I, Stephanie Neeman, hereby submit this original work as part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Musical Arts in Piano.

It is entitled:
A Pedagogical Study of Joel Hoffman's each for himself?

Student's name: Stephanie Neeman

This work and its defense approved by:

Committee chair: Brett Clement, Ph.D.

Committee member: Joel Hoffman, D.M.A.

Committee member: James Tocco,
A Pedagogical Study of Joel Hoffman's *each for himself?*

A doctoral document submitted to the
Graduate Thesis and Research Committee
of the College-Conservatory of Music, University of Cincinnati

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Musical Arts

In the Division of Keyboard Studies of the College-Conservatory of Music

by

Stephanie

March 15, 2013

MM, Manhattan School of Music, 2010
BM, Manhattan School of Music, 2008

Committee Chair: Brett Clement, PhD
ABSTRACT

Joel Hoffman’s *each for himself?* (1991) is a work in seven movements for piano solo. This piece is a study in contrasts of mood, technique, harmony, rhythm, sound and musical language. It follows in the tradition of works like Rzewski’s *North American Ballads* (1982) and Vine’s first piano sonata (1990) in that it appropriates variety of styles and transforms them into unique type of concert music. While this makes *each for himself?* accessible to students, making it an ideal introduction to the modern piano repertoire for the advanced student, it has technical and musical challenges not ordinarily found in the standard repertoire. Rhythmic challenges include polyrhythms and rapid time signature changes, as well as motoric rhythm and rap-based rhythmic patterns. More traditional musical challenges include finding and bringing out contrasts, creating unique textures and solving various pedaling problems. As a pedagogical guide, this document provides an overview of each movement in the set discussing the musical, interpretive and technical challenges presented and proposing possible solutions.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When we go to a piano recital of an advanced-level high school or college student, we typically hear the music from the standard piano repertoire, from Bach to Rachmaninoff. Occasionally we will see a more diverse program that includes more recent composition. There are many significant pieces for piano solo that were written in the last twenty-five years, but only a few are performed regularly, such as Rzewski’s *North American Ballades*, Corigliano’s *Etude Fantasy*, Muczynski’s *Desperate Measures*, Lieberman’s *Gargoyles*, and Carl Vine’s *Piano Sonatas*.

The document is intended to guide students, teachers, and performers in their preparation and performance of Joel Hoffman’s *each for himself?* (1991). I will consider the historical background of this piece, the overall structure of the work, and the composer’s comments in order to investigate technical and musical difficulties from a pianist’s perspective.

I intend to demonstrate ways to approach Joel Hoffman’s *each for himself?* from a pedagogical point of view. I will provide an overview of each movement in the set. The work itself is poly-stylistic: “The Five” is atonal, “Transcendental Blues” is a transformed blues, “Machine Flats” uses asymmetrical rhythms like Stravinsky and Bartok, “Patches Purple” is in a neo-baroque style, “Returns” is in a neo-romantic style, “Rap Rag Red” is a mixture between rap and rag, and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Returns” uses parallel harmonies and Latin rhythms. I will also discuss the interpretive and
technical challenges presented, and propose possible solutions. This contemporary piece deserves a more prominent place in the repertoire, not only because it is an effective piece to perform, but also because it is technically accessible.

I have worked with Joel Hoffman on this piece, and he has given me insight into the meanings and processes behind the music. To further promote this piece, as requested by the composer, I will record the whole set as part of Joel Hoffman’s works collection on Albany Records.

**Biography**

Hoffman was born in 1953 in Vancouver, Canada. His father, Irwin Hoffman, is a conductor and worked as the music director of the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra, Grant Park Symphony (Chicago), Belgian Radio and TV Orchestra/Brussels, Florida Orchestra, Costa Rica National Orchestra, Caracas Symphony (Venezuela), Santiago Symphony (Chile), Bogota Symphony (Colombia), and Cali Symphony (Colombia) and was acting music director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. His mother, Esther Glazer is a concert violinist.

As the eldest of four children, Hoffman’s early musical experiences were shaped by listening to his parents and also his siblings, Gary, Toby, and Deborah, who are all professional musicians. He began piano studies at the age of five. He was a precocious pianist and made his debut with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra at the age of 15, playing Beethoven’s First Piano Concerto. Other engagements include performances as a soloist with the Belgian Radio and T.V. Orchestra, the Costa Rica National Symphony and the Florida Orchestra. His piano teachers included Easley Blackwood, Irene Grau, Martin Jones, and Mollie Margolies.
Hoffman was interested in composing from a young age. His early compositions were written for his siblings and his parents to play. Many of these early works were for piano, but in his compositional maturity, he has composed fewer works for his own instrument.

Hoffman began composition studies in Chicago with Easley Blackwood at the age of 14. Blackwood was an important influence. At the time (1960s), Blackwood was an influential composer who later explored unusual tuning systems. Hoffman discovered a new side of contemporary music that was both adventurous and accessible. Hoffman would take four-hour lessons with Blackwood, working on piano, composition, and theory in a single session. A true Renaissance man, Blackwood was also an expert in American history, and his wide range of interests inspired Hoffman to expand his horizons, drawing from Chinese culture and Eastern European folk music for his inspirations.

Hoffman traveled to the United Kingdom to attend the University of Wales, where he completed his Bachelor of Music degree. His piano teacher, Martin Jones, was an exponent of much unusual contemporary repertoire, and expanded Hoffman’s musical horizons. His composition teachers there were Alun Hoddinott and Arnold Whittall.

Hoffman completed his Masters of Music and Doctor of Musical arts degrees in composition at the Juilliard School, where he studied with Milton Babbitt, Elliott Carter and Vincent Persichetti.

Joel Hoffman’s music draws from such diverse sources as Eastern European folk music and bebop, and is pervaded by a sense of lyricism and rhythmic vitality.

While Hoffman is a prolific composer in many genres, he feels that the medium of
piano solo is one of the most challenging for him. His first mature piano composition is *Fantasy Pieces* (1975) and was premiered by the composer when he was a student at The Juilliard School.

