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ABSTRACT

An Exploration of Pitch Organization in Krzysztof Penderecki’s *Passion According to Saint Luke*

At this time, the extant analytical work on Krzysztof Penderecki’s music falls into two basic categories: those works that address his earlier, more strictly avant-garde compositions in terms of Sausseurian binary parametric oppositions, or those that consider his more mature works, such as the *St. Luke Passion*, solely in terms of foreground motivic content. As insightful and valuable as many of these studies are, none has addressed the notion of an emergent comprehensive pitch structure in works such as the *Passion*, in which Penderecki was developing a personal and thoroughly contrapuntal compositional style based on what was for him a new method: the use of twelve-tone serialism.

My assertion is that a unified and pervasive organization of pitch, beyond Penderecki’s purely aesthetic intuition, does indeed exist in the *Passion*. At the heart of this organization is the structure of the work’s two twelve-tone rows, i.e. how the rows and subsets thereof “carve out” pitch-class space as they unfold in musical time, which proves to determine the intervallic content of the work’s seemingly disparate motivic elements despite the fact that few of these motives even partially constitute literal row segments.

My study provides an explication of this relationship between the *Passion’s* twelve-tone rows and the work’s foreground material as well as analyses that address excerpts from the beginning, middle, and conclusion of the work. The composite image that these analyses reveal is that of a basic serial structure, extrapolated through various intervallic and graphic connections
into a multitude of motives, the newly evident relationships among which form a narrative that
interacts meaningfully with the passion story itself. Penderecki’s compositional ingenuity and
originality are already well-known; what this study demonstrates is his consummate mastery of
motivic organization and text setting, the acknowledgement of which is long overdue.
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Any comprehensive analytical exploration of a work with the phenomenal diversity and complexity of Penderecki’s *Passion According to St. Luke* must be based on the work’s most fundamental and pervasive characteristics; otherwise, its chances of achieving any degree of effectiveness are slim. The present study fulfills this requirement in that its primary purpose is to correlate the consistent patterns of both melodic and harmonic pitch-class intervals that constitute the *Passion’s* musical surface with intervallic patterns that are embedded in the work’s two twelve-tone rows. In turn, the theoretical symbology I use in the text of this study is not complex, and requires only a few explanatory statements: Where I choose to represent pitch classes rather than pitches, I use either the numbers zero to eleven—with the letters “t” and “e,” rather than numerals, signifying the numbers ten and eleven—or letter names with no designation of register. For pitches I use letter names and numbers according to the convention set forth by the Acoustical Society of America, with “C4” representing middle C, etc. A set of numerals within parentheses denotes a pitch-class set’s prime form as well as the set class it defines, and a set of numerals without parentheses denotes an ordered set of pitch classes.

The starting point for this investigation was in the fall of 2004, when I first became acquainted with Miguel Roig-Francoli’s analysis of the initial twelve measures from the thirteenth
movement of Penderecki’s *Passion*,¹ the movement that I address in chapter five of this study. His approach was to employ a similar technique to that used by Jonathan Bernard to analyze works by Varese, Ligeti, and Bartok: utilizing a Cartesian graph to reveal projections of pitches and intervals across registral and temporal space.² Although, as it has turned out, my analysis is primarily concerned with exploring the ways in which the *Passion*’s twelve-tone rows serve as intervallic prototypes for the pitch content of the *Passion* in general, the conceptual framework embodied in Bernard’s and Roig-Francoli’s approaches—defining registral borders and points of division within complex sonorities and tracking their interactions with other pitch groups—has consistently informed this study throughout its progress.

---


CHAPTER 1
THE LABYRINTH: HISTORICAL AND ANALYTICAL BACKGROUND

“‘In the life-story of every eminent human being, we can see the epoch of the Iliad and
the epoch of the Odyssey, [from] youthful heroism [to] struggle [to] manliness and the search for
return [to] tired age and nostalgia for home.’ I also have my Iliad and my Odyssey.”¹ This is the
way in which Krzysztof Penderecki described his life as an artist in 1998. By that time, his ca-
reer as a prominent composer had already spanned nearly forty years, during which he had alter-
nately been labeled a defender of tradition as well as a leader of the avant-garde, and had gar-
nered praise and condemnation for both.

Penderecki’s widespread fame as a composer began with unusual suddenness. In the
summer of 1959, the Polish Composers’ Union held a competition for young composers, accept-
ing two hundred anonymous entries. The three works the judges singled out for merit were so
exceptional that they decided to forego a third prize and instead award a first prize and joint
second prizes. When the entrants’ names were finally revealed, the judges were amazed; all
three turned out to be the work of Penderecki, at that time a “relatively unknown [twenty-six-
year-old] musician from the State High School for Music in Cracow.”² As Penderecki subse-
quently stepped into the international spotlight, he brought with him an “enduring concern with

¹. Penderecki cites Julian Klaczko’s paraphrase of Goethe in the initial essay of: Krzysztof Penderecki,

the subjects of freedom and oppression,” gestated in a childhood dominated by sights of Nazi officers “rounding up … Jews in the streets” and, later, cultural repression under Soviet rule.³

Musically speaking, the influences that informed Penderecki’s work at this point reflect both the typical characterization of traditional Polish art music—an infusion of native folk melodies and dance rhythms into the Western European classical tradition—and the burgeoning Polish avant-garde of that time. B. M. Maciejewski relates that Penderecki’s first violin teacher imparted to him an enduring “love for Johann Sebastian Bach” and that Penderecki also “loves Chopin’s music,” despite his dislike for the piano as an expressive instrument.⁴ Such inclinations were common among Penderecki’s contemporaries; even in the early Warsaw Autumn music festivals of the mid-1950’s, “new Polish music … was influenced [primarily] by native traditions and French models.” However, by the 1958 festival, “the signal for a change of direction was coming … from … [composers such as] Stockhausen, … Boulez, and … Cage.”⁵

The Warsaw Autumn Festivals were the most important modern musical events in the Eastern bloc of the 1950’s, described as an “open window for young … composers” intent on counteracting the “pseudo-classicism and pathos of the [ongoing] Stalinist era.” This they did through the use of “purely technological” methods, such as twelve-tone technique, that “empha-

---


⁴. Maciejewski, *Twelve polish Composers*, 166.

sized the rational perfection of composition above all.”

This radically avant-garde period was short-lived, however, as, by the late 1960s, Eastern composers were incorporating more and more traditional elements into their works. This development was largely motivated by the contentious environment in which Eastern composers such as Penderecki worked during the 1960s, with governmental agencies pressuring them to create works that were “socialist in form and national in expression,” as prescribed by the doctrine of socialist realism. Such expectations stood in sharp contrast to the compositional philosophy of the Darmstadt school during those years, which eschewed semantics and subject matter and—ironically—was motivated by communist and anti-fascist ideologues within a society that itself had only recently been liberated from fascism.

In addition to these stylistic and political considerations, an intense life-long religiosity weighed heavily on Penderecki’s art. “I was perhaps overly devout,” Penderecki once stated; in his hometown “the church was absolutely the center of life,” and his mother had at one time wanted him to enter the Roman Catholic priesthood. This highly conscious spirituality led him again and again to sacred texts for inspiration, throughout all phases of his compositional career.

For the years surrounding Penderecki’s creation of the Passion According to St. Luke, Ray Robinson has traced three fairly distinct general stylistic periods, each containing salient examples of religious musical expression. In the first, approximately from 1956 to 1962, Po-


land’s—and therefore Penderecki’s—post-war isolation from the West, which caused Penderecki to be unfamiliar with the emphasis that leading Western composers of those years were placing on total serialism, was evident in works such as the *Psalms of David* of 1958. The compositional style of this piece owes much to Stravinsky, whose music Penderecki had heard for the first time only the previous year.\(^9\) Also evident in this work is the development of Penderecki’s “sound-mass” or sonoristic compositional technique,\(^10\) for which he still is best known. Mieczyslaw Tomaszewski has cited the advent of Penderecki’s *Threnody* in 1960 as the beginning of his most intense period of experimentation, facilitated by the large and prestigious orchestras and choruses newly at his disposal.\(^11\)

The second period, from 1962 to 1974, is crucial to this study. After the decidedly sonoristic and percussive *Fluorescences* of 1962, Penderecki faced a dilemma, feeling that further explorations into the avant-garde could “destroy the whole spirit of music,” and resolved instead to “gain inspiration from [his] past.”\(^12\) The resultant synthesis of sonorism with a new utilization of melody—generally twelve-tone but often diatonic and set with traditional pitch and metric notation—found its exemplar in the *St. Luke Passion* of 1965-66. A trend away from true sonorism and toward dense polyphony had begun during these years, and emerged as the defining characteristic of Penderecki’s next stylistic period, beginning with the *Awakening of Jacob* of


\(^10\) The eminent Polish musicologist Jozef Chominski coined the term “sonorism,” now widely used especially in Poland and Germany with respect to Penderecki’s early and middle works, to refer to “an exploration of the pure sound values of the sound material,” values that in traditional composition are “secondary result(s)” of “melody, rhythm, and harmony,” as explicated in: Danuta Mirka, *The Sonoristic Structuralism of Krzysztof Penderecki* (Katowice, Poland: Music Academy in Katowice, 1997), 7-8.


