expressive performance. On the other hand, in Improvisation 1 and Improvisation 2 of Section B, the artists are engaged in highly interactive music making. This coincides with Moser’s understanding of the performance as a necessarily communicative process. Crucial too is that a long-time friendship and collaboration between Moser and Gubaidulina has resulted in the performer’s deep understanding of the composer’s work. However, various changes employed by the performer in both score and performance tell us that a performer’s input can certainly affect how the composer’s work develops.

4.4 Observations on the Interpretation by Vladimir Tonkha and Friedrich Lips

The recorded interpretation of In Croce by Vladimir Tonkha and Friedrich Lips was included on the bayan artist’s ninth release, Apocalypse, in 1998. In addition to the Gubaidulina composition, this album contains creations by other Soviet and Russian composers including another duet for cello and bayan, Kirill Wolkow’s Stichira of Iwan the Terrible (which was dedicated to the performers), and Sergey Berinsky’s Symphony No. 3 (And the Sky Has Awakened), for bayan and symphony orchestra, which was written in collaboration with Lips. John Cage’s Souvenir for organ, composed in 1983, is a contrasting addition to the repertoire.

Lips’s interpretation of In Croce generally balances faithful following of Gubaidulina’s ideas with his personal expression. Yet Lips told me that when he and Tonkha created their own transcription of the piece, their emphasis was on the intentions of the composer. He added that Gubaidulina greatly appreciated their version of the piece.

Where Tonkha’s and Lips’s rendition of In Croce often contrasts Kliegel’s and Moser’s performance is in its expressive aspects. For example, Lips opens his 1998 recorded performance significantly slower than the originally notated tempo (q=100). At approximately q=76 this interpretation is also somewhat slower than Moser’s adaptation (q=84). Due to the

---

110 Catalogue number: CD009eT.
slower tempo and the serene $p$ dynamics of the first section (A), Lips’s performance is particularly meditative in character.

On the other hand, Tonkha performs powerfully, applying considerable pressure of the bow on abrupt crescendi. The timing of Tonkha’s phrases is somewhat freer than that of Lips as well. For example, at RN 3 [00:57-01:06], the two artists perform highly contrasting roles: the bayan exudes a tranquil, heavenly voice against the furious attack of cello. Like Moser, Lips assumes the role of the accompanist throughout Section A and delivers the bayan part following the dynamics provided in the score.

In Improvisation 1 of Section B (RN 24), Tonkha’s and Lips’s entrances are similar to the modifications made by Moser (in both, her transcription and recording)—they occur interchangeably. Also, like Moser, Lips excludes the long pedal cluster indicated in the original score. When we discussed this, Lips expressed an understanding of Moser’s interpretation, and he also underlined the importance of interaction with the cellist in this subsection. He told me that he and Tonkha intended to “make fantasy together.”

The Russian artists deliver the subsequent development subsection in a suspenseful manner. In this section, Lips follows Moser’s idea of incorporating a bellow-shake in m. 192 [05:24]. Lips’s arrangement of Improvisation 2 (RN 30) largely coincides with that of Moser. Like her, he also excludes the cluster pedal and only executes the right-hand motives in a high register [06:19]. Lips starts this subsection by replicating the ricochet of the cello. However, he gradually deviates from the score and improvises freely in a manner similar to Moser’s performance. In their performance of In Croce, Tonkha and Lips follow Kliegel and Moser by performing both Improvisation 1 and Improvisation 2 in highly interactive ways. However, in the second part of Improvisation 2, Lips refers back to the original version of In Croce and includes the underlying note C, from which he then develops clusters [06:43]. This indicates merging of the two versions of the score in Lips’s and Tonkha’s interpretation.

The opening registration of Section C provided by Lips is similar to Moser’s; however, he introduces further stop changes. In m. 257 (one measure after RN 38), Lips incorporates a $16’+4’$ mixture [09:50]. The Russian artist then concludes Section C using the same mixture of the ranks.
In Section C, Tonkha and Lips introduce noticeable modifications which do not occur in either of the two scores. First, in m. 273 they perform subito $p$ on the third beat of the measure [10:28]. Second, in mm. 317-318 where Gubaidulina suggest an abrupt crescendo, Lips does the opposite. In the moment of the highest note of the cello, Lips carries out an abrupt decrescendo. The bayan performer here interposes a contrasting dramatic moment, creating an impression of a long sigh or a painful end [12:26].