He has received awards from the American Academy-Institute of Arts and Letters (1987), the National Endowment for the Arts (1985, 1991) for his *Violin Concerto* and *Cubist Blues*, Columbia University (1976) for *Variation for Violin, Cello and Harp*, BMI (1971), ASCAP and the American Music Center (1977). Hoffman is Professor of Composition at the College-Conservatory of Music/University of Cincinnati and Artistic Director of MusicX, a summer festival held at first in Cincinnati (1996 to 2008) and later at the Hindemith Music Centre in Blonay, Switzerland (2009 to 2011). He also makes regular visits to Asia, where he is guest faculty at the China Conservatory in Beijing and the Taipei National University of the Arts in Taiwan. He has been Composer-in-Residence with the Buffalo Philharmonic and the National Philharmonic in Washington. He has been awarded residencies at the Rockefeller (1985), Camargo (1986) and Hindemith Foundations (1986–88), the MacDowell Colony (1987–88 and 2012), Yaddo (1985) and the Copland House (2012).

Hoffman’s orchestral compositions have been performed by the Chicago Symphony Brass, the BBC Orchestra of Wales, the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, the Berlin Radio Symphony, the Kiev Chamber Orchestra, the Slovenian Radio Symphony, the Israel Chamber Orchestra, the National Repertory Orchestra, the Costa Rica National Symphony and the Madison Symphony Orchestra among others. His chamber music has been performed by members of the Berlin Philharmonic, the Cleveland, Brentano, Ariel, Amernet and Shanghai Quartets, the Golub-Kaplan-Karr Trio among many others.
Hoffman has been commissioned by dozens of individuals and organizations including Tanglewood, the Fromm Foundation, the Washington Camerata, the American Harp Society, the Eastman School of Music, Areon Flutes, DecaCelli, the Memphis Symphony Orchestra, Caramoor, Bargemusic, the International Viola Congress, the Irving Klein String Competition, the Prince William Symphony Orchestra and RAI Trade (Rome). Hoffman’s music is regularly heard in Europe and North America at festivals such as St. Nazaire (France), Great Lakes, Caramoor, Newport and Chamber Music Northwest (US), Portogruaro (Italy) and Korsholm (Finland).

Joel Hoffman’s music is published by Onibatan Music, RAI Trade, E.C. Schirmer, G. Schirmer and Lyra Music. CDs can be found on the Albany, CRI, Koch, Stradivarius, Centaur, EMA, Deutsche Welle and Gasparo labels.

*each for himself?*

Joel Hoffman’s *each for himself?* is a work in seven movements for piano solo. This piece is a study in contrasts: contrasts of mood, technique, harmony, rhythm, sound and musical language. The movements are in different styles, ranging from neo-baroque (“Patches Purple”) to rap music (“Rap Rag Red”). Hoffman appropriates these styles and genres towards his personal musical language.

For example, the length of the last section in “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” is greater in the orchestral version than in the piano piece. Also, the orchestral version omits one movement, “Machine Flats.” A few years later in 2003, Hoffman revised the original version of each for himself? This revision includes expanding and refining the piece.

According to the composer, Wassily Kandinsky’s painting of the same title, “Each for Himself,” (1934) inspired him to compose the work. Hoffman says that “The paintings have fascinating formal two-dimensional structures and these stimulated me to think of analogous musical-temporal structures.” Hoffman has synesthesia, a neurological condition in which stimulation of one sensory or cognitive pathway leads to automatic, involuntary experiences in a second sensory or cognitive pathway.¹ Therefore, many of his works are inspired by colors, this piece being particularly representative. The titles of three movements from the set are named based on the colors, blue, purple and red (“Transcendental Blues,” “Patches Purples,” and “Rap Rag Red”), respectively. A few years ago, Hoffman became more aware of his synesthesia and began to make more connections between pitch and color. For example, Hoffman mentions that when he hears music, he sees colors, such as seeing the color blue when he hears the note G.

Yes, except at the time I wrote most of those pieces, it was all under the surface. I wasn’t aware of synesthesia the way I am now. I started to realize somewhere around three years ago that I actually connect colors to musical notes. For a long time, I thought this wasn’t real. I had read about composers who claimed synesthesia but wasn’t very convinced. It’s not exactly that when I hear a note, I see a specific color immediately, and always only that color. I do see colors when I hear notes and chords, but it’s not an absolute thing. The more I think about these connections with respect to the pieces that I wrote before a few years ago, the more I realize that this connection was already there, but it was an evolving

process. If you play a G, I think blue, but I cannot swear to you that it’s a simple truth as in “I am 59 years old.” It’s not like that. D sort of feels green to me, yellow is E (it always seems to be an E nowadays), but I slowly came to all of this.²

When he began composing the piece, Hoffman challenged himself by the concept of composing a set of several pieces that were not related to each other. He intentionally made a point of making each movement substantially different from the others. As Hoffman explains, many multi-movement pieces work as a set, without there being any connection between the movements.

For example, let’s take four-movement symphonies. Consider any Beethoven symphony (with the exception of the fifth, sixth and ninth, which have some kind of linking mechanism across movements). If you think of the others - the seventh symphony for example - there is nothing but absolutely wonderful and memorable movements, but if you actually ask why does the second movement of the seventh symphony, the slow variation movement, why does it have to be in that symphony? Couldn’t a different movement be just as good? What’s the reason that this very movement has to be the second movement of that symphony? Why does the scherzo have to be that scherzo? If you know these pieces for decades, as I do, you can’t imagine the third movement being different than that one…but objectively speaking, what is the reason that this movement has to be in that symphony? Why can’t some other movement, similar maybe, in the same key, with the same tempo, be just as good. This kind of multi-movement piece seems to be arbitrary, and it sometimes bothers me. It also bothers me that people seem to accept this, without hesitation or question.³

Since each movement of each for himself? is very different from the others, Hoffman was also faced the challenge of gluing the movements together as a set. This is partly achieved through the use of connective titles. He began with four movements, all for which he had a clear conceptual idea: “Patches Purple,” “Returns,” “Rap Rag Red,” and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” Since the title of “Patches Purple,” and “Rap Rag

² Interview with Joel Hoffman, December 12, 2012.

³ Ibid.
Red” consisted of the colors, Hoffman added the color blue to the set with “Transcendental Blues.” The last movement’s title “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return,” inspired the titles for the remaining two movements, “The Five” and “Machine Flats.”

In setting up the background of each movement, I will examine what Hoffman has to say about them.