Penderecki, among many other artists, has lamented the effect the mass media has had on contemporary society, “reduc[ing] everything to a pulp” and “homogen[izing] culture.”\textsuperscript{14} Irina Nikolska, writing about a 1995 performance in Russia of \textit{Utrenya}, another of Penderecki’s large-scale religious works, reported that, although the audience reacted well to the visceral emotion of the piece, the reception was noticeably less warm than it would have been in earlier years, due in large part to a pervasive “decrease of interest in contemporary music.”\textsuperscript{15} During Penderecki’s aforementioned period of compositional synthesis, however, a contrasting situation presented itself, with communist repression of both religious and avant-garde artistic expression stimulating widespread audiences, at least in the West, to pay intense attention to works such as the \textit{St. Luke Passion}. It is difficult to guess how much attention a similarly novel and large-scale work would garner in today’s marketplace of art music, but the impact of the \textit{Passion’s} premiere in Muenster, West Germany, on March 30, 1966 was undeniable. It was the event that made Penderecki a truly “world-famous composer.”\textsuperscript{16}

Filling Muenster Cathedral to capacity for the first performance of Penderecki’s \textit{Passion} were the requisite large orchestra, three adult choirs, boys’ choir, three soloists, speaker, and conductor; the Bishop of Muenster and his cathedral chapter; the managing director of West German Radio; assorted Polish and German critics; Penderecki himself; and a throng of listen-


\textsuperscript{16} Schwinger, \textit{Krzysztof Penderecki}, 39.
ers.\textsuperscript{17} In the immediate aftermath of the event, critics were effusive in praising Penderecki’s achievement. The venerable Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt wrote that Penderecki had “built the most important bridge between the spirit of the liturgy and modern music.”\textsuperscript{18} Within a few years, the \textit{Passion} received over a hundred performances, and Penderecki moved into the uppermost echelon of modern composers. Meeting this newfound status was a parallel strain of hostile criticism, with writers—some of whom had initially praised the \textit{Passion}—accusing Penderecki of abandoning the cause of modern music and “courting the masses” with elements typical of his second stylistic period such as triadic resolutions and references to Gregorian chant. As a result of the \textit{Passion}, Penderecki garnered the Italia Prize; the Great Art Prize of North Rhine/Westphalia; a teaching post at the Folkwang College in Essen; the aforementioned fame and high standing among his colleagues; and a sharp increase in commissions, performances, and personal income.\textsuperscript{19} However, throughout the rest of his career Penderecki would be followed both by praise for the natural expressiveness and high drama of his works as well as derision for what some see as crowd-pleasing traditionalism and eclecticism.

\textit{The Passion Itself}

The \textit{Passion According to St. Luke} is a work in two parts, comprising twenty-four movements, the total duration of which Penderecki prescribes as approximately eighty minutes. I have already described the size of the forces the work requires; to be specific, the orchestra includes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} Schwinger, \textit{Krzysztof Penderecki}, 39-41.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Schwinger, \textit{Krzysztof Penderecki}, 41.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Schwinger, \textit{Krzysztof Penderecki}, 41-44.
\end{itemize}
over fifty strings; nine woodwinds, including saxophones; fifteen brass players; thirty-two percussion instruments; harp; piano; organ; and harmonium. Against this monumental instrumental edifice the various choirs, the soloists, and the speaker pronounce the text, which Penderecki compiled not only from Luke’s gospel, as the work’s title denotes, but also from five of the Psalms, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the Improperia, and three non-scriptural sources: the Latin hymns “Vexilla regis prodeunt” and “Pange lingua” and the sequence “Stabat Mater.”

Ever since the Passion’s first performance, comparisons with J. S. Bach’s own landmark and large-scale passion settings have abounded. In terms of its sheer textural scope, Penderecki’s work correlates with Bach’s St. Matthew Passion, although it lasts less than half as long in practice. In terms of its treatment of the biblical story of Christ’s betrayal, trial, and crucifixion, the St. Luke Passion begins, like Bach’s St. John Passion, in the garden of Gethsemane. In Bach’s St. Matthew, by contrast, this point in the narrative appears just before the close of Part 1. In this way, the St. John and St. Luke settings share a focused and compact dramatic sensibility.

The fact that Penderecki includes both biblical and non-biblical textual sources recalls Bach’s practice as well; in the early eighteenth century, this pluralism of source material was particularly innovative against the “exclusively biblical” passions of Schütz and the contemporary passion verses “set by [composers such as] Telemann.” Among general similarities such as these,

22. ibid.
the most striking is arguably between the ways in which Bach and Penderecki use their vocal forces for dramatic purposes. Penderecki’s Evangelist—a character also used by Bach, but which recalls even earlier passion performance traditions by speaking, rather than singing—relates the narrative proper, alternating with the soloists and choruses, who play particular roles in the drama and provide “pious commentary” on its events as they occur.24 In addition, Penderecki, following a practice predating and including that of Bach, uses a baritone to play the role of Jesus and the chorus to serve as the turba, or crowd, that mocks him as his trial unfolds.

In terms of specific musical elements, Penderecki’s opening chorus, “O Crux, ave,” with its use of triple mixed chorus contrasted with boy sopranos and altos, directly recalls the opening vocal texture of Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion*.25 Making this reference abundantly clear is the marked appearance of the BACH motive Bb-A-C-B in m. 8 as the last four pitches of the work’s second twelve-tone row, presented here for the first time. This motive occurs, in varied forms, throughout the work, and, as I will discuss later, its contribution to the overall serial structure of the *St. Luke Passion* is of paramount importance. Another prominent and recurring feature of this work is the choral motive on the word “Domine,” comprising two simultaneous dyadic expansions from an augmented sixth to an octave that are a minor third apart (Figure 1.1). I have termed this clear, but chromaticized, reference to the prototypical cadences of pre-Baroque polyphony the *chromatic double clausula* (CDC). This motive, which will also figure prominently in my analysis, functions dramatically as a highly condensed Bach chorale, “a pause in the …


Figure 1.1: The “Domine” motive

Figure 1.2: “Święty Boże”/“Deus meus” motives
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Figure 1.3: The *Passion*’s two twelve-tone rows
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Figure 1.4: “In te”? “In pulverem” motives

In te          In pulverem
narration, [compelling] … the listener … to meditate on the Passion story.”

Joining the BACH motive and the CDC is a motivic source that is Penderecki’s alone: the Polish hymn “Swiety Boze (Holy God).” The incipit notes of its two “phases” are the basis for two more important figures in the Passion: The “Swiety Boze” motive itself, the outlining set class (0134), and the diatonic “Deus meus” motive, containing the first three pitches of an ascending minor scale (Figure 1.2). Penderecki’s references to this hymn are significant, as they help to cast the St. Luke Passion as a particularly Polish work, at a time when the conflict between national and religious issues in Eastern Europe was truly volatile.

The “Swiety Boze” and BACH motives are prominent segments of the St. Luke Passion’s two twelve-tone rows (Figure 1.3). Penderecki presents these series conspicuously only at the work’s opening, allowing them to serve as referential ordered collections throughout the rest of the work. An example of a later figure that evokes, but varies, the intervallic content of these rows is the “In pulverem” melody, itself subjected to variation later in the work to become the “In te” motive of the Passion’s final movement (Figure 1.4). Focusing on this sort of intervallic correlation between the Passion’s twelve-tone rows and the abundant motivic material throughout the work is the approach I use to explore the Passion’s pitch organization, an approach that was previously not extant in the analytical literature.


28. Robinson and Winold, A Study, 70-71. I demonstrate the specific intervallic correspondence between the rows and the “In te” motive in Chapter 6.
Past Analyses of Penderecki’s Music

The body of published analyses that address Penderecki’s music is sparse. To date, the deepest exploration of the *St. Luke Passion* in particular is Ray Robinson’s and Allen Winold’s *A Study of the St. Luke Passion*, first published in 1983 and cited above. In this study, Robinson and Winold compare and contrast Penderecki’s work with passion settings of the past, catalogue the *Passion*’s identifiable motives, and present the work’s two twelve-tone rows as well as all of the notable inverted and/or retrograde segments thereof that occur throughout the piece. Despite the exhaustiveness of their study, however, they do not attempt to unify these data into a pitch-structural analysis of the *Passion* per se, but instead use them to construct a detailed formal and motivic guide to the work.

The landscape of analytical scholarship regarding Penderecki’s music in general changed greatly in 1997, with the appearance of Danuta Mirka’s large-scale dissertation *The Sonoristic Structuralism of Krzysztof Penderecki*. Therein, Mirka engages Saussurean theories of semiotic structure, in which the features of a work that define themselves purely in terms of binary parametric oppositions are its most fundamental structural elements, to address Penderecki’s early sonoristic style in particular. For her, the “langue,” or “elementary structures of [Penderecki’s] system” that precede musical perception, consists of oppositions within the basic parameters of pitch, loudness, and time, such as “loud dynamics vs. soft dynamics.”29 From this framework spring multiple analytical manifestations of the “parole,” or the “system at work,” in

Penderecki’s music itself. These take the form of detailed narrative graphs that demonstrate the interactions and transitions between musical elements—as defined by the “langue” of the work in question—as the music unfolds in time, and provide welcome insight into a compositional technique that long seemed so idiosyncratic and intuitive as to be analytically impenetrable.

Mirka’s work does not address the St. Luke Passion itself, but it obviously sheds a great deal of light on its sonoristic content. However, the presence of her study makes the analytical darkness still surrounding the Passion’s dodecaphonic content all the more stark by comparison, and the question of whether it is possible to determine a unified structure for Penderecki’s work solely in terms of the individual pitches and pitch classes it comprises becomes more pointed. In addressing this question, this study begins, as does the work itself, with an exploration of the Passion’s twelve-tone rows.

CHAPTER 2
DOTS VERSUS LINES: ROW STRUCTURE IN THE PASSION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

I have drawn the title of this chapter from a comment that Penderecki made during an interview for the journal *Music and Musicians* in 1973, in which he spoke of his fundamental differences with the Darmstadt school of composition, to wit: “…we never had a real point of contact…you could say that the difference between Darmstadt and me was that they were interested in dots, whereas I was interested in lines.” To be sure, pointillism was never a part of Penderecki’s stylistic vocabulary, even in the most radically avant-garde works of his early period, but it was in his works of the mid- to late 1960’s, such as the *St. Luke Passion*, that the more linear aspects of his compositional method came to the fore. Dodecaphonic composition facilitated these melodic elements, from two-note motives to twelve-tone rows, the fluidity and expressiveness of which often give them a distinctly romantic stylistic quality. However, these melodies are frequently awash in complexes of contrasting musical features, such as microtonal clusters and cascades of glissandi over wide ranges, and are themselves combined in dense polyphonic textures on a regular basis. Of interest, therefore, is the extent to which the dodecaphonic and linear content of the *Passion* is able to achieve prominence over the work’s more sonoristic features, rather than to be obscured by them.