Lips also modifies the composer’s instructions in Section A’. He uses her sporadic dynamic instructions to build a wide, constant pulse on a low cluster in the right hand. This way, Lips occupies a somewhat more active role than did Moser, who, in contrast, performs this section in a static manner.

4.4.1 Summary of the Interpretation by Vladimir Tonkha and Friedrich Lips

Tonkha’s and Lips’s performance of In Croce incorporates elements from both Gubaidulina’s and Moser’s editions. From the perspective of technical adjustments for the bayan, Lips’s execution differs slightly from that of Moser. What the Russian artists emphasize in their impressive performance are many expressive segments. Indeed, the artists follow Gubaidulina’s text, but they do not hesitate to incorporate their own expressive ideas as well. These modifications are also in accordance with Lips’s thoughts on interpretation (as previously mentioned), in which he emphasizes his personal feelings and intuition in shaping performance. Still, Tonkha’s and Lips’s performance is based on a long-time friendship and collaboration with Gubaidulina, which supports profound knowledge of her ideas about music. It is exactly this level of understanding and personal connection with the composer that gave the performers confidence and credibility to make both small-scale modifications and occasional freer interpretations (which are, based on our discussions, viewed favorably by Gubaidulina).

4.5 Observations on the Interpretation by David Geringas and Geir Draugsvoll

The interpretation of In Croce by David Geringas, a well-known Lithuanian cellist and student of Mstislav Rostropovich, and Norwegian accordionist Geir Draugsvoll, was released on the
album *Quasi Improvisata*, by the German label Dreyer Gaido in 2003.\(^{111}\) In addition to *In Croce*, the two performers also recorded *Songs of Shulamith* for cello, bayan, percussion, and tape by Anatolijus Šenderovas, and *Habanera* by Eduardas Balsys, which Šenderovas arranged for this duet.\(^{112}\) The album also includes *Quasi Improvisata* by Lithuanain composer, Lepo Sumera, and several compositions by Astor Piazzolla, also arranged by Šenderovas.

According to Draugsvoll, the idea of this project was to document an eclectic repertoire which involves a certain degree of improvisation or spontainety.\(^{113}\) This led us to a discussion of his ideas about the treatment of musical scores. Draugsvoll told me:

> I often treat the score very directly. In the beginning I would use it as my God a little bit, and get the knowledge of the composers’ intentions, which are hopefully notated in the score, and try to fulfill them as good as I can. But that’s not necessarily art. It can be, of course. But after this, after I premiere or record a piece, for example, which is where things should be done “right”, because you might regret it otherwise, then I might change something in the performance.

Draugsvoll’s statement struck me for several reasons. First, he does not consider a mere delivery of the score to be art or artistic. He clearly indicates that performers’ intentions and input are necessary for making the composer’s work stimulating or inspiring.

I also asked Draugsvoll to further discuss what it means for a premiere or a recording to be done “right”:

> If you speak to musicologists or historians, they are hysterically occupied with how things should be. Yes, we should have respect for traditions, but who actually made these traditions? When we look back at the time of J. S. Bach, for example, how many star musicians were at that time? Probably not

\(^{111}\) Catalogue number: 21008.

\(^{112}\) For the performance of Šenderovas's *Shulamith*, for cello, bayan, and percussion, Draugsvoll and Geringas were joined by Sofia Gubaidulina's long time friend and collaborator, Mark Pekarsky.

\(^{113}\) Geir Draugsvoll, interview with author.
very many. On the other hand, in contemporary music, where the music is notated in a specific way, for a specific medium, because you can’t really play *De Profundis* [by Gubaidulina] on the piano, it’s so specifically meant. That leaves a limited possibility for adjustment of the scores. Also, when it comes to the adjustments, I like discussing them with the composers, when possible, of course.