“The Five”

The title “The Five” is derived from the title of the last movement, suggesting that the musical concept was inspired by the title. As Hoffman describes:

For example, in the first movement “The Five,” there are a lot of things that happen in sets of five in that movement. Actually it’s mostly superficial things, this organization into sets of five: it’s a relationship that is real, but has no substance. Things happen in groups of five in that movement.4

“Transcendental Blues”

When a pianist hears the word “transcendental,” he is likely to associate it with Franz Liszt’s set of twelve *Transcendental Etudes*. This is exactly what Joel Hoffman had in mind when he wrote this movement. “This piece is essentially an etude in that it focuses on limited material that requires substantial technical skill.” It is an allusion to the Liszt’s *Transcendental Etudes*, but we will see later that this movement is very different from them. Liszt’s *Transcendental Etudes* usually incorporate more than one technical problem in an etude. Another famous set of etudes from the nineteenth century is the Chopin’s 24 Etudes, which focus on one specific technical problem on each etude. Hoffman’s *Transcendental Blues* is more like Chopin’s that focuses on one specific

4 Ibid.
technique, the hand-crossing arpeggio. Also the “Blues,” as part of the title, is far removed from the style of Liszt’s.

Hoffman described this movement in the interview:

The concept for that one is an imaginary scenario: if Franz Liszt had tried to write the blues one day, what would that have sounded like? Lots of arpeggios, for sure, but also there is a blues progression outlined in the bass.⁵

“Machine Flats”

This is among the movements where the title is derived from the “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” Therefore, Hoffman conceived the title prior to the musical setting. When Hoffman finished composing this piece, he was very pleased with the result. Later in the same year, Hoffman reused this movement for his piano trio, “Cubist Blues.” The form of this piano trio is different from “Machine Flats.” It is in four movements and much longer than the piano piece, about twenty-one minutes. Hoffman recorded this piece with Daniel Mason and Benjamin Karp on Gasparo Records in 2002.

When I first went to artists’ colonies, I became friends with visual artists as well as other composers and writers. I saw first-hand what I had already known from my awareness of art history and going to museums: I’m sure you’re aware of the multiple paintings by Monet of certain themes, such as haystacks or Rouen cathedral or the Westminster Bridge in London. You can see that he has seemingly infinite number of ways of interpreting the same subject. This was very attractive to me and I thought, what’s the source of this belief that a composer’s musical idea cannot be reused in another composition? Why can’t one recast it and re-use it in different forms? So it’s turned out that I have done this a lot over my career.⁶
“Patches Purple”

In the late 1980s, Joel Hoffman taught a class called “Eighteenth Century Counterpoint” at the College-Conservatory of Music at the University of Cincinnati. One of the assignments for the students was to write a piece in the style of Bach’s Inventions. At that time, Hoffman felt that the students did not successfully imitate the style of Bach, and he wrote this piece to demonstrate to the students how it should be done. He felt good about this little piece of music and decided to recycle it. “The Patches Purple” is not the original version that Hoffman composed for the class. He added additional musical elements, notating pedal markings, dynamics, and rallentando, expanding the piece into extreme registers, using clusters, octave doublings, and prolonged sequences.

Hoffman found that the sequences in particular are an important departure from Bach’s musical style.

The one thing that towers over all of the other differences between this piece and the Bach dialect is the prolonging of sequences. What makes this movement sound like Bach in a dream or fantasy is the number of times that I repeat something. Bach’s circle of fifths sequences always happen a certain number of times, more or less. With Bach, we also have real as well as tonal sequences. The real ones sequence the material at an exact interval (usually at the fifth), but if you do real sequences at perfect 5ths, you soon move far away from the key in which you started. Therefore Bach, at a certain point, would adjust the perfect 5th to a diminished 5th so as not to move too far afield. I didn’t do that. I actually take it literally as perfect 5ths all the way and as such, go far away from the original key. I was curious to see what would happen to the syntax of the music if I did that.7

The title itself was taken from David Tovey’s book called Essays in Musical Analysis. According to this concept, the sections of the movement that depart from the style of Bach are the “purple patches.”

7 Ibid.
It is very clear exactly when I am in the Bach dialect and when I am not, and this is very deliberate. So the appreciation of the 'purple patches' depends on a precise knowledge of the Bach idiom. When I repeat things Bach would not have repeated or included harmonic moves Bach would not have made, or extended the range of the keyboard beyond that which Bach had, I am straying into “purple patch” territory in the way Tovey described.  

“Returns”

“Returns” was another movement of which Hoffman had a clear concept from the beginning. This movement was intended to be in the style of nineteenth-century piano works. In the recapitulation section, he returns to the theme in exact retrograde, intrigued by the possibility of applying this transformational technique that experienced a twentieth-century resurgence to floating nineteenth-century harmony.

I wanted to see what happens when you take the harmonic syntax, the logical flow of chords that sound like a recognizable 19th century composer and turn it backwards. What does that sound like? It’s simplistic to put it this way, but I discovered that up to a point, Faure backwards sounds like Schumann. I discovered that in working on this piece. Again, I don’t mean this to be taken too seriously, because harmonic flow and logic are subtle, delicate and complex things. Certain chords convincingly follows other chords, others just don’t. Without this subtle logic, Schumann’s chords sound arbitrary. It would be as if I suddenly began speaking to you with no grammar left in my language. The words would sort of convey what I’m trying to say, but the thoughts wouldn’t be clear, because one needs the grammar to make it clear. So this was the experiment: what happens if you take Faure and run it backwards, what do you get? It was a weird concept, but it was a clear one.

“Rap Rag Red”

Hoffman found the rhythmic patterns and phrasing of rap music to be interesting.

---

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid.
He wanted to capture the rhythmic vitality and variety of rap music on the piano. This involved not only capturing the percussive beat loops, a relatively simple task, but also to convey the subtleties of inflection and accent in the rapper’s voice.

I had never heard a classical take on rap. This was in 1990, when rap was still relatively new. I was wondering what would happen if you tried to capture the wildness and the energy of rap in the world of classical piano; what would it sound like? That was my concept.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{“The Five-Flat Machine’s Return”}

This movement has five flats in the key signature, but it is not in D-flat Major. Why use the title “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return?” According to the composer, in 1950s, there was a fad in the movie industry of producing science fiction/horror movies that brought back popular characters, such as, The Mummy, The Wolfman, and Frankenstein’s Monster. These movies often include “The Return of” something in their titles. In this movement, it refers to the return of “The Five-Flat Machine,” which is the motive in mm. 37–41 (see Figure 1.1.)