A survey of the score reveals that, although sonoristic elements abound throughout the *Passion*, the smallest interval by which Penderecki instructs any performer to deviate from the standard twelve pitch classes is a quarter tone. With this being the case, microtones do not compromise the integrity of the work’s dodecaphonic material, but instead tend to serve as textural filler; for example, microtones may fill the “gaps” within a chromatic trichord to form a set of five pitches, each one a quarter tone from the next, that maintains the range and symmetrical quality of the original. Additionally, when Penderecki utilizes glissandi, the music still retains a diastematic quality in that, in the vast majority of cases, the glissandi occur between sustained pitches or change direction upon reaching a specifically notated pitch. In these ways, Penderecki assigns importance to the boundary pitches of the glissandi rather than allowing them to become lost in the pitch continuum on the musical surface. The standard set of twelve pitch classes thus reveals itself clearly as the norm for this work, and the two twelve-tone rows of the *Passion* are the keys to understanding how Penderecki organizes the intervals within it.

In the preceding chapter, I mentioned that the “Swiety Boze” and BACH motives figure prominently within the *Passion*’s twelve-tone rows. However, these motives, along with the other segments of the series to which they belong, account for relatively little of the work’s surface pitch material, the majority of which does not derive from extended serial or motivic quotations. Intervallic patterns are what bind the pitch content of the *Passion* together, and it is for this reason that the double representations of each row in Figure 2.1 are particularly useful. The upper portion of this figure presents the rows in pitch space, progressing from right to left as they do in score notation and following the contour that the rows display in the *Passion*’s opening measures. The lower portion of this figure presents the rows in pitch-class space, with arrows grouping their pitch classes into what I call *chromatic subsets*, the subsets of each row that
Figure 2.1
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Figure 2.2
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Figure 2.3: Syntactical labels
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Row 2: 43562178t90e
unfold in unidirectional semitones. These chromatic subsets are essential serial building blocks for Penderecki, as their pervasiveness within the two rows demonstrates. Furthermore, Penderecki clearly differentiates the two series based on the chromatic subsets’ sizes. Row 2 divides easily into dyadic chromatic subsets, and although row 1 contains chromatic subsets of cardinalities 2, 3, 3, and 3—in addition to the singleton pc 0—one can easily shift its order positions one degree to the left and reveal a series derived from trichordal chromatic subsets (Figure 2.2). This shift is justifiable in light of the fact that, following the Passion’s initial presentation of row 1, the row’s initial two pitch classes are repeated, ending with the chromatic subset <012> that is divided between order positions 1, 2, and 12 in the unaltered version of the series. We can therefore consider the “shifted” form of row 1 (row 1s) to be an intervallic prototype of the “authentic” row (row 1a), and retain both forms for analytical use.

Returning for the moment to the upper portion of Figure 2.1 and the rows’ pitch-spatial properties that are represented there, it is important to note the visual images that those properties can evoke. Lydia Rappoport-Gelfand has created referential labels for both rows that are based on such graphic considerations and—while speculative—are compelling, demonstrating the semiotic power contained in the contours of these series: The undulating but generally ascending shape of the first row represents Jesus climbing the Mount of Olives, while the wedge-like pattern of the second row, crowned by the BACH torculus, depicts the image of the cross itself.2

The importance of directionality within the chromatic subsets that make up the Passion’s twelve-tone rows has led me to develop a new way of conceptualizing the pitch-class space in

which his twelve-tone rows reside. Echoing Penderecki’s sentiments that I cited at the opening of this chapter, this concept is decidedly linear rather than pointillistic. Instead of envisioning a cyclical array of connectible points, I utilize a schema comprising twelve contiguous units, groups of which form linear entities rather than collections. This approach reveals what I call a \textit{syntax-determinate pitch-class structure} for the work in general, and causes the chromatic subsets at the heart of each of the Passion’s rows to become analytically definitive.

To address the syntactical properties within and among each row’s chromatic subsets, I define three terms: \textit{initiation} (I), \textit{expansion} (E), and \textit{termination} (T). Figure 2.3 demonstrates the application of these terms to the elements of both series as presented in the Passion as well as the “shifted” version of the first: Within any chromatic subset, I label the first pitch class to appear “I,” the last “T,” and, in the case of trichordal sets, the pitch class between them “E.” I then use these labels to discern not only the positions and boundaries of the chromatic subsets, but also to correlate pitch classes with similar syntactical functions within them.

In essence, the “initiation-expansion-termination” concept directly evokes Mark Johnson’s “source-path-goal” schema, which in turn serves as a \textit{de facto} definition for the concept of teleology as it relates to those experiences that we tend to perceive spatially, such as the presentation of music.\footnote{Johnson’s schemata are summarized and effectively applied to musical situations in: Candace Brower, “Pathway, Blockage, and Containment in Density 2.5,” \textit{Theory and Practice} 23 (1997).} Traditionally, we tend to associate teleology in music with hierarchical analytical constructs, but that is not the case in this study. My approach is to affix exactly one syntactical label to each pitch class within a series; it is then up to the music itself to tell us which, if any, of the patterns that these labeled pitch classes exhibit carry structural weight at any particu-
lar time over the course of the work. Hierarchical or not, of course, a teleological compositional
construct differs greatly from, for example, the continually developing variations of Schoenberg
or the motivic distillation and concentration of Webern and the Darmstadt school, and when
theorists have applied it to serial works in the past, they have generally only done so in order to
contrast those compositions with their tonal antecedents. In the case of the Passion, however,
the value of defining the structure of Penderecki’s rows based on the teleological qualities inhe-
rent in their presentation is clear when we consider how many meaningful segmental possibilities
such an approach yields.

For each of the Passion’s rows, the position that the chromatic subsets and syntactical
labels occupy imply associations with certain specific set classes. For example, the fact that the
typical chromatic subset cardinalities for rows 1 and 2 are respectively three and two associates
the chromatic trichord (012) with row 1 and the chromatic dyad (01) with row 2. Additionally,
we can divide pitch-class space according to the placement of the chromatic subsets’ boundaries
within each row, creating more associations between set classes and Penderecki’s rows. If we
consider these boundaries as singular entities—for example, in row 1s we could consider these
boundaries to be the midpoints between PCs 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and E-0—they would form a member
of set class (0369) in row 1s and a member of the whole-tone collection in row 2. On the other
hand, if we collect all of the PCs that abut these boundaries—i.e., all of a row’s “Is” and “Ts”—
only row 1 would yield an analytically useful set class, the octatonic collection, whereas such a
collection from row 2 would encompass the entire chromatic aggregate.

While the aforementioned methods of determining associations between the Passion’s rows and particular set classes produce more salient results for row 1, the opposite is the case when we group PCs within each row that have similar syntactical labels. A grouping of all of the “Is” or “Ts” from row 1s yields a member of set class (0167), which, as it turns out, plays no discernible role in the music itself. A grouping of all of the “Es” from row 1s yields a member of set class (0369), matching the intervallic structure of the boundaries between row 1s’ chromatic subsets that was described above. However, a collection of all of the “Is” or “Ts” from row 2 yields a unique and useful result: a member of set class (023579), the only set class associated with either row that is both asymmetrical and a closely-related subset of the diatonic collection. This finding is important in light of the large amount of diatonic melodic material in the Passion, material that—in the absence of an analytical approach such as this one—seems largely unconnected to the work’s twelve-tone rows.

Since a chromatic subset of a twelve-tone row can only unfold either clockwise or counterclockwise in pitch-class space, I have found it useful to segment the Passion’s rows according to the directional oppositions among their chromatic subsets. I use the term oppositional locus to refer to a point in pitch-class space at which two chromatic subsets that unfold in opposing directions either converge or diverge, regardless of whether those subsets are adjacent in terms of order within the row. In syntactical terms, these are the points at which two pitch classes within a twelve-tone row that are adjacent in pitch-class space both function either as initiations or terminations. These loci occur in two forms: positive, comprising adjacent terminations, and negative, comprising adjacent initiations. No additional associations between row 1s and any particular set classes result from examining the configuration of that row’s four oppositional loci, since these
loci map directly onto the boundaries between the chromatic subsets within row 1s, but in row 2 the situation is distinctly different. Through the schemata that represent row 2 in Figures 2.1 and 2.3, we can clearly note a negative oppositional locus between PCs 4 and 5 and a positive oppositional locus between PCs 8 and 9. This approach treats row 2 as a sort of compound melody, one part of which unfolds clockwise and the other counterclockwise, one chromatic dyad at a time. Bearing this in mind, we must note the fact that, if we isolate the four counterclockwise chromatic subsets, their presentation is not quite linear, to wit: <43>, <21>, <t9>, <0e>. Although the PCs within each of these dyads unfolds counterclockwise, the dyads themselves form two groups of two dyads each that exhibit directional opposition of their own, with <43> and <21> unfolding counterclockwise and <t9> and <0e> unfolding clockwise. The point of these groups’ convergence, a positive oppositional locus at the chromatic subset—rather than pitch-class—level, is between PCs 0 and 1, as shown in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.4: A positive oppositional locus between counterclockwise-unfolding chromatic subsets in row 2

The pitch classes in order: <4321t90e>
Approaching row 2’s three oppositional loci as we did the boundaries of each row’s chromatic subsets, both considering the loci to be the midpoints between the pitch classes that form them and representing the loci with those pitch classes themselves, the following set-class associations with row 2 result: The midpoints between PCs 0-1, 4-5, and 8-9 form a member of SC (048), whereas those pitch classes themselves form a member of the hexatonic collection. Members of these two set classes rarely appear within the Passion’s musical material; instead, the musical significance that SC (048) and the hexatonic collection exhibit is indirect, as explained below.