In keeping with his interest in contemporary music, Draugsvoll elaborated on the problem of new notations as a means of communicating intentions of the composer. Interestingly, at the same time that he acknowledged the specific aims that often drive the use of new forms of notation, he also explained that performers can take on a more important role in terms of shaping the specified musical ends:

> It’s an interesting issue to discuss, how they [contemporary composers] can get their intentions out. When we look at the air-button moment in *Fachwerk*, Gubaidulina wanted something hectic, but she couldn’t get that by the way she had notated it originally. That’s where we [performers] come in. Gubaidulina and I experimented a little bit searching to best describe her idea. But if you sit alone, and see an air-button by Sofia Gubaidulina, of course you will play it.

For their interpretation of *In Croce*, Geringas and Draugsvoll relied on Moser’s transcription. However, they also referred frequently to Gubaidulina’s score. For example, Draugsvoll opens Section A in tempo that is closer to Gubaidulina’s original instruction of $\mathfrak{q}=100$. As is the case in the other recorded performances, Draugsvoll likewise assumes the role of an accompanist to the cellist throughout the A section.

Geringas and Draugsvoll deliver the beginning of Section B (Improvisation 1) energetically with the accordionist applying a stop with multiple ranks. Like Moser and Lips, Draugsvoll combines straight cluster glissandi with vibrating sonorities. However, he uses a wider range for their execution [03:56]. Much like the other two performers, Draugsvoll emphasizes the communicative component of this subsection, with the instruments appearing interchangeably:
There is a conversation between the two instruments here. Some artists perform this section together, but I think it’s quite obvious what she [Gubaidulina] wants in the score. I treat this section very improvisatorially. I listen to the cellist, what he or she is doing and I comment on that. In my recent conversations with the composer, she preferred this way of execution.\textsuperscript{114}

The artist further states that the original version of \textit{In Croce}, where instruments occur simultaneously in this improvisatory subsection, is “inaccurate.” This shows how a performer might question the notated intentions of the composer and even modify them in order to convey their personal understanding of higher order intentions. It also shows how those modifications might well be embraced by the composer.

Draugsvoll performs the Development of Section B (RN 25-26) and the following culmination (RN 27-29) much more quietly than Moser and Lips. Furthermore, he phrases the blocks of the chords with \textit{crescendi} at their end, an approach that also differs from the two other performers [04:26-05:22].

Draugsvoll’s treatment of the text in Improvisation 2 is also different from Moser’s and Lips’s versions. Specifically, he incorporates the low-register pedal originally notated in the first version of \textit{In Croce} [05:23-05:55]. Also, his registration of this subsection contrasts those of Moser and Lips – a warm, 8’ \textit{cassotto} rank. However, Draugsvoll follows the notated dynamics. In the second part of Improvisation 2 (RN 31), where Lips follows the original version of the piece, Draugsvoll implements Moser’s solution as noted in both her transcription and her performance: a moving cluster.

Dynamically, Geringas and Draugsvoll perform Section C (RN 36) in accordance with Gubaidulina’s notational instructions. While they open this section somewhat faster than the originally notated tempo, Draugsvoll slows down dramatically and in a manner that corresponds with the lowering of the register. His choice to follow the original notation in this

\textsuperscript{114} Geir Draugsvoll, interview with author.
way, however, results in a dynamic imbalance in the accordion part, which is a factor of the instrument’s construction. The wide melodies in the left-hand at the beginning of Section C are hardly audible due to the comparative strength of projection of the right-hand manual. Similarly, when the melody is passed to the right-hand (m. 260), it is overpowered by a descending chromatic sequence of thick minor trichords in the left [09:26-10:27]. Unlike Lips and Moser, who tried to solve this problem by implementing different stop changes throughout the section, Draugsvoll excludes such alterations yielding a very different sounding performance.