The crazy monster keeps coming back: no matter how many times you shoot it between the eyes, it keeps coming back again. That’s the idea of “The Five-flat Machine’s Return”. I guess it’s youthful exuberance! Despite the allusion to horror movies, in reality there’s nothing dark or scary at all; in fact it’s more like a bunch of Brazilian people dancing on the street. It’s filled with sun, light and energy.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
Performances

Hoffman wrote each for himself? for Frank Weinstock, who was then a piano faculty member at College-Conservatory of Music at University of Cincinnati. Frank Weinstock premiered the work in 1991. Emanuele Arciuli has also played it a few times in the United States and in Italy. I have performed this piece several times, both at University of Cincinnati, and at other venues. In October 2011, Hoffman held a two-day residency at Belmont University in Nashville, Tennessee, and each for himself? was performed there.

Other than the performances mentioned above, I could not find any other performances of this piece. Hoffman mentioned that a number of pianists have requested the music from him, a few from Europe, but he had not heard if they actually performed
the piece.

**Recording**

To date, there is only one available recording of this piece. Emanuele Arciuli recorded three out of seven movements of this piece. The movements that he recorded were “Machine Flats,” “Returns,” and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” The recording album is called “Americans!” on the Stradivarius label. This album includes works by John Adams, Samuel Barber, George Crumb, Joel Hoffman, John Cage, and Frederic Rzewski.

From another recording session, Emanuele recorded the whole set in Cincinnati a few years ago. According to Hoffman, unfortunately, the raw tape went missing.
CHAPTER II
FORMAL ANALYSIS

1. The Five

This movement uses techniques that we associate with atonal music. For example, it references 12-tone serialism by featuring the process of aggregate completion and also by using a unique series. The title itself is ambiguous, The Five? One would expect a noun followed after the word “five.” But perhaps this ambiguity is the essence of the whole movement. These themes are different stated by the following factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>THEME I</th>
<th>THEME II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Faster</td>
<td>Slower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Louder</td>
<td>Softer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Flowing</td>
<td>Serene and mysterious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Similar throughout the piece</td>
<td>Keeps changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Signature</td>
<td>Constantly changing (3/4, 4/8, 5/8, 6/8, 7/8, 8/8)</td>
<td>More regular (mostly 2/4, sometimes ¾)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2.1. Difference between Theme I and Theme II Chart, Hoffman’s each for himself? first movement, “The Five.”

Regarding to the form, the movement features an alternation between two “themes,” marked “Tempo I” and “Tempo II” on the score. Theme two is always marked with use of una corda at the beginning and by a fermata sign at the end before returning to theme one. The texture of theme one is consistent throughout the piece, being generally more fluid and asymmetrical than theme two. Theme two is basically constructed by gradually unfolding a large progression of chords. The composer varies
this section by adding an extra beat, except in the last statement (mm. 38–42), the composer adds two additional beats. In the initial statement of theme II (mm. 7–8), it appears as four quarter-note block chords. In each of the subsequent reappearances of this theme, Hoffman adds one more chord and breaks the chord into progressively smaller subdivisions of the beat. For example, the second time it appears (mm. 14–15) as ten overlapping eighth-note broken chords, the third time (mm. 20–22) it appears in a total of six quarter-note beats, utilizing the subdivision of eighth-note triplets.

Hoffman starts with a 10-note series, which is first stated in mm. 1–3 in the right hand. This row concludes with the pitch classes 8 and 3, forming an interval of a seven chromatic steps, the inversion of the opening interval of five chromatic steps. Hoffman then uses the final two pitches of the row as the first two pitches of an inverted form of the same row. As this row concludes with the pitch classes 2 and 7, the first two notes of the row in its original form, he makes this connection clear by concluding the melody of the first section with one final note, pitch class 11 (E), which would be the continuation of a new statement of the original row, again overlapping with the previous row by two notes. Thus, this melodic pattern repeats itself after the first twenty notes (twelve notes of the original row, plus an inverted row of twelve notes, minus two notes where they overlap and two more notes where the inverted row overlaps with the second original row). This larger twenty-note series is the basis of the pitch material in this movement (see Figure 2.2).
Fig. 2.2. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” mm. 1–13.

Hoffman omits certain pitches of the aggregate in the series and returns to them later with added emphasis. The first twelve notes of these series complete an aggregate, while the final eight notes nearly complete a second aggregate; as shown in Figure 2.3 and 2.4. He leaves out pitch classes 8 and 3, returning to the opening G-major triad instead. When the first theme reappears after a two-measure interpolation, it begins with an emphasis on pitch classes 8 and 3, thereby completing a second aggregate (see Figure
2.5). These pitches (8 and 3) are also the last two pitches of the first aggregate. When they are stated in measure 9, they begin an overlapping statement of the series (see Figure 2.4). This process of omission and later emphasis centers around four pitch classes: 2, 7, 8, and 3. By looking at the process of chromatic saturation, we can draw a conclusion that the first theme melody is constantly changing throughout the piece, however the first theme is held together with the notes D and G, or D# and G#, or D and G# (pitch classes 2, 3, 7, and 8). These pitches usually begin and end the phrases.

Fig. 2.3. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” mm. 1–6. The second series of section A leaves out pitch classes 8 and 3 (G# and D#).
Fig. 2.4. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” mm. 1–6 and 9–13.

Fig. 2.5. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” m. 9. The second time Theme I appears, it starts with pitch classes 8 and 3, achieving aggregate completion.
Theme II chords are based on certain pitch class sets. Hoffman only uses two different sets, 6-Z19\(^1\) and 6-Z44.\(^2\) The chords in measure seven and eight are uniformly hexachords in groups of two chords. Combining hexachords offers the possibility of a process of aggregate completion, but the combination of these two-chord groups forms only 11 different pitch classes. For example, if we combine the chords in measure seven (D, F#, A#, C#, G, B and A, E, C, D#, G#, B), there are only 11 different pitches, with the note B doubled and the note F omitted. In measure eight, a similar structure emerges with the combination of the two chords forming 11 different pitches, but these chords double the note F and omit the note B. This process of doubling and omission lends significance to the tritone-related pitches F and B. Interestingly, the notes F and B act as an axis of symmetry for the two-chord groups, as they invert onto one another around this axis. That is, the chords in measure seven invert onto each other at T\(_{10}\), as do the chords in measure eight (see Figure 2.6).