The set class (048) divides the chromatic aggregate into three equal parts. This fact implies an association of chromatic tetrachords, representing one-third of the chromatic aggregate, with row 2, in addition to the aforementioned association of chromatic dyads with that row and the association of chromatic trichords with row 1s. Together, these correspondences encourage a general association of chromatic set classes that have odd-numbered cardinalities with row 1 and a general association of set classes that have even-numbered cardinalities with row 2. Reinforcing this notion is the way in which row 1a unfolds, particularly because of its divergence from the prototypical chromatic-subset structure of row 1s. The fact that row 1a begins with an “incomplete” two-pitch-class chromatic subset followed by a “complete” trichordal chromatic subset, which together form a member of SC (01234), associates SC (01234) with row 1, balancing the number of chromatic set classes associated with each of the Passion’s rows.

As for the hexatonic collection and its association with row 2, its importance to this study of the Passion derives from a particular subset that it shares with row 2-affiliated SC (023579): SC (037), the consonant triad. I include the consonant triad in this search for associations between the Passion’s twelve-tone rows and specific set classes because it is the most dramatically
significant set class in the *Passion*, appearing climactically—and surprisingly, considering the
dissonance and complexity of the *Passion* in general—at the ends of both the “Stabat Mater” and
the work as a whole. Although this set class is also a subset of the octatonic collection, and
could therefore associate with row 1 as well as with row 2, the specific pitch classes that Penderecki uses to build the *Passion’s* final sonority suggest an ultimate association with row 2, as
demonstrated in figure 2.5, which presents the row in prime form.

![Figure 2.5: The E-major triad within row 2](image)

Considering that, as mentioned above, row 2 is a sort of compound melody, one part
comprising dyads the member pitch classes of which unfold clockwise in pitch-class space and
the other comprising dyads the member pitch classes of which unfold counterclockwise in pitch-
class space, it becomes clear that the pitch classes E, G#, and B play important syntactical roles
within the row. Respectively, E is the row’s initial pitch class, G# is the final pitch class within
the clockwise-unfolding group, and B is the final pitch class within the counterclockwise-
unfolding group, as well as being the final pitch class of the row. It is notable that B is the final
pitch class of the counterclockwise-unfolding group but not the farthest pitch class within that
group from the group’s initial pitch class, E; the farthest pitch class from E within that group is
instead A. This is due to the fact that B and A are members of the BACH motive within row 2,
the two dyads within which unfold clockwise while their member pitch classes unfold counter-
clockwise. This demonstrates Penderecki’s compositional ingenuity: He utilizes the BACH mo-
tive not only as an extramusical reference within row 2 but also as a device by which to achieve
a connection between serial syntax and triadic structure. In light of these findings, we can con-
sider the consonant triad in general to associate with row 2, that association being all the more
distinct for the E major triad in particular. With this final association in place, I present in figure
2.6 a list of all the set classes that we now can associate with particular rows from the St. Luke
Passion:

Figure 2.6: Row/set-class associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row 1:</th>
<th>Row 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chromatic trichords and pentachords</td>
<td>Chromatic dyads and tetrachords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC (0369)</td>
<td>The whole-tone collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The octatonic collection</td>
<td>SC (023579)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC (048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The hexatonic collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The consonant triad (SC 037), especially E-G#-B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that the structural grouping possibilities within each of the Passion’s rows are
numerous and overlap to a large extent. Essentially, each row contains a number of inherent
segmentational schemata that fall into two basic categories: ordinally contiguous and ordinally
disjunct. The ordinally contiguous schemata define the chromatic subsets and other literal seg-
mens of the rows themselves, while the ordinally disjunct schemata define pitch-class sets de-
rived from the locations of one or more of the following elements: the chromatic subsets’ boundaries, pitch classes with similar syntactical functions, and oppositional loci within a particular row. Pitch-class sets defined by ordinally disjunct schemata, such as diatonic sets, triads, and members of the (0369) set class, stand in marked contrast to their ordinally contiguous counterparts, which generally comprise series of semitones. All in all, these segmentational schemata and the pitch-class sets they define have a precompositional function, serving as a palette of referential interval patterns at the composer’s disposal. Only through an exploration of Penderecki’s music itself can we determine what roles they play and what relationships exist between them in the Passion.

Each of the following four chapters addresses a particular movement, or a section thereof, from the Passion: Chapters three and six deal respectively with the work’s opening and closing movements, chapter four with the lyrical and meditative “Deus, Deus Meus,” and chapter five with the decidedly sonoristic “Et Surgens Omnis Multitudo.” Within each of these chapters is an annotated score example to which the analytical text corresponds. In chapters three and five, I have supplemented certain score examples with spatial graphs in order to make the pitch-spatial design of the music being analyzed more easily discernible. These chapters share a common format: First, I describe the section’s pertinent general features, then I relate the musical surface material to features of one or both of the twelve-tone rows. Following that are three synopses, the first two addressing the role that each row plays in the movement as signified by the presence of its features in the surface material, and the third combining the previous two into a composite narrative. Together, these analyses demonstrate the variety of edifices that Penderecki constructs on the basis of the syntactical structure of his twelve-tone rows.
CHAPTER 3
EXPOSITION: “O CRUX AVE”

Even a cursory study of the first eight measures of the *Passion According to Saint Luke* clearly reveals its expository nature (see the first two pages of Figure 3.1). After the initial choral outburst on the words “O Crux,” Penderecki presents row 1 markedly in the low brasses and strings, sustaining each individual pitch so that a massive cluster that includes all twelve pitch classes is formed. In contrast dynamically, but just as distinct, is the first presentation of row 2 by two of the treble choral parts, accompanied only by a single organ line. Throughout the rest of the work, full or even nearly full iterations of either row are rare, making these initial statements all the more unique. The incomplete row statements that precede rehearsal letter A and follow letter D maintain the marked status of the movement’s initial row statements by virtue of being unaccompanied lines juxtaposed with thick polyphonic textures.

This movement also serves an expositional purpose in terms of texture, giving the listener a sort of sonic overview of the melodic, chordal, and sonoristic materials that interweave throughout the *Passion*. With Penderecki in general, but in this movement especially, no two textures are quite alike; for example, a dodecaphonic cluster may be static, as in m. 6, or may comprise undulating polyphonic lines, as in the section following letter D. More than elsewhere in the *Passion*, Penderecki also constructs sections utilizing only one pitch class, such as at letter
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A and letter B, providing a maximum level of contrast with the movement’s clusters and melodic lines alike.

I have used the points in this movement at which only a single pitch class is present to divide the movement into four main sections. The first, the primary material of which comprises the “double-exposition” of the Passion’s twelve-tone rows, extend from the opening measures to letter A. The next section, which ends at letter C, departs from the melodic nature of the first, featuring two six-voice clusters in different registers. At letter C begins a gradually growing contrapuntal texture that introduces diatonic material—including subtle triadic references—for the first time in the work before culminating in a 16-voice cluster. This cluster encompasses all twelve pitch classes before a sudden—and distinctly cadential—resolution to one pitch class over the span of four octaves at letter D. At this point, the fourth and final main section begins with an integrated statement then condenses, through glissandi, to a single pitch class once again. As these sections unfold, the presence of references to row 1 at the beginning and end of the movement and the preponderance of references to row 2 in the interior of the movement cause the two rows to display relatively equal prominence overall. This is appropriate, since one of the duties of this movement is to introduce both of the Passion’s twelve-tone series clearly. In addition, this movement’s musical material tends to lead in a particular referential direction: from sets that associate with row 1 to sets that associate with row 2. This makes sense in light of Rapoport-Gelfand’s interpretation of row 1 as representing the ascent to Golgotha and row 2 as the image of the cross itself, the destination of the Passion’s narrative.

Before the first statement of row 1, the choirs and organ sound single pitch classes in octaves: first G, then A-Ab-G. Immediately, there is ambiguity in determining to which row these pitch classes are affiliated. Grouping them according to the text “Crux ave” (G-A-Ab) yields a
semitonal contour of <+2, -1>, found only around the positive oppositional locus of row 2.

However, the pitch classes A-Ab-G are presented contiguously, and, by virtue of their trichordal status, evoke row 1. This latter interpretation casts the opening pitch classes logically as a preparation for the ensuing complete exposition of row 1. Actually, the exposition is more than complete, as the last pitch class of the row is followed by a reiteration of the first. The second pitch class of row 1-D-sounds again as well, but it is sustained by choir 1 and the low brass in m. 6, ending the row’s progress. The remaining pitch classes that the choir sings in m. 6, like the opening pitch classes of the movement, form a subtle precursor to the row statement—this time, that of row 2—that follows. Within each subdivided vocal part, these pitch classes are grouped into perfect fourths that, together, nearly span the cycle of fourths, leaving out only the sustained Ds held over from row 1. These perfect fourths—along with their fellow members of interval class 5—associate with row 2, albeit vaguely, because their consonance and the fact that they bisect the chromatic aggregate arithmetically evoke traditional triadic and diatonic musical structures, which in turn relate to the row 2-affiliated diatonic subset (023579) more than to any other set class associated with either of the Passion’s rows.

Following the exposition of row 2 is a tenor reiteration of the first seven pitch classes of row 1, ending with a sustained G. However, evocations of row 2 continue to prevail, as, in the measure before letter A, the altos meet this G with an A and Ab, recalling the opening figure of the movement but not proceeding back to G. Therefore, the figure just before letter A, as opposed to its earlier counterpart, refers to row 2. This figure also occurs in the third measure after letter A (D-E-Eb), punctuating the otherwise unary pitch-class texture that opens the movement’s second section.
Four measures after letter A, the octaves on D give way to glissandi that lead to a six-pitch-class cluster (figure 3.2). This cluster comprises two literal chromatic subsets of row 1: PCs F#, G, and Ab in the tenor parts and B, Bb, and A in the alto. Penderecki emphasizes the termination pitch class of these two subsets, A, by doubling it in the soprano parts. In m. 17, the basses enter abruptly, singing somewhat meandering lines, all of which include centrally located four-note motives belonging to set class (0123). In addition to the registral difference between mm. 14-16 and m. 17, there is also a referential difference, namely that these bass melodies correspond clearly to row 2, not row 1. This is primarily due to the contours of the four-note motives, all of which match one of these sequences, which evoke the oppositional loci of row 2: <-1, -2, +1>, <+1, +2, -1>, and <+1, -2, -1>. The opening and closing pitch classes of each of these melodies also correspond to row 2 by subtly referring to the intervals within a triad, as each pair forms either a major third, perfect fourth, or perfect fifth.