In the years after the release of the recording, Draugsvoll had the opportunity to discuss various performative parameters of In Croce with Gubaidulina directly in preparation for new performances. He told me that in their dialogues, the composer modified certain interpretative choices, deviating from both the original and Moser’s version of the text:

In the last part [see Figure 85], she wanted the chord in the accordion part to come before the cello entrance, in a mf, like a big sigh [somewhat similar to Lips’s performance]. She also wanted this cluster to be in the left hand and the right hand to produce a slow beat. Something like a tam-tam [also similar to Lips’s rendition]. This part became quite different at the times I’ve been working with her. I didn’t do that in the recording.

The changes were not solely made by Gubaidulina. For example, Draugsvoll suggested the exclusion of the fermata sign at the ending of the second part of Improvisation 2 (RN 31) in the original and Moser’s version (Figure 89).

Figure 89. In Croce (transcription): m. 213. Fermata sign at the end of Improvisation 2.
4.5.1 Summary of the Interpretation by David Geringas and Geir Draugsvoll

Much like Lips’s and Tonkha’s performance, Geringas and Draugsvoll merge the two versions of *In Croce* in their rendition. However, Draugsvoll’s version of the bayan part is slightly different from Lips’s. Geringas and Draugsvoll made several minor modifications, as exemplified by the somewhat freer treatment of the dynamic instructions, especially in Section B. When discussing Improvisation 1 and Improvisation 2, Draugsvoll often alternated between the two editions, at moments treating the original text as incorrect (for example, simultaneous occurrence of the instruments in Improvisation 1). Interestingly, in our interview Draugsvoll pointed out several undocumented modifications suggested by Gubaidulina which also occur on Lips’s and Tonkha’s recording made fifteen years before. This illustrates that the composer’s intentions were likely transmitted orally from Gubaidulina to Lips and later Draugsvoll.

The changes in Gubaidulina’s intentions for *In Croce* are even more apparent in the analysis of the recording of the piece made by Asier Polo and Alberdi Iñaki, which was made entirely with her guidance.

4.6 Observations on the Interpretation by Asier Polo and Alberdi Iñaki

In 2010, as part of Festival de la Quincena Musical de San Sebastian, Alberdi Iñaki recorded an album entirely comprised of compositions by Gubaidulina with her supervision. The album, entitled *Cadenza*, was published by the Belgian Etcetera and includes the following pieces: *Seven Words, In Croce, Cadenza*, and *Et Expecto*.115 For *In Croce*, Iñaki is joined by the renowned Spanish cellist, Asier Polo.

During our discussion of his recording of *In Croce*, Iñaki stressed the importance he places on close adherence to the score, at least initially: “For me, the score is a very serious subject. The score is everything. My accordion teacher, Carlos Iturralde, was an accordionist and a composer, and we always had this kind of discussion. He always insisted on following the

115 Catalogue number: 1433.
instructions of the composer, and respecting them. But after you learn the score, yes, you can change it somewhat.”

Today, Iñaki guides his students according to this advice from his own early teacher. He thinks modifications of the text are acceptable as long as they “improve the music.” However, his attitude towards the musical score does not only result from Iñaki’s early training; it also draws from his understanding of the score as a fixed object: “The score is an artwork. You have to be very respectful of it. It’s like a sculpture or a picture and you have to look at every detail, enjoy it, but also work on delivering interpretation that will match the composer’s idea.”

Observing Iñaki’s statements, one might anticipate a performance of In Croce that entirely conveys Gubaidulina’s intentions as prescribed in the score. Yet, although Polo and Iñaki use the original score of the composition for their performance, there are a number of deviations from it in their performance. Their version of In Croce, documented in the 2010 recording, was created through dialogue with the composer and very much in keeping with her revised ideas about the piece.

For example, following Gubaidulina’s suggestion, Iñaki opens Section A two octaves higher from the originally notated pitch. This way Gubaidulina and Iñaki increase emphasis on the register separation of the instruments at the beginning of the piece. Together, the pair implements further register changes throughout the first Section. In RN 7, Iñaki performs his part one octave lower from the opening [01:26]. Shortly thereafter, at m. 81, he descends another octave [01:39] to finally coincide with the originally notated pitch. However, in m. 147, he drops an octave lower [02:56] than what is indicated in the original score.