Additionally, aggregate completion has wider significance in the progression. The combination of the first chord in measure seven and the first chord in measure eight completes the aggregate. Aggregate completion also occurs when the second chord of measure seven is combined with the second chord in measure eight (see Figure 2.7). This process continues in subsequent statements of Theme II.

\(^1\) The first chord of Theme II section, 6-Z19, consists of the first six notes from the Theme I row.

Fig. 2.6. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” mm. 7–8.

Fig. 2.7. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” mm. 7–8.
Fig. 2.8. Hoffman, each for himself? first movement, “The Five,” mm. 38–42. Pitch class sets of Theme II.

2. Transcendental Blues

Hoffman had Liszt’s *Transcendental Etudes* in mind when he wrote this movement. This movement is basically an etude of arpeggios. Though not a traditional blues, it references the blues progression in the bass. The first four bass notes of the piece, in measure 3, 4, 5, and 7 are $\text{B}_{b} – \text{B}_{b} – \text{E}_{b} – \text{B}_{b}$, mirroring the I–I–IV–I
progression that characterizes the first eight measures of the 12-bar blues pattern. As in the 12-bar blues, Hoffman then moves to F, or the dominant key in B-flat. The low F bass note in m. 20 sets off a six-measure cadenza, culminating in a climactic trill at the top of the piano, underscored by two accented Fs (see Figure 2.9). Hoffman finally returns to the “tonic” bass note, B flat, in m. 29. He thus abstractly references the I-I-IV-I-V-I pattern that characterizes the blues.³

![Fig. 2.9. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues.” m. 20. Hoffman moves to F, the dominant key of B-flat. The low F bass note sets off a six-measure cadenza.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>IV or V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 2.10. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues.” Common 12 bar blues progression pattern.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
<th>PITCHES</th>
<th>ROMAN NUMERALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 3</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 4</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 5</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 7</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 13</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 14</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 27</td>
<td>F (top register)</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 28</td>
<td>F (top register)</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 29</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 30</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 38</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 42</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2.11. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues.” Table of the bass progressions in the second movement of *each for himself?*

However, the resemblance to the blues is well-hidden and not easily discerned by the casual listener. While the bass note changes in mm. 3–7, the arpeggiated chord above remains the same. In measure 16, the harmony changes dramatically, the first such shift in a predominantly static harmonic progression. Hoffman marks this section “new color”, and thus prepares the listener for the arrival of the dominant bass F in measure 20 (see Figure 2.12).
In addition, Hoffman abandons the structural blues bass line at several points. In these sections (mm. 9–12, 31–37), Hoffman uses bass progressions in whole tones, rising from B natural to F in mm. 9–12 (see Figure 2.13), and descending from D sharp to F in mm. 31–37. These whole tone lines could recall the “walking” bass that characterized many recordings of the early jazz era.
Fig. 2.13. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” mm. 9–12. Hoffman uses bass progressions in whole tones, rising from B natural to F.
### 3. Machine Flats

The third movement, “Machine Flats,” is in a rhythmic, “mechanical” idiom. A rhythmic ostinato in the bass provides a steady beat while the right hand has heavy accents and syncopations. Hoffman likens this style to a sort of a primitivism like Bartok’s *Allegro Barbaro* or Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring*. He uses variation to gradually increase the complexity of the principal theme in imaginative ways.

The structure of this piece is A1-B-A2-B-A3-Coda. Section A, in its various appearances, is developed by the means of variation, although it might not sound that way because it is in a different textures every time the A section comes back. On the other hand, the section B maintains a consistent texture throughout the piece.

Section A begins with the right hand theme accompanied by the repetitive rhythm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLUES</th>
<th>NOT BLUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 1–8</td>
<td>mm. 9–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 13–15</td>
<td>mm. 16–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 27–30</td>
<td>mm. 31–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 36–44</td>
<td>mm. 45–48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2.14. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues.” Table of measure numbers for the blues progression sections and for sections that are going away from the blues progression.
in the left hand on C. These motoric repetitive rhythms are intended to represent the machines (see Figure 2.15).

![Musical notation](image)

**Fig. 2.15.** Hoffman, *each for himself?* third movement, “Machine Flats,” mm. 1–4.

The second time Section A appears (fourth beat of m. 24), Hoffman writes the theme in the same register, but it is played by the left hand. Hoffman also accompanies the theme in parallel minor thirds on the top of the theme (see Figure 2.16).

![Musical notation](image)

**Fig. 2.16.** Hoffman, *each for himself?* third movement, “Machine Flats,” mm. 23–26.

At the third appearances of Section A (m. 52), the theme is stated two octaves higher than its original appearance. This time, Hoffman applies octave doubling to some of the notes of the theme for more emphasis. The melody-with-accompaniment style of this section also provides textural contrast (see Figure 2.17).
Section B utilizes the same texture throughout, which involves alternation between the left hand and the right hand. The right hand imitates the left at the sixteenth note value. There is one dyad that remains the same for the entire section B, which is G and B. Hoffman alternates the notes G and B with three different sets of chords and repeats these sets three times. The beginning of each repetition is marked with an accent (see Figure 2.18).

Fig. 2.17. Hoffman, *each for himself?* third movement, “Machine Flats,” mm. 52–57.
Fig. 2.18. Hoffman, *each for himself?* third movement, “Machine Flats,” mm. 17–22.

The second time section B appears, these same set of three chords is repeated only twice (mm. 40–43) and Hoffman continues this section with a new set of three chords repeated three times in measures 43–46 (see Figure 2.19).
The coda is comprised of seven consecutive repetition of a machine-like pattern.

The rhythm used in the coda is not new, but is in the same rhythm from the left hand at the beginning of the movement.

As in the first movement, Hoffman incorporates elements of serial technique, in the
form of complements, where he completes the aggregate by stating missing notes of the earlier theme. The first section (mm. 1–17) is restricted to eight pitches, omitting pitches G, B, E, and C-sharp (see Figure 2.20). In the next section (see Figure 2.21), these omitted pitch classes added in mm. 17.

Fig. 2.20. Hoffman, each for himself? third movement, “Machine Flats,” mm. 1–13. This section uses 8 pitches, which are F, A-flat, A, B-flat, D, E-flat, C, and F#.
Fig. 2.21. Hoffman, *each for himself*? third movement, “Machine Flats,” mm. 17. At the second half of the measure, Hoffman uses pitches that he omitted in the previous section: G, B, E, C# to complete the aggregate.