The third section of this movement is most clearly diatonic at the outset. Repeatedly, the tenors sing D-E and the boy sopranos follow with F-F#, realizing the first three degrees of both a major and minor scale or mode. Within the denser texture that follows, similar interplays occur, first between the boy altos and the sopranos of choirs 1 and 2, then between the choir 1 tenors and choir 1 sopranos. The fact that Penderecki builds these two later diatonic references respectively on A and D even implies a tonic-dominant relationship, or at least that the perfect fifth carries structural importance. Because of row 2’s association with the diatonic subset (023579), these diatonic references cause this section to associate decisively—and solely—with row 2.

Following letter D, the silence preceding the double basses’ A# and the contour of the melody that follows it make it seem that that A# is the initial pitch class of a transposed iteration of row 1. Following this assumption leads to the conclusion that the row statement is cut off
Figure 3.2: mm. 14-16
after seven pitch classes, as it was preceding letter A, and is complemented by the BACH motive of row 2 in the organ. However, these two lines comprise only 11 pitch classes; the missing one is A. Interestingly, if we take the octaves on A at letter D into account, the double basses’ statement becomes a retrograde inversion of row 1 that combines with the BACH motive to form the chromatic aggregate. The sustained pitches that follow these melodies, along with the double basses’ G# and A that close the movement and are connected by a glissando, form a chromatic octachord, so that the material corresponds no longer with both rows: Both the octachord’s cardinality, which corresponds to two of the three equal parts into which row 2’s oppositional loci divide the twelve-tone aggregate, and the E-major triad—with semitones filling in one of its thirds—that the sustained pitch classes outline (E, F, F#, G, G#, B) make its sole association with row 2 clear.

In the choral statement following letter D, each choral part presents motives with either the contour <-1, -2, +1> or its inverse, another evocation of the positive oppositional locus within row 2. Glissandi link these statements to the final subsection of the movement, which comprises clusters in the violins, harmonium, and choral parts that condense to As, doubling the already sustained As in the organ and double basses. The respective pitch-class cardinalities of these clusters, all of which are chromatic, are seven, four, and six. Each of these cardinalities corresponds to a particular row based on that row’s chromatic subset cardinalities: The cardinality of seven corresponds to the third and fourth chromatic subsets combined with the singleton pitch class of row 1a, the cardinality of four corresponds to any two chromatic subsets of row 2, and the cardinality of six corresponds to any two chromatic subsets of row 1s. Thus, although this passage contains mixed row associations, the majority of those associations are with row 1, so that references to row 1 close, as well as open, the movement.
A particular similarity between this movement’s initial and final evocations of row 1 is that they each coexist with less significant references to row 2: the less-preferred grouping of G, A and Ab at the opening and the four-pitch-class harmonium cluster at the close. Supporting the formal symmetry that these elements imply is the presence of lengthy, if not full, quotations of row 1 in each of the outer sections. Whereas the first section includes the movement’s only complete statement of the row soon followed by a half-statement, the fourth begins with a version of the row that is altered by the BACH motive within row 2. Only one reference to row 1 exists in the middle of the movement: the chromatic cluster immediately following the octaves on D at letter A. As opposed to its outer sections, the interior of this movement is the domain of row 2.

From the measure before letter B to letter D, the movement’s pitch-class material associates only with row 2, and maintains at least some connection to row 2 throughout the final section as well. Since, as mentioned above, a secondary reference to row 2 also colors the opening of the first section, the only material completely free from an association with row 2 comprises the exposition of row 1, the partial statement of row 1 following the exposition of row 2, and the chromatic cluster following letter A.

Based on the spatial association of row 2 with the image of the cross, the general dominance of references to row 2 in this movement reflects the movement’s central text, “O crux ave,” as do the numerous examples of row 1 evocations leading directly to material associated with row 2, as follows: The exposition of row 1 precedes that of row 2, the partial statement of row 1 prior to letter A leads in the next few measures to evocations of the positive oppositional locus within row 2, and the chromatic cluster following letter A that refers to chromatic subsets within row 1 leads to motives that reflect the oppositional loci of row 2 in general. Despite this focus
on the destination of the Passion’s narrative, however, the “frame” of row 1 references in this movement reminds us that the journey has just begun.
In the process of describing his gradual turn from modernism to traditionalism in the years surrounding his composition of the *Passion*, Penderecki made the following statement: “...the perfection of the self must be accompanied by the regeneration of nature.” For Penderecki, this regeneration entailed a return to diatonic melody, which is predominant in the *Passion* for the first time in this movement. Diatonicism was implicit in the third section of the first movement, but vaguely; in this movement, the <+2, +1> contour that consistently sets the words “Deus, Deus meus” becomes a significant motive that Penderecki recalls throughout the rest of the work (Figure 4.1). Another important motive that makes its first appearance in this movement is the chromatic double clausula (CDC) that sets the word “Domine” at letter B and letter D. Although the overall content of this two-chord progression is completely chromatic, its resolution to two minor-third dyads an octave apart matches the minor quality of the “Deus meus” motive and marks the “Domine” motive as another distinctly traditional element in this work as a whole.

The printed designation of the movement as an aria provides the key to its character. Throughout the portion of this movement that this chapter addresses, from its beginning to letter E, the texture is mainly that of melody—sung by the baritone soloist in the role of Jesus—and accompaniment, not lacking in chromaticism but written entirely with standard notation. Even after the marked increase in choral forces following letter C, a single melodic line, in the boys’
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choir and the tenor part of choir 1, dominates the texture; only at letter D does a fully integrated chordal texture emerge.

I have divided the music represented in figure 4.1 into four sections, as follows: The opening section comprises most of the baritone soloist’s material, while after letter B the baritone sings more sporadically and the choirs make their first entrances. At letter C, “piu mosso,” the choirs take over the musical foreground, and at letter D, following a large-scale statement of the “Domine” motive, the tenors and basses produce the movement’s first simultaneous chromatic aggregate, the homophonic nature of this section standing in stark contrast to the material that came before. As diatonic material is noticeably more abundant in these thirty-two measures than it normally is within the *St. Luke Passion*, row 2 associations abound, especially in the baritone solo. Row 1 references play a consistently antagonistic role, seeming to reflect the feelings of doubt and abandonment inherent in the text.

The “Deus meus” motive itself, with which the baritone soloist begins the movement, is in the form of SC (013). This set class is a subset of both the row 1-affiliated octatonic collection and the row 2-affiliated SC (023579). In order to break this referential tie, it is useful to note the most fundamental structural difference between these two set classes: While the prime forms of both are scalar, the octatonic collection divides the chromatic aggregate into equal parts, while SC (023579) does not display such symmetry. This difference is made significant by the respective pitch-class symmetry and asymmetry of the frequently juxtaposed twelve-tone and diatonic material in the *Passion* as a whole. Therefore, we can consider common subsets of the octatonic collection and SC (023579) that are symmetrical to associate more directly with the
octatonic collection and row 1 and those that are asymmetrical—such as SC (013)—to associate more directly with SC (023579) and row 2.

After stating the (013) motive twice, the soloist’s melody proceeds with PCs Db, C, and B, which display a pitch-class contour of <-1, -1>. When combined with the A and Bb of the “Deus meus” motive, the resulting set is a transposed quotation of the first five pitch classes of row 1. This pattern of referential contrasts between overlapping pitch-class sets continues, as the C and B that complete this reference to row 1 form a member of the row 2-affiliated SC (013) with the A that follows them, and this A forms a member of SC (013) with the two pitch classes that follow it—F# and Ab—as well. Since the “Deus meus” set is also a member of SC (013), these sets form an apt transition back to that motive. The next excursion from this foundational set is a leap to PCs Eb, F, and E in mm. 8-9. As a transposed quotation of the eighth, ninth, and tenth pitch classes of row 2, these pitch classes evoke one of that row’s positive oppositional loci. The presence of these pitch classes continues the referential trend set by the “Deus meus” motive, as does the following five-pitch-class set, beginning with the E and F# that set the syllables “de-re” in m. 9. This set is a marked spelling of the first five degrees of a major scale or mode on E. The transpositional level of this set is important, as it prefigures the centricity around E that the following section of music displays. The four-note set that begins with the B of this scalar group-B-Bb-C-C#—evokes the negative oppositional locus of row 2 and precedes a final iteration of the “Deus meus” motive by the baritone soloist.

The instruments that accompany the baritone solo primarily sound Gs in the opening measures of this movement, reinforcing the G of the “Deus meus” motive as a sort of localized tonic. The Eb, and E of m. 3 in the cello and bass parts combine with this G to form a member of set class (014), a subset of both the octatonic and the hexatonic collections and therefore am-
biguous in terms of row references. Just following this event, the organ part allies distinctly with row 1, with B, G#, A, and Bb statements that correspond in terms of contour to either of that row’s positive oppositional loci. However, the organ’s E, F, and G leading into m. 5—another member of (013)—prepare the way for the return of the “Deus meus” motive by referring to row 2. In the last four measures of this opening section, beginning with octaves on D, the organ part continues to display contrasting overlapping references: The first three pitch classes—D, Eb, and C—form a member of (013), corresponding to row 2; the third through sixth—C, C#, Bb, and A—form a member of (0134), referring to row 1; and the sixth through eighth—A, G#, and G—continue the association with row 1 by forming a member of (012).