Compared to the other three bayan and accordion performers, Iñaki shapes his part with greater freedom, at least in relation to the original score and Moser’s transcription. Yet, this freedom in relation to the notation was guided by the composer, leaving us to wonder whether it was him or her who made the choices or if this liberation from the score was the result of their specific collaboration. Throughout the piece, Iñaki continuously manipulates the bellows, adds the accents, abrupt crescendi and decrescendi, and creates more of an expressive, restless character.

116 Alberdi Iñaki, interview with author.
than the other players, who provide a rather tranquil voice of accompaniment throughout Section A.

Another important modification that did come at the suggestion of the composer can be heard during Improvisation 1 (RN 24). Iñaki recalls that Gubaidulina asked him to perform the accordion motives simultaneously with the cello, describing them as “explosions.” This contrasts the interpretations by the other three performers, who have collaborated with Gubaidulina on their performances, and who also reasoned that the symbolic meaning of the piece (crossover) could best be achieved in this subsection when the instruments occur interchangeably. Iñaki and Polo realize the new composer’s vision of this subsection (explosions) by accentuating the endings of the motives [03:40-04:08]. Like the other three bayan and accordion artists, Iñaki implements both, straight-glissando and wave-like gestures. Similar to the Moser’s adaptation, Iñaki excludes the long pedal cluster.

During Improvisation 2 (RN 30), Iñaki told me that, while he and Gubaidulina discussed certain aspects of his performance, he also took liberties with the score in order to achieve the mood he envisioned, albeit with the composer’s approval:

> Unlike the previous improvisatory section, this is a moment of meditation. It should be performed freer and not necessarily as notated. You have to listen to the cello and together create some kind of a tranquil atmosphere. Also the placement of the clusters in the accordion part has to be timed according to the actions of the cellist, not necessarily as notated. You don’t want to disrupt the performance of the cello… Here with Gubaidulina I mostly discussed the registration. We searched for a rank that would best resemble the original quasi-metallic colour of the organ. I can’t recall exactly, but after a number of trials I think she suggested the 4’ stop. That’s what I have in the score right now.

The recording certainly conveys Iñaki’s cautious dialogue with Polo [05:11-05:46]. However, it also suggests that like Draugsvoll, Iñaki uses a warmer rank than what is notated—it is, likely an 8’ cassotto, instead of a 4’. Here he also omits the low chromatic pedal, a modification introduced in Moser’s version of the piece. Iñaki emphasized the communicative
segment of the second part of Improvisation 2 (RN 31). His description of this segment also indicates the use of the original score: “After the long C note on the accordion and the pizzicato of the cello, you have to carefully build the cluster so that entrances of the instruments exchange naturally and without interruptions.” In keeping with this understanding, the Spanish accordionist carefully shapes clusters from note C as per the original text, and matching the transcription of Lips, his former teacher, comments on the performance of the cellist [05:46-06:46].

According to Iñaki Gubaidulina also asked for changes to the beginning of Section C (RN 36): “Here Sofia suggested to switch the material between the left and the right hand, so that the main melody performed now on the right-hand manual projects with more clarity [see Figure 3.17b].” Iñaki’s statement here coincides with the explanation Gubaidulina gave me in our interview, referring to this modification as the most significant one when transcribing *In Croce*. Also, this adaptation from the score following years of collaboration with various accordionists illustrates the composer’s knowledge of the technical possibilities, and also limitations of the instrument. In fact, Gubaidulina’s suggestion here is easier to apply than the one Moser offered in her interpretation.

Iñaki and Polo’s performance of Section C deviates from the originally notated tempo. They perform this section slightly below the \( \textit{\textnotes=52} \) indicated in Gubaidulina’s score. Like Moser, Lips, and Draugsvoll, then, the Spanish accordionist focuses on linear dynamic shaping rather than strict compliance with the score in order to produce a long, developing crescendo together with the cellist [08:22-12:15]. This emphasizes a register separation of the instruments and the central idea of the piece: crossover.