Hoffman develops the variations by adding pitches, and creating different textures. He moves from a single-line theme with repetitive primitive rhythm in the left hand to adding voices in parallel minor thirds on the top of the theme to applying octave doubling to the theme, while the left hand provides a repetitive scale-like accompaniment. He contrasts these sections with a more static texture in Section B.

4. **Patches Purple**

According to Hoffman, this movement is intended to sound like J.S. Bach’s *Inventions* (1723) with inserted “purple patches,” a term that is used by British musicologist, Donald Francis Tovey. The term “purple patches,” applies to the sections that wander away from Bach’s style. In this analysis, I will look for “purple patches,” contrasting elements of this movement with Bach’s musical language.

The early numbers of Bach’s *Inventions* usually start with a single-line subject, without any accompaniment (for examples, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4). In the later numbers, Bach
composes an accompaniment for the subject at the beginning of the piece (Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15). Hoffman’s “Patches Purple” begins with an accompanied subject. However, the syncopated accompaniment at the beginning clearly departs from Bach’s style and it is the first “purple patch” in the piece. The answer is quite conventional, starting on the fifth scale degree, in the manner of Bach’s Inventions.

There are many obvious musical departures from Bach’s Inventions in this movement, which departs from Bach’s Inventions, such as the use of pedal, clusters, octave doubling, dynamic markings (pp, subito dynamic, gradual change), written out rallentando markings, and the use of extreme register (from E1 in mm. 10 to C8 in mm. 42). However, as Hoffman indicates, the most substantial “purple patches” are seen in his treatment of sequences. In Bach’s Inventions, the sequences are normally repeated four times (see Figure 2.22). Hoffman writes longer sequences than Bach. In this movement, the sequences are repeated six times, for examples in mm. 12–14 and mm. 15–19 (see Figure 2.23. and 2.24.).

Bach usually uses sequences to modulate from one key to another. For example, in his first Invention, he modulates from C major to G major to A minor and back to C Major. He uses sequences to maintain thematic materials for uniformity of motive, but gradually shifts the harmonic function. This way, he creates a smooth transition from one key to another. Sequences in Hoffman’s “Patches Purple,” do not modulate. He repeats the same pitches in different octaves (see Figure 2.23. and 2.24.). Sometimes, he develops this same idea by gradually adding more notes to the clusters on top of the sequences. For example, Hoffman begins the cluster with a single note, and he adds one
note at a time until it becomes a six-note cluster (mm. 32–36). Therefore, Hoffman uses sequences mostly as prolongation of harmony instead of using it as a tool to modulate. However, there is one section where he uses a sequence as a tool to modulate (mm. 43–47). This sequence moves around the circle of fifths (E-flat major–A-flat major–D-flat major). In measure 46, one would expect the chord G-flat Major, but instead it lands on the pitch G natural, where Hoffman moves to C minor, then D Major 7, that leads to G minor. Bach uses sequences to move away from the tonic key, while Hoffman uses sequences to come back to the tonic key.

![Fig. 2.22. J.S. Bach, Invention No. 1 in C Major, mm. 3–4.](image)

![Fig. 2.23. Hoffman, each for himself? fourth movement, “Purple Patches,” mm. 12–14.](image)
In this movement, Hoffman looks back to the old form, but appropriates aspects of this style into his own musical language. Hoffman retains the two-voice texture, similar kind of figuration, sequences, perpetual motion, and a harmonic language that makes it sound like Bach’s Inventions. However, the use of prolonged sequences, pedal, clusters, octave doubling, dynamic markings, and extreme register departs from Bach.

5. Returns

The fifth movement of the set, “Returns” is the only movement in the set that is slow. One may argue that the first movement is also slow, however the constant change of tempo between the two sections makes it sound more fluid. According to the
composer, “Returns” represents a struggle between the real world and the dream world. There is yearning and nostalgia in this movement. Hoffman marks some sections with pedal, including a few sections that are very chromatic and will therefore sound “blurry.” These blurry sections are intended to represent the dream world, for example measure 1 and mm. 40–42 (see Figure 2.25 and 2.26).

Fig. 2.25. Hoffman, each for himself? fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 1–2.

Fig. 2.26. Hoffman, each for himself? fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 39–42.
While the familiar triadic harmonies makes “Returns” sounds tonal like piano music from the romantic era, Hoffman applies modernist techniques. For example, the movement is structured in part as palindrome. The axis of this palindrome occur on the seventh beat of measure 20 (see Figure 2.27), though there are a few sections that are not exact retrogrades, especially in the middle section (mm. 14–17 and 23–27).

This movement is highly chromatic, but Hoffman often leads series of chromatic chords to the key of E-flat (open fifth chord) or G-flat major. These cadences help glue the musical materials together (see Figure 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 2.31). This approach is similar
to Ives’ Sonata No. 2, “Concord Sonata,” where Ives always inserts the Beethoven fifth symphony’s theme as point of resolutions throughout the piece.

Fig. 2.28. Hoffman, each for himself? fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 5–7.

---

Fig. 2.29. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 11–14.
The process of having these chords stated in retrograde leads to some interesting harmonic progressions. In many ways, the harmony of this movement recalls late romantic idiom with chromaticism and linear voice leading. However, the progressions in
common practice harmony are generally non-retrogradable, as the traditional tonic-subdominant-dominant-tonic model does not necessarily work in reverse. In the first section of “Returns,” Hoffman tends to lead from tonic sounding chords to dominant sounding chords, resulting in authentic cadences (dominant to tonic) when the passages are mirrored at the end (see Figure 2.32 and 2.33).

Fig. 2.32. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 1–4.
Fig. 2.33. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 37–42.
Hoffman seems to prefer harmonic motion by ascending fifths in the first half of the movement, thereby avoiding the cadential V-I relationship that defines common practice harmony. In mm. 15–16, for example, he ascends harmonically by fifth three times consecutively, leading from D-flat major to B-flat major (see Figure 2.34). When this section returns in the mirror passage, the harmonic progression descends by fifth. The fact that the first three chords in the return section are dominant seventh chords, it reinforces the sense of tonality. These chords, B-flat major7–E-flat major7–A-flat major7–D-flat major may be heard as a series of secondary dominant chords (see Figure 2.35).