The second section of this movement begins with a small-scale statement of the “Do-
mine” motive by the boys’ choir. Though compact, this two-chord progression encapsulates the tension between the characteristics of the work’s two twelve-tone rows with great effectiveness. As mentioned earlier, its voice leading resembles that of pre-tonal clausulae and the minor third to which the initial chord resolves matches the quality of the “Deus meus” motive. Counterbal-
lancing these allusions to traditional diatonic constructs that associate with row 2 are the facts that the entire motive forms a chromatic hexachord, strongly associated with row 1; that the ini-
tial chord of the CDC is a member of SC (0235), a subset of both the octatonic collection and SC (023579) that associates more directly with the octatonic collection and row 1 because of its symmetry; and that the minor third—when abstracted from this cadential context—is an impor-
tant signifier of row 1, especially row 1s. At letter B, this motive serves a transitional purpose, the G and E to which it resolves being the incipit pitch classes, respectively, of the “Deus meus” motive that precedes it and the one that follows it. Reinforcing this veritable “key change” are the instruments that accompany the baritone, sounding sustained and low Es.
In mm. 15-18, the choirs enter with a mixture of slow-moving motives and sustained pitches. In terms of “text” setting, this pitch material is split almost exactly evenly between the phonemes “A” and “O.” If we divide the pitch classes that the choirs sing in these measures according to this distinction, the resulting sets are 02456578 and E023456. The similarities between these sets are striking: The upper five pitch classes of each form a chromatic pentachord, referring to row 1, and the lower three pitch classes of each form a member either of set class (024) or set class (013), both of which correspond to row 2. Thus, the row affiliations of these choral entrances are ambiguous, in contrast to the firmly row 2-oriented “Deus meus” motive that the baritone soloist sings simultaneously.

The third section of this movement features three distinct musical strata. One is by now familiar: In the measure preceding letter C and in the third measure after it, the baritone soloist sings the “Deus meus” motive, based again on G, accompanied by Gs in the low strings and harmonium. At the same time, some of the vocal parts and the organ embellish the pitch class G with sustained Abs and F#s, countering G’s association with the “Deus meus” motive, and therefore with row 2, with a trichordal connection to row 1. Finally, as mentioned above, the boys’ choir and tenors sing repeated Dbs and Cs; but entering at the same time are additional tenors and basses, as well as a timpani, sounding Bbs and As. Together, these pitches form members of SC (0134), and thereby associate with row 1. Carrying this conflict between the rows into the movement’s final section is the ensuing CDC on the word “Domine.”

The pitch-class material of section 4 that follows the “Domine” CDC unfolds quickly, beginning with Eb, then moving through a C#-D-E trichord to a full and equally voiced twelve-tone cluster, as annotated in figure 4.1. The pitches Eb-C#-D-E, as a member of (0123), refer to row 2, whereas the same can generally be said about the cluster that follows: A survey of the
dyads in each vocal part that make up the cluster reveals that the tenors of choirs 1 and 2 sing pitch classes that surround D—C, C#, Eb, and E—and that the basses of choirs 2 and 3 sing pitch classes that surround G—F, F#, Ab, and A. G and D themselves form a dyad in the bass part of choir 1, and the remaining pitch classes, A# and B, form their own dyad in the tenor part of choir 3. Although the sets that surround G and D form members of the row 1-oriented (0134) set class, the central G-D combines with A# and B to form a member of the hexatonic and triadic set class (0347), confirming the overall allegiance of this cluster to row 2.

Whereas the Passion’s two twelve-tone rows carried relatively equal importance in the first movement, a contrasting situation presents itself in this movement, with row 1 playing a definitely more subsidiary role. This is to be expected in a movement defined by a diatonic melodic motive and implications of triadic harmony. In the first section, references to row 1 initially present themselves between statements of the ‘Deus meus” motive by the baritone soloist, providing contrast both in his line and in the parts that accompany it. However, in the four measures before letter B, only the organ presents motives associated with row 1, this time not returning to row 2 references, but leading directly into a CDC in conflict with the consistently row-2-oriented baritone. In the second section, row 1-oriented material presents itself in the choral parts, but is overmatched by associations with row 2, in other choral parts as well as the baritone solo. Evocations of row 1 perhaps are strongest in the third section, in which the chromatic trichord in the vocal parts and organ engages in the ‘Deus meus” motive directly and the (0134) member set dominates the texture until the large CDC at letter D. This statement of the “Domine” motive, ambiguous in terms of row allegiance as always, is the movement’s last vestige of row 1 references.
The passing and ambiguous evocations of row 1 in mm. 3 and 4 of this movement represent the only break in the continuous presence of row 2 references from the movement’s opening to the middle of the third section. In the first section it is the “Deus meus” motive itself and the E-major pentachord that most strongly signify row 2. In the second section, statements of the “Deus meus” motive become less frequent, so that the more generic pitch-class sets, C, D, E and B, C, D take up some of the referential duties. As mentioned above, row 2 is most “embattled” in the third section, where sustained F#s and Abs effectively chromaticize the “Deus meus” motive, but this section merely provides relief for the next, where row 2 references break away from the neutral “Domine” motive to exert hegemony.

It may be that the row 2 references in this movement—which correlate the cross and the “Deus meus” motive as well as the notion of traditional musical practice—primarily signify closeness and directness of communication with God. The settings of the preliminary requests “respice in me” (look upon me)” in the first section and “Verba mea auribus percipe (Give ear to my words, o Lord)” in the third include fully row-1-oriented textures, which in this movement are unique features. Leading up to letter B, Penderecki sets the direct question—as opposed to a mere address—“quare me dereliquisti (why hast thou forsaken me )?” with a melody strongly oriented to row 2 and including the E-major pentachord. However, he also reflects the meaning of the text itself by having the organ part “abandon” the vocal line in favor of references to row 1. In the fourth section, with the ambiguously set address “Domine” functioning as a preceding referential pivot, the choirs articulate the most direct statement of the psalm with material associated solely with row 2: “intellege clamorem meam (consider my meditation).” Thus does the movement’s pitch-class material match the gradually increasing intensity and demand inherent in the text of the psalm.
In this, the last movement of part 1 of the Passion, we encounter one of the work’s many truly sonoristic segments, in which Penderecki employs the sonic characteristics—indeterminacy, microtonal clusters, and the like—that made him famous. Features such as these also exist in the movements that chapters 3 and 4 address, but are not the primary musical material as is the case here. Easing the analytical difficulty that this movement poses is the fact that the sonoristic characteristics of this music are kept within limits dictated by traditional performance practice, and never achieve a level of indeterminacy or complexity that prohibits an exploration of this movement’s pitch structure. As Mieczyslaw Tomaszewski has noted, Penderecki achieves rhetorical effectiveness by “restrain[ing] … elemental expression with conventional forms.”

This study addresses the first twelve measures of this movement, up to the point at which the narrator/evangelist first speaks (Figure 5.1). These measures are wordless, although the choir does make an entrance; the txt of the rest of the movement depicts Jesus’ trials before the authorities of Jerusalem and the derision of the attendant crowds. Because of this, emotional immediacy and force are hallmarks of this movement. It opens with a series of cascading clusters, first in the violins, organ, and harmonium; then in the violas; and finally in the vibraphone, woodwinds, and low brasses. This constitutes the first section of the movement, and is followed by two
Figure 5.1: "Et surgens omnis multitude"
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measures that are relatively static from a textural standpoint, defining the third section. The third and final section leads to the evangelist’s entrance with a texture that grows from six to 36 parts, subgroups of which simultaneously expand and condense in terms of pitch content. Throughout these sections, references to row 1 and row 2 are unusually balanced, so that sets associated with the rows do not play oppositional roles, as is the case in many other movements of the Passion; rather, they combine with each other in varied and intricate ways.

The first section immediately presents the problems inherent when a study of pitch organization engages sonoristic music. The pitches of the initial clusters are high, but not actually specified; I approximate them in figure 5.2 based on the general ranges of the instruments involved, although I acknowledge that the violins in particular would present a wider range of pitches than those that I indicate. Even though my graph represents an idealized realization of the score, it is significant that Penderecki instructs the performers to play the “five highest notes.” As is the case with a traditionally notated five-pitch cluster, this cardinality refers directly to the first two chromatic subsets of row 1.

In the fourth measure of this movement, the cellos and double basses, through successive individual entrances, form a cluster that comprises eight chromatic pitches as well as eight pitches that bisect a standard half step. Despite this mixture of quarter- and semitones, not to mention the wide tremolo that Penderecki indicates, we can discern references to both of the Passion’s twelve-tone rows within this cluster. Although not intervallically—or even directionally—consistent, alternate entrances in this subsection form two lines: one of ten pitches with a generally rising contour and one of eight pitches with a generally falling contour. The final pitches of each line are half-step bisections: A-Bb and D-Eb. These are symmetrical around F#, which is the initial pitch of this cluster. The distance in pitch-class space between either of these lines’
Figure 5.2: mm. 3-7
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final pitches and F# is 3 ½ semitones, which is significant: Since three semitones is the distance between oppositional loci in row 1s and four semitones is the distance between oppositional loci in row 2, this pitch-class placement creates complete ambiguity regarding row associations. The following series of glissandi in the violas, each of which begins with a C, is just as referentially ambiguous: C lies 2 ½ semitones—in pitch-class space—from the A-Bb and D-Eb that are the final pitches of the low strings’ cluster; that distance is midway between two semitones—the distance between chromatic subset boundaries in row 2—and three semitones—again, the distance between oppositional loci within row 1s. In fact, not only do the violas’ glissandi begin on C, but the placement of their arrows’ heads in the score indicates that they should end on C as well, so that these glissandi form a cluster of their own, as indicated in figure 5.1.

In the third measure of this section, the vibraphone and flutes add to the high-pitched clusters initiated at the beginning of this movement, but the chromatic sets that they contribute are tetrachords, not pentachords, and therefore evoke row 2, not row 1. Thus, the pitch complex comprising their parts along with those of the violas, organ, and harmonium now includes references to both twelve-tone rows.