During the Section A’ (RN 48), the final section of the piece, the composer made further changes, this time back to the initial conception and away from a later change that emerged during her collaboration with Draugsvoll and Lips. Whereas, as discussed above, Gubaidulina asked the two performers to enter earlier than the cello, she asked Iñaki and Polo to begin together as notated in her original score. Iñaki did not recall Gubaidulina’s idea of the pulsating dynamics of the sustained cluster that she had shared with Draugsvoll and Lips.
4.6.1 Summary of the Interpretation by Asier Polo and Alberdi Iñaki

The interpretation by Asier Polo and Alberdi Iñaki demonstrates strong input from the composer and the performers’ acquiescence to her suggestions. At the time of the dialogue with Polo and Iñaki, Gubaidulina had a more profound knowledge of the technical aspects of the bayan/accordion (register range, manual projection), and she utilized it to emphasize her ideas about In Croce. Although Iñaki focused on the original score, some of Moser’s edits found their way in his and Polo’s performance. It is difficult to know whether these moments were the results of Gubaidulina’s suggestions or Iñaki’s or study of Moser’s work. Iñaki’s performance also evidences other influences beyond Gubaidulina and Moser. For example, he incorporates the clusters developing from the central C note that are heard in the performance by his teacher, Friedrich Lips. Iñaki and Polo’s version of the piece, then, is an excellent example of how a musical work changes over time in response to specific performances, collaborations, and the changing ideas of the composer herself.

4.7 Conclusion

Analysis of the recordings of In Croce and interviews with the four performers highlights a number of significant issues. Firstly, the majority of performances incorporate a large number of adaptations introduced in Moser’s edition of the score, which according to the Swiss bayanist, was created in a dialogue with the composer. Secondly, all of the performers stated that they respected the score greatly but that they had to make decisions about registration and dynamics that at times differed from what was notated. Then, each performer stressed the importance of solving the balance problems between each manual of the instrument and the need to create an informative, communicative dialogue with the cellist. Yet they did so in different ways at times. Each performer brought an informed perspective to their realization of the music, always in dialogue with the notation, but also in relation to subsequent “texts” such as recordings and Moser’s transcription, as well as direct consultation with Gubaidulina and in Iñaki’s case, his teacher, a key collaborator of the composer.

Analysis of the various recordings of In Croce also shows how Gubaidulina gained a better understanding of the bayan and accordion from her involvement with elite performers. They allowed her to guide them in their interpretations and provide an increasingly clear, albeit
changing, perspective on her ideas about the piece, its meanings, and various performance details that help convey them. Rather than a fixed notion of the work as her sole creation, then, Gubaidulina’s demonstrates not only an awareness of her own technical limitations, but more importantly, a more fluid and accommodating attitude toward performance that allows for change, problem solving and musicians’ personalized contributions to the music.
Chapter 5
Conclusion

The focus of this dissertation has been on the interrelationships between contemporary music composer Sofia Gubaidulina and four bayan and accordion performers with whom she closely collaborated on the creation of several important pieces of music in her oeuvre. Consideration was given to the way their collaborations affected the compositional outcome. The question of authorship and understandings of the composer’s intentions to adapt to issues pertaining to the performers and their instruments with their mechanical differences were examined. I suggest that thinking through the ways that Gubaidulina’s music for bayan and accordion was composed, prepared for performance, and documented both in notation and recording as processes taking place in specific “art worlds” as described by Becker, can also productively offer possibilities for subsequent performances of this music, and possibly, other compositions by Gubaidulina.

In the first chapter, I discussed different notions of author and authorship and how these at times contrasting perspectives intersect with musical debates related to performers’ treatment of composer’s intentions. I maintain that several performers contributed to the sound and meanings of Gubaidulina’s compositions, usually through highlighting elements less emphasized in the score but always based on profound engagement with her history, aesthetic approach, and a studied understanding of goals specific to the composition. I related this to Gubaidulina’s perspectives as well, noting that she often modified her own musical goals with the specific knowledge and musical conceptions of her music offered by the performers with whom she collaborated. This discussion set the tone for contextualizing and better understanding Gubaidulina’s accordion music as decidedly hers, but also inseparable from the influence of her collaborative network, the art world, in which each piece was produced. This occurred sometimes over long spans of time and through various revisions and adaptations with each performer.
In the second chapter, I provided an overview of Gubaidulina’s opus for the bayan and accordion, aiming to detail the context of her writing and key factors that shaped her compositional process. Gubaidulina gradually came to understand the instrument better, and her compositions utilized this knowledge. This process continued over time as a result of working closely with several notable bayan and accordion performers. As her understanding of the accordion/bayan grew, she utilized that knowledge to create pieces for them that took into account and adapted to their particular musical aesthetics and the specifics of their instruments while still remaining true to her longstanding compositional processes and aesthetics.