![Figure 2.34](image)

Fig. 2.34. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fifth movement, “Returns,” mm. 15–16.
The overall feeling of the chord progressions in the first part of the piece is I to V, meaning that its mirror image moves from V to I. The series of chromatic chords in this movement gives a sensation of going somewhere because of the progression from tonic to dominant (half cadence). In the return of the theme, it sounds more tonal because the harmonic progression leads to a perfect cadence. Perhaps this also gives the piece remnant of a common practice harmonic structure, in that it “leads” to a dominant in the middle of the piece and “returns” to a tonic at the end. He ingeniously suggests this relationship without actually modulating the tonal center of E-flat and G-flat. Hoffman emphasis this bipartite structure by placing a *forte* dynamic (the loudest point) near the center of the work, right before the chords go in retrograde.
6. Rap Rag Red

Hoffman’s “Rap Rag Red” is one of a few classical piano pieces that utilizes the style of rap music. In this movement, he imitates rapping through the use of syncopation and percussive rhythm. He constantly alternates eighth-note and triplet subdivisions of the beat. Also, the use of chromatic scales and clusters is prominent to highlight the dramatic effect. The pitch range of this movement covers almost the entire keyboard, A₁ (in m. 1) to B₈ (in m. 43). Perhaps the notes in the low range are intended to represent the loud bass of rap music.

The formal structure of this movement is A-B-A. The return of Section A contrasts with the previous section. It is the first time in the movement that the dynamic is soft. Hoffman also distinguishes it from the first Section A, by adding octave doubling on some pitches, for example the left hand passages from mm. 85–86 (see Figure 2.36 and 2.37).

Fig. 2.36. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 5–7.

---

5 Another classical piano piece that specifically refers to rap music is Paul Chihara’s “Hip Hop Farmer” from his *12 Bagatelles*. In this piece, Chihara appropriates the rap style on Schumann’s “The Happy Farmer,” Op. 68 No. 10.

6 See Appendix A.
In this movement, Hoffman creates a percussive effect by writing layers of seemingly unrelated harmonies. These provide consistent percussive effects throughout the movement such as the pattern kick + kick + snare in the left hand. The bass drum kick is always created by a single note or an octave in the bass and the snare hit is usually the pitch-class set [0237]. However, the relationship between the kick and the snare is not necessarily harmonic, because they appear in different intervallic relationships throughout the movement. For example, the interval relationship between the kick and the snare in measure 18 is not the same as in measure 49 (see Figure 2.38 and 2.39). The interval between the kick and the lowest note of the snare chord in measure 18 and 19 is a tritone, whereas in measure 49, the interval decreases to an augmented second.
On top of this percussive effect kick + kick + snare pattern, Hoffman layers a melody that features a different harmony. For example, in measures 29–30, Hoffman maintains the same harmony in the left hand, while the right hand moves sequentially (see Figure 2.40).

Hoffman uses certain pitch sets prominently throughout this movement. One of the most distinctive gestures of this movement is the left hand pattern in measure one. This gesture includes pitches [A, C, and D], which is pitch-class set [025] (see Figure 2.41). A few measures later, in measure five, the left hand pitches sound quite different from the pitches in measure one, but they utilize same set class [025] (see Figure 2.42).
Also a different pattern with the same pitch set can be seen in measures 22, 23, 41, and 59 (see Figure 2.43).

Fig. 2.41. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 1–2.

Fig. 2.42. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 5–8.
Fig. 2.43. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 20–25.

In measure eight, Hoffman introduces a new chord [A-flat, C, F, G], which is set class [0237] (see Figure 2.44). This chord is used often throughout the movement. For example, it is used as a block chord in measures 12, 13, and 37 (see Figure 2.45). Hoffman also varies this chord by transposing it. Hoffman transposed this chord up an augmented 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) (by T3) from its initial appearance in measure 15 (see Figure 2.46). We can also see the same set class in measures 31, and 32 (see Figure 2.47).
Fig. 2.44. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” m. 8.

Fig. 2.45. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 12–13.
Fig. 2.46. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” m. 15.

Fig. 2.47. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 31–32.

Another set class that Hoffman uses in this movement is [0257], which we can see in the form of clusters in mm. 25–26 and as a melody in measure 30 (see Figure 2.48 and 2.49).
Fig. 2.48. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” m. 26.

Fig. 2.49. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” m. 30.

Hoffman writes one section of the rap melody in parallel intervals, which increasing in size over the course of the piece (see Figure 2.50, 2.51, 2.52). Initially, it appears as seconds (mm. 25–27), then thirds (mm. 44–45), and he later expands the interval to fourths (mm. 77–81).
Fig. 2.50. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 23–27.

Fig. 2.51. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 42–47.
Hoffman re-orchestrates the elements of rap for the piano. Each percussive
element has its own vocal style or timbre as a result of these particular pitch-class sets.
The kick is represented by unisons or octaves, and the snare is more dissonant. He
characterizes the declamatory style group singing by writing parallel intervals, which are
angular. He contrasts this technique with unison melodic lines, chromatic and stepwise
motion for the faster patter sections of rap music.
7. The Five-Flat Machine’s Return

The last movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s Returns,” is quite similar to that of the third movement, “Machine Flats.” Both pieces begin in a similar style, utilizing motoric and repetitive rhythm. They both have two main themes, where Hoffman varies the first theme as a means of development each time it returns while keeping the other theme largely the same in each repetition. The structure of “The Five-Flat Machine’s Returns,” is A1-B-bridge+B-A2-bridge-A3-B-Coda. Unlike the “Machine Flats,” however, this movement has two large sections that depart from both main themes. Hoffman calls these sections “bridges.” There are found in mm. 53–82 and 96–120.