Closing section 1 is a cluster among the saxophones, bassoons, horns, trombones, and tuba that resembles the one that began in the low strings three measures earlier. However, this one is purely chromatic, and covers all twelve pitch classes. It clearly refers to row 2, and not only because of its wedge-shaped contour. Although single pitches generally outline this wedge as it expands, the cluster’s initial and final pitches are grouped into chromatic dyads, like those that make up row 2, with the first three and the last four pitches of this cluster—E-Eb-F and G#-A-B-Bb—outlining the oppositional loci of row 2; in fact, the cluster’s opening three pitches exactly match those of row 2.
The first measure of section 2 is static except for a gradually growing chromatic cluster in the organ, at its end stretching from E to Bb; the pitch-class cardinality of this cluster matches that of two of the chromatic subsets within row 1s. Abruptly thereafter, in m. 9, the cellos form another chromatic cluster spanning a triton, this one almost symmetrical around D, which in turn is the goal of the cellos’ ensuing glissandi. A pitch placed a quarter tone from D and Eb in the fifth cello part keeps the cluster from achieving true symmetry, and interacts interestingly with the double basses’ A, Ab, G, and F# of the same measure. Whereas the chromatic tetrachord that these pitches form evokes row 2, as does the triadic form that results when we group their boundary pitches, F# and A, with D, a grouping of the maverick pitch’s other quarter-tone neighbor—Eb—with F# and A forms a member of the (036) set class, which refers to row 1 and maintains a balance between the cellos’ and basses’ row references.

The third section, beginning with the Ds with which section 2 ended, establishes a whole-tone hexachord, a relatively rare element in this work and a non-diatonic reference to row 2, after which the initial Ds expand, through glissandi, to the pitch-class set e01345, a member of set class (012456) (see figure 5.3). This set class, which will appear again in this section, equally refers to both rows, since the boundary pitch classes of its two row-1-oriented chromatic tri-chords form a subset of the whole-tone collection, which evokes row 2. In measure 11, in which the whole-tone hexachord collapses to a single F#, new voices enter on Eb and F. By the end of the measure, the Ebs expand to the set 9e0123. This is another referentially ambiguous pitch-class group, since, although it spans a triton and this evokes row 1, the whole step between 9 and e suggests positing that the whole-tone set—and row 2 associate—9e13 is the set’s intervalically fundamental subset, with 0 and 2 serving as chromatic filler.
With the addition of the low brass to the texture, m. 12 contains five chromatic clusters of cardinality six or greater, only one of which is already formed when the measure begins. The two of cardinality six are 789e01 and 578tel, the latter expanding from the entries on F in the previous measure. In terms of intervallic structure, 789e01 matches the previous e01345 set and its balanced associations with both rows; also, it shares the affinity that 578TE1 has for the PC F by condensing to it by the end of the measure. 578TE1 itself is overtly octatonic, referring to the initiations and terminations of the chromatic subsets within row 1s. Throughout the measure, the low brasses build a cluster of their own that contains clear references to row 2. The order in which its pitch classes are presented is <54327109e1>: a linear chromatic tetrachord followed by three chromatic dyads, then two individual pitches. The cardinalities of the tetrachord and dyads, as well as the fact that they alternate directions in presentation, evoke the character of row 2, as does the cluster’s lone reference to a row 2 oppositional locus, made by the subset <10TE>. Of interest is the fact that the PC Ab does not appear in this cluster; an additional Db takes its place. If Ab were placed in the last order position instead of the second Db, the last four pitches of this cluster would represent another of the oppositional loci within row 2, specifically the negative one. In other words, an evocation of the negative oppositional locus of row 2 was avoided following a reference to one of that row’s positive oppositional loci, which denotes a particular emphasis on the positive oppositional loci of row 2 that persists and takes on greater significance in the final movement. The final cluster that begins in m. 12 resides in the choral parts and is fully dodecaphonic. Its presentation is markedly chaotic compared with the other clusters of this section, with a mixture of individual and simultaneous entries, and displays virtually none of their intervallic characteristics or those of the Passion’s twelve-tone rows. It seems that, as this
section builds to a textural climax, the role of this particular pitch group is sonoristic rather than referential.

There is one more salient pitch-oriented feature in this section, one that unfolds over the course of all three of the section’s measures: the double basses’ glissando from E to Bb. Its final span of a triton recalls the organ’s cluster in section 2, and similarly evokes row 1. This slowly revealed musical element plays an important role in determining the referential orientation of section 3 as a whole, as explained below.

Regarding the row-1-oriented material throughout the three opening sections of this movement, it is the row’s equally sized tetrachordal chromatic subsets—present in row 1a but pervasive in row 1s—that prove to be the referential touchstone. The opening pentachordal clusters, and their evocation of chromatic subsets with differing cardinalities, are, in the end, anomalous. In both sections two and three, Penderecki uses glissandi to build tritones, which correlate to the distances between chromatic subset boundaries or oppositional loci in row 1s. Placed between these figures are four clusters that represent either trichordal chromatic subsets or members thereof that share syntactical relationships.

The references to row 2 in these twelve measures are as varied as the row 1 references are unified. The more abstract evocations of row 2 comprise two chromatic tetrachords; an interval of four semitones, corresponding to the distance between row 2’s oppositional loci; a triad; and four whole-tone-derived sets in the third section alone. The more specific references to row 2, namely the full-scale variations on the row itself at the ends of sections 1 and 3, pointedly showcase representations of oppositional loci; whereas such representations serve as motivic building blocks at many other points within the Passion, here they appear within more of a contextual
framework, putting conceptual distance between themselves and the row’s other motivic signifiers.

What differentiates this movement from those covered in chapters 3 and 4, in terms of the interaction between references to row 1 and references to row 2, is the degree of balance and integration among them, for example: After the initiation of the three initial indeterminate clusters, there is no point at which references to both rows are not sounding simultaneously. Furthermore, in section 3 alone, there are two references to row 1, tow to row 2, and three that refer equally to both: a completely evenly distributed assortment. Both the intricate referential ambiguity of this movement and the unusually varied material associated with row 2—the row of destination—indicate that, at this point, the destination of this work is still far away.
My characterization of the Passion’s final movement as “finale and apotheosis” is not the result of a sweeping thematic recapitulation: Although there are plenty of serial and motivic references in this movement, the synthesis of these musical elements plays as important a role as do their individual statements. It is also not the result of a mammoth texture that dwarfs the many examples of dense polyphony and sonoristic devices that preceded it: The texture of this movement is dense, but less so than many of the work’s previous movements, and it is traditionally notated throughout. One supremely marked feature, the closing major triad on E, serves as a phenomenal focal point not just for this movement but for the Passion as a whole.1 Interestingly, the Passion is not the only work of Penderecki’s to feature a climactic conclusive triad. His earlier work Polymorphia concludes in the same fashion, despite displaying thoroughly sonoristic characteristics otherwise, and uses its final triad to release chromatic tension, as does this movement.

The movement begins with a statement of its primary motive, which is also one of the primary motives of the Passion as a whole (Figure 6.1). Robinson and Winold have labeled it the “In te” motive, an inversion of a motive used earlier in the work to set the opening text of
Figure 6.1: “In te, domine”
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[Music notation with text: In Dominum et in Dominum me faciati.]

[Tempo and dynamics indications: p, f, mf.]

[Additional parts for organ and vibraphone.]
Psalm 22.² This relationship between these two motives is significant, suggesting a direct—and sensible—opposition between statements translated as: “Thou hast brought me into the dust of death” and “In thee, O Lord, do I put my trust.” I have sectionalized this movement according to the score’s rehearsal letters, which respectively correspond to the initial entrance of the “In te” motive, its restatement, the beginning of a static, undulating texture that contrasts with the melodic polyphony of the rest of the movement, and the final statement of the “In te” motive. The referential duality inherent in this motive, which I explicate below, is one of the main media through which tension builds in this movement, released only by the final triad and its unambiguous association with row 2.

The vocal entrances that open the first section contain four pitch-class sets that serve as distinct references to the oppositional loci within row 2, two of which overlap: 021, t9e, 546, and 687. In addition, the singleton Eb that begins the motive joins with the following two PCs to form a member of set class (013), the common subset of the octatonic collection and SC (023579) that, by virtue of its asymmetry, associates with row 2 as well. However, the trichordal segments listed above implicitly divide the overall motive into the subsets 3021t9e and 54687, whose chromatic contiguity and respective cardinalities of seven and five just as clearly evoke the chromatic subset cardinalities of row 1a.

The remainder of section 1 consists of interplay between the soprano, baritone, and bass soloists. Initially, the soprano and baritone recreate the exposition of row 2 from the Passion’s first movement, presenting the row’s first eight PCs simultaneously with the BACH motive. Significantly, the BACH motive appears here in its normal form, not in inversion as in its exposi-

² Robinson and Winold, A Study, 70-71.
tion. In measure 4, the baritone and soprano assemble the first eight PCs of row 1, accompanied by a now-inverted BACH motive in the bass. In m. 5, the soprano and bass sing the first six PCs of row 1 in mirror counterpoint; then, beginning with the word “tua,” the bass follows with short references: the diatonic subset 420e, evoking row 2; the chromatic trichord 876, evoking row 1; and a conjunction of members of (036) and (013) to set the word “me,” forming mixed references. The baritone soloist’s statement beginning in m. 6 is equally mixed: an eight-note quotation of row 1—01254367—framed by an evocation of an oppositional locus—8t9—and a member of SC (013)—431, both of which refer to row 2. Spanning mm. 6-7, the soprano sings another melody that has mixed implications, but this one is biased in favor of row 1: After a representation of a row-2 oppositional locus—645, the next twelve notes realize the dodecaphonic aggregate in the form of chromatic trichords.