The third chapter illustrates this type of collaboration and adaptation with Gubaidulina performing the “core activity” in the art worlds that gave rise to the pieces De Profundis, Silenzio, Fachwerk, and Cadenza. The discussion was based on interviews with Gubaidulina and the performer-collaborators in which they discussed their various contributions, including modifications to the score that were made during their performance preparation. I then analyzed the four pieces, addressing elements of Gubaidulina’s writing that were the result of the dialogues between her and the other musicians.

As an extended case study, in the fourth chapter I traced the creation process of Gubaidulina’s In Croce starting with the initial composition, then a transcription by a collaborating bayanist (Moser), and then several recordings by other bayan and accordion artists. Here Moser, Lips, Draugsvoll, and Iñaki discussed their interpretative decisions based on their understanding of the two versions of the score, supplemented by their dialogues with Gubaidulina.

The completed study reveals several matters of importance for understanding the creation and performance of Gubaidulina’s music. There is little doubt that the composer had clearly conceived ideas about the meaning and form of her pieces and her approach to composition. She stated this clearly during our interview (February 2017), and the performers left little doubt on the matter as well. Further, all artists approached their collaborations with her based on this understanding. Nevertheless, all of the performers shaped the pieces in particular ways. Although the type, timing, and amount of input varied, it is important to note that much of what they did concentrated on the technical aspects of the bayan and accordion. This is especially evident in De Profundis and Silenzio, in which Friedrich Lips and Elsbeth Moser
suggested registration and implementation or exclusion of certain techniques. On the other hand, there were instances in which the performers’ contributions extended beyond the merely technical. In particular, Gubaidulina’s dialogues with Geir Draugsvoll and Alberdi Iñaki led to them having even more prominent roles shaping *Fachwerk* and *Cadenza*. Even so, both performers acknowledged that the music was firmly rooted in Gubaidulina’s compositional voice, despite their important role in shaping it. Indeed, both performers described themselves as contributors rather than co-authors. As Becker suggests, these pieces would not be what they are without input from the specific performers. However, as he also suggests with his formulation of art worlds, the pieces would not exist at all without Gubaidulina, her overall musical vision, and especially her openness to collaboration when working with an instrument with which she initially lacked intimate familiarity.

The dialogues between Gubaidulina and her collaborating performers also suggest that writing for a relatively young instrument, such as the bayan or accordion, almost inevitably requires involvement of a performer or someone deeply knowledgeable about the capabilities and limitations of the instrument. Beyond general matters of what a type of instrument can and cannot do, such involvement, as evidenced by the music discussed here, can often result in segments of a piece constructed in accordance with the specific capabilities and preferences of the performer and their particular instrument. For example, in our interview Gubaidulina stated that some elements of *Fachwerk* need to be transposed an octave lower on Lips and Moser’s instruments because of the slightly narrower range of their bayans. This issue is all the more crucial on accordions with a piano keyboard, where the shape and order of the keys often requires re-voicing of wide chords. Although such modifications do not necessarily interfere with what Kivy describes as “strong” intentions of the composer, such as meaning and structure of the piece, they can certainly relate to composers “weak” intentions, pertaining to pitch, timbre, or instrumentation.