The first theme is recognizable by its melodic contour, while Hoffman varies other aspects of the theme such as rhythm, texture, and dynamic. The first theme (theme A) consists of diatonic pitches. Theme A is characterized by four ascending stepwise pitches and a leap of a third upward, with a syncopated accents on the final note. The movement begins with six introductory measures, grouping eighth notes in a palindromic of 3+3+2 | 2+3+3 pattern in the time signature of 8/8. Then, at measure seven, this rhythmic pattern becomes the accompaniment and the theme appears on top of it also in the same pattern of 3+3+2 | 2+3+3 (see Fig. 2.53).
At measure 83, the theme appears in a different time signature, $\frac{3}{4}$, which forces a metrical reinterpretation of the melody. Hoffman also doubles the melody at various intervals. The accompaniment of this section is a repetitive three groups of four sixteenth notes (see Figure 2.54).
While the beginning has an incessant eighth-note ostinato accompanying the melody, the second appearance has rapid sixteenth-note accompaniment. The last time the section A melody appears, Hoffman varies it by simplifying the theme into a single line melody divided between the two hands without an accompaniment (see Figure 2.55). This also involves a metrical reinterpretation from the previous appearance. This whole section is in 9/8 and the dynamic is piano (the previous two times are in mf).
Theme B is characterized with ascending octave melody in the left hand that is constantly interrupted by chords in the right hand. This theme creates a hemiola effect, because of the combination of three groups of three notes with occasional pattern of three groups of two notes (see Figure 2.56). The pitches of theme B are quite consistent throughout the piece, utilizing the title-referenced “five flats” key signature. However, in one section, Hoffman transposes this pattern and rhythm to another key and rearranges some pitches to a different register, allowing it to act as a bridge (mm. 73–82) to the five-flat key signature in measure 83 (see Figure 2.57).
Fig. 2.56. Hoffman, *each for himself?* seventh movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return,” mm. 37–40.
Fig. 2.57. Hoffman, *each for himself?* seventh movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return,” mm. 72–84.

Hoffman completes the movement with a coda. In here, right hand pentatonic pitches repeat in different rhythmic patterns. This coda includes insistent repetition of a two-chord pattern. Hoffman gradually builds intensity by increasing the number of notes both by adding pitches to vertical chords and increasing the density of the arpeggiation. In measure 173, chord A, a G-flat major seventh chord with added pitch E-flat, takes up three beats. Chord B is a G-flat major seventh chord with pitch A added. Descending motion from D-flat to B-flat in the bass is the basic pattern of the entire coda (see Figure 2.58). Starting in measure 177, Hoffman doubles the D-flat in the right hand and adds more accents and articulations (see Figure 2.59). In measure 181, the rhythmic patterns in the right hand are made up of two different gestures. One is a quintuplet descending figure (a) and the other is a quick two notes descending gesture (b). This hemiola rhythmic pattern appears in the order of a+a+b+b+b (see Figure 2.60). Later, he increases
the density by only repeating the quintuplet descending figures and finally he concludes
the piece with repeated cluster chords, which is a combination of pitches a and b (see
Figure 2.61).

Fig. 2.58. Hoffman, *each for himself?* seventh movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s
Return,” m. 173. Basic Pattern.

Fig. 2.59. Hoffman, *each for himself?* seventh movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s
Return,” mm. 175–177. Hoffman increases the intensity by adding more accents,
articulations, and chords in the left hand.

Fig. 2.60. Hoffman, *each for himself?* seventh movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s
Return,” mm. 181–182.
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Hoffman also uses a coda section to similar effect in another work of his, “Music in Yellow and Green” for piano, flute, violin, and cello (2012). It is similar in the sense that the pitches in the coda remain similar throughout the coda and it is repeated for about two pages. The last few measures of both pieces are marked with $fff$ to highlight the climax.

Pitch materials in this movement are diatonic. In the “Machine Flats,” every repetition gets bigger and bolder, where the last variation of theme A is the climax of the movement. In “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return,” the last statement of theme A begins sparsely and marked piano. The climax of this movement is at the end of the coda, when Hoffman builds up to $ffff$. 
CHAPTER 3

A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO TECHNICAL AND INTERPRETATIVE ISSUES

In this chapter, I will discuss practical performance issues in playing Joel Hoffman’s *each for himself* including tempi, dynamics, pedaling, leaps, fingerings, glissandi, clarity, order of movements, memorization and interpretative issues. Through discussions of selective examples from the piece, I will suggest possible solutions. Along with musicological resources, articles by various concert pianists and piano pedagogues will be explored for possible solutions.

A. Tempo

In the first movement, the expressive character of sections labeled “Tempo I” can be best realized with rubato and tempo flexibility. This provides contrast with “Tempo II” sections, which maintain a strict tempo at quarter note=48. A constant tempo in these sections can also help to clarify the rhythmic diminution from quarter notes to sixteenth-note quintuplets. The contrast between “Tempo I” and “Tempo II” sections is not easily perceived by the listener simply on the basis of the difference of the metronome markings (quarter=60 and quarter =48), so contrasting them through rubato can be an effective way to clarify the form. Because the entire movement consists of the alternation between “Tempo I” and “Tempo II” sections, and due to the irregular phrase lengths of “Tempo I,” it may be a challenge to maintain the same tempo for all of the “Tempo II” sections.
This challenge is compounded because each time the Tempo II section appears, it does so with smaller beat subdivisions (the first time it appears in quarter notes, the second time in eight-notes rhythm, the third time in triplets, the fourth time in sixteenth notes, and the last time in quintuplets). Practicing the Tempo II sections by isolating them and playing them continuously, omitting the Tempo I sections in between, is an effective way to develop a uniformity of tempo. The use of a metronome in the early stages of learning this movement can help as well, although the shifting tempi mean that the performer needs to be able to feel the internal pulse themself, and a metronome will soon prove to be a hindrance. As Josef Hofmann writes:

Never play with a metronome: You may use a metronome for a little passage as a test of your ability to play the passage in strict time. When you see the result, positive or negative, stop the machine at once. For according to the metronome a really musical rhythm is unrhythical—and, on the other hand, the keeping of absolutely strict time is thoroughly unmusical and deadlikel.

All of the Tempo I sections are marked “poco rallentando” at the end. This allows the performer to have a smoother tempo transition between Tempo 1 and Tempo II. The only Tempo I section that does not have the poco rallentando sign is the last (m. 37). Instead, Hoffman marks the last note of that section with a fermata sign, therefore rallentando is not necessary (see Figure 3.1).

---

In the second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” Hoffman marks the climax with two consecutive fermata signs in the left hand while the right hand is playing a continuous trill also marked with a fermata sign (see Figure 3.2). This movement is quite fast, and the performer needs to find a happy medium between stretching the fermatas for dramatic effect and retaining the momentum of the music. Traditionally a fermata sign is held for about twice the length of the written note value (here, a