Following the unison iteration of the “In te” motive that opens the second section, the sopranos of each choir sing the “Deus meus” motive in m. 11, forming a diatonic reference to row 2, followed by the pitches F#, F, D, and Eb, a member of set class (0134), corresponding to row 1 because of its status as a subset of the octatonic collection. Concurrent with this line are a handful of other salient referential figures. In mm. 9-10, the double basses, fourth trombone, and tuba present a member of the diatonic subset class (01568), referring to row 2, while the choral basses sing row-1-oriented chromatic trichords. In addition, the horns and third trombone form a pitch-class complex that displays an orientation that is mixed but that favors row 1: a “Deus meus” motive by the fifth and sixth horns and third trombone, evoking row 2; a motive by the third and fourth horns that fills the chromatic gaps within the “Deus meus” motive and with it forms a chromatic hexachord, shifting the focus to row 1; and a chromatic trichord by the first and second horns that sharpens this focus. In m. 11, the brasses produce two new pitch-class
groups: The horns’ set belongs to the class (0135), a diatonic row 2 reference, and the trombones’ set belongs to (0134), maintaining the overall referential balance of this section by evoking row 1.

Section 3 begins abruptly with static octaves on A, embellished by Bb, Ab, and G between mm. 13 and 16 to form a representation of the negative oppositional locus within row 2. From m. 17 to the end of the section, various choral voices, partially doubled by the organ part, articulate chromatic dyads—another type of row 2 evocation—to thicken the texture gradually. In terms of pitch-class content, many dyads are repetitions of those sounded previously in this section; an ordered list of this section’s dyadic PCs that is based on their first appearances is as follows: 9-t and 8-7, as mentioned above, followed by 6-5, 1-2, 0-e, and 3. I represent the 3 in this list as a singleton since it is partnered with 2, which has already appeared in the series. The 120e group forms yet another association with an oppositional locus from row 2. As for the 2-3 dyad that closes this subsection, note that, before its appearance, the only pitch classes not yet sounded in this subsection are 3 and 4. Thus, the 2-3 dyad represents an overt avoidance of completing the chromatic aggregate, leaving out E. The fact that E is the root of this work’s final triad links the Passion again to Polymorphia, Penderecki having used similar pitch-class lacunae to build anticipation for that work’s final sonority as well.

At letter D, with one last unison statement of the “In te” motive, Penderecki initiates the final element of this movement’s general ABA formal schema, thus signaling that an overall conclusion is imminent. One more cluster follows, building up over the course of mm. 27-28: It comprises eleven PC’s, leaving out F#, ostensibly to make its subsequent appearance as the upper voice of the “Domine” motive in m. 29 more marked. The D of this collection also stands out, setting the clearly declaimed words “In manus tuus commendo spiritum meum (Into thine
hand I commit my spirit),” that are sung by the boys’ choir. The rest of this collection appears in the other choral parts, contrastingly setting “Redemisti me (Thou has redeemed me)” with only one syllable sustained by each part. The first three and last of these pitch classes appear individually; the rest are parts of simultaneous dyads or trichords. Their order is: 2, 0, 3, 8-9-e, t-7, 1-4, and 5. 203 and 89e are both diatonic subsets, and therefore align with row 2. However, the following dyad t7 joins with 89e to form a chromatic pentachord, corresponding to the first two chromatic subsets of row 1, as does the union of the remaining pitch classes of the cluster into a chromatic hexachord.

The “Domine” CDC of m. 29 initiates what is, in effect, the work’s closing cadence, and not its only one. The *Passion* is full of non-traditional techniques designed to build tension and to follow it with a distinct sense of resolution thereof. For example, large-scale clusters may suddenly collapse to single pitch classes in octaves, or a long-lived eleven-tone aggregate may give way to a sonority built upon the single pitch class that it lacks. Here, the progression is both thematic and referential. Thematically, the “Domine” motive that has occurred throughout the work as a call to God, originating in the despair of Psalm 22 as set in the third movement, leads to the text “Deus veritatis,” combining with it to form the statement “(Lord God of truth).” In this way, the word “Domine” becomes fully recontextualized. Referentially, the mixture of references inherent in the CDC, and in the movement as a whole as well, resolves to a completely assured triadic evocation of row 2. This firmly places row 2 in the role of a phenomenal goal for the work as a whole, fitting with its previously mentioned associations with the cross and the concept of destination.

The references to row 1 within the first section of this movement are markedly specific: In addition to groups of chromatic hexachords and trichords—the last of which covers the
twelve-tone spectrum—and a member of the set class (036), this movement’s only evocation of
the oppositional loci within row 1, there are three large-scale quotations of the series itself. In
the second section, this specificity begins to fade away, as two sets each of chromatic hexachords
and trichords dominate this section’s row-1-oriented material. Also present are two members of
(0134), which, as mentioned above, is the set class of the first four pitch classes of row 1, and,
interestingly, falls one pitch class short of representing an oppositional locus. This fact becomes
significant when we consider how often the musical material of this movement evokes the oppo-
sional loci of row 2. After an absence in section 3, row 1 references return at the end of the
movement, but now are completely generic, comprising only chromatic hexachords and penta-
chords.

Among the many references to row 2 in this movement, the most prevalent types are re-
presentations of oppositional loci and diatonic sets. In fact, the only musical material referring to
row 2 that does not fall into that category comprises a few of the unconnected dyads of section 3.
Whereas, as usual, the evocations of the oppositional loci within row 2 exhibit cardinalities of
three, the diatonic references come in several different forms, including the member set of
(01568) in section 2. The variety and abundance of these diatonic sets prepares the way for the
movement’s ultimate diatonic evocation, its concluding triad; in turn, the oppositional-loci asso-
ciations reaffirm the role their relative positions play as a basis, within the work’s overall serial
context, of that distinctive sonority.

Like the closing movement of part 1 of the Passion, the first two sections of this move-
ment display a great deal of interaction and balance between references to the work’s two
twelve-tone rows. By virtue of the number of large-scale row 1 quotations within the first sec-
tion as well as the string of discrete chromatic trichords sung by the soprano soloist in mm. 6-7,
row 1 plays a slightly dominant role to open the movement. However, after a thoroughly balanced second section, the contrasting third displays affinity only for row 2. This situation serves as a precursor to the unequivocal row-2 orientation, following the conflicting references of the fourth section’s initial four measures, of the movement’s final sonority.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the four movements of the *Passion* covered by this study as a whole, along with the fact that they make up only approximately one sixth of the work’s overall content, we see not only the immense gestural and textural variety that Penderecki commands, but also the surprising degree of unity he maintains among the elements of this work. Certain distinctive features of his compositional technique, such as the incremental nature of his twelve-tone rows as they unfold and his penchant for gap-filling, are consistently evident not only in the musical surface of the *Passion*, but also in the structures within his rows that are the basis for the work’s referential content, such as the rows’ chromatic subsets and oppositional loci. This sort of referential unity manifests itself most clearly in the work’s final triad, which brings together all of the associative techniques used in this work.

As mentioned in chapter 2, the pitch classes E, G#, and B represent a subset of SC (023579), the octatonic collection, and the hexatonic collection—the members of which surround the oppositional loci of row 2—as well as signify the initiation and terminations of the two directionally oppositional groups of dyads within row 2. In addition to all of these relationships, the preponderance of small-scale references to the oppositional loci within row 2 throughout this work suggests another mode of association involving the *Passion's* final triad. The fact that the lower neighbors of two of the oppositional loci within row 2 are E and G# implies a specific, rather than abstract, link between those loci and the final triad, focusing on its root and major third.
This is significant in light of the fact that this major triad stands in opposition to the many statements of the “Domine” motive—which brings with it a strong E-minor implication—that populate the *Passion*, including the statement immediately preceding the final triad. A direct comparison of the work’s two twelve-tone rows shows that this dichotomy corresponds to their structure as well. Figure 7.1, which matches the pitch classes of each row—in prime form—according to their order positions as defined by the numerals 1 through 12, demonstrates the presence of invariant subsets within the two series. In both rows, PCs 1 through 6 fill order positions 1 through 6, PC 7 is at order position 7, PC 8 is at order position 8, and PCs 9 through 0 fill order positions 9 through 12. The G and G# at the center of each row demonstrate, by virtue of their invariance, their fundamental importance within this work, an importance with deep implications when we consider that those pitch classes represent the minor and major thirds above E. Thus, in addition to all of the associations inherent in the *Passion’s* rows that I have already described, one of the rows’ most basic references is to the contrast between despair and faith embodied in the “Domine” motive and the work’s E-major conclusion.

Figure 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order Position:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row 2:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emphasis on directionality and intervallic relationships in this study—not to mention the numerous modal and triadic evocations within the *Passion*—suggest that it may be possible to add another layer to the theory on which this analysis is based: a layer that addresses pitch
centricity. I believe this to be a viable course to take, not only because there are many single-pitch-class, diatonic, and triadic elements within the work that one could potentially “string together,” but because of links that exist between those events and the serial quotations and references covered in this study. For example, the first movement of the Passion opens with slightly embellished octaves on G, followed by the “13-tone” statement of row 1, with C#s at its beginning and end. We could consider this emphasis on C#, the syntactical label for which is “E” (expansion) within row 1s, to connote an emphasis on all four syntactical “Es” within that row, C#, E, G, and Bb. Interestingly, the musical material from this point nearly through the end of the movement centers largely on D, potentially casting the preceding emphasized C#’s and G’s as the tendency tones that lead to the root and third of a triad built on D, accompanied by E and Bb to form, in effect, a diminished seventh chord. Admittedly, most of the Passion’s material does not imply such relationships this clearly and compactly, but the wealth of associations by half-steps and perfect fourths in this work creates great potential for this analytical approach.

It is a testament to the scope and compositional depth of Penderecki’s Passion that, when we consider the work’s pitch structure, so many avenues of analytical exploration appear, even beyond those explored in this thesis. Taking into account, in addition to the findings and speculations presented here, the world of sonoristic relationships in Penderecki’s music opened up by Mirka, the meaningful motivic quotations that pervade this work, and the dramatic wealth of the Passion’s text, the pitch-structural and semiotic information that their interactions generate is almost unimaginably voluminous, and encourages a great deal of further study.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


83