The implications for Gubaidulina’s collaborations and the attitudes toward various intentions within an art world are made plain when considering the various performances of Gubaidulina’s *In Croce*. To be sure, most of the performers declared a commitment to accurate execution of the instructions notated in the score. The analysis of the four performances of *In Croce*, however, confirmed that none of them depended entirely on one edition; rather, all of
them modified and/or merged the two texts to different degrees. Moreover, even Moser’s and Kliegel’s performance, which was based on Moser’s transcription of Gubaidulina’s original manuscript, diverged slightly from the first set of adaptations she made. Interestingly, the sense of obligation to truthfully render Gubaidulina’s instructions as conveyed in the score expressed in our conversations (but slightly less evident in their performances) was greater than what Gubaidulina actually expects. In our interview, the composer actively embraced the idea of interpretive freedom for the performer. Fortunately, the performers’ reverence for the authority of (this) composer and (this) composer’s respect for her collaborators and openness to their interpretations was a comfortable fit in the various versions of In Croce. The performances were slightly different, but powerful in their own ways for expressing Gubaidulina’s high-level intentions. For example, each of the four performers was familiar with the central theme of the piece: the crossover or cross. However, the manner they express it varies, especially in the first improvisatory section. The very fact of an improvisatory section, let alone several, suggests Gubaidulina’s openness to the individual contributions of each performer who plays In Croce. Still, collaboration is key. In our interviews, the performers used their understanding of the score, the idea of the piece and their dialogues with Gubaidulina to support decisions that were both individual and in keeping with the goals of the composer.

Observing Gubaidulina’s own learning process, I have learned much about performing her music. Her tendency to encourage significant modifications as she became deeply acquainted with the instrument tells me that Gubaidulina embraces changes. However, she expects those changes to be grounded in clearly established and expressed conceptions.

While this study has been restricted to four original pieces by Gubaidulina for bayan and accordion and one transcription, her opus for the instruments is vast. Further, much of it does not directly involve contributions from performers. In the least, a critical engagement with performances of this music and of pieces that were composed through collaboration but performed without consultation with the composer might provide an interesting critical counterpoint to what I have discussed here.

The issues and questions arising from Moser’s transcription of In Croce point to many other questions. For developing instruments, are transcriptions even necessary? How authoritative
should they be considered? For her part, Gubaidulina believes that there should be multiple transcriptions of *In Croce*. How might this change the way we think about composer’s intent and authority? What practical issues might arise for performers looking to honour that authority or express (their understanding of) a composer’s intentions, especially high and mid-level ones? These are some of the important issues which I hope will emerge in future studies, enhancing our insight to critical academic literature for the bayan and accordion.

Finally, all of the music discussed in this dissertation was created through collaboration in art worlds. Gubaidulina embraced numerous influences and utilized them to compose powerful, timeless music. Moreover, her work for the bayan and accordion encouraged and inspired a large number of established and emerging composers to write for the instruments, contributing to their development and reputation.

Understanding the art world surrounding Gubaidulina’s output is not simply a matter of understanding her music, as important as that may be; it is about understanding our place in that world.
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Light and Darkness
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1976 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
   • Page 9, system 1

Detto I
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1978 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
   • Measure 336-341

Musical Toys
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1969 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
   • Measure 16-18

Seven Words
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1982 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
   • Measure 6, movement VI, measure 1

Et Expecto
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1985 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
   • Measure 1-8

Galgenlieder (a 5) (Gallow Songs)
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1996 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
   • Movement 8, measure 16-20
De Profundis
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1978 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
  • Measure 1, 17-20, 28-30, 42-59, 66-70, 82-85, 122, 133-137, 147-148, 149, 193-197
  • Measure 27-29 (2015 edition)

Silenzio
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1991 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
  • Measure 1-7, 73-87, 115-123, 119-128, 139-143, 164-168, 174-176, 177-179, 256-263, 311, 312-318

Fachwerk
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 2009 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
  • Measure 1-6, 56-60, 73-76, 138-139, 145, 217-222, 223-228, 259-261, 284, 287, 359-362, 477-484, 597
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By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1979 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
  • Measure 1-4, 5-9, 58-62, 78-81, 177-179, 180, 192-198, 211-213, 213, 214-219, 244-247, 256-259, 319-323, 343-344

Under The Sign of Scorpio
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 2003 by G. Schirmer, Inc.
All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured.
Used by Permission.
  • Cadenza
  • Measures – 1, 3, 4, 5-8, 13, 15-16, 17, 24, 27-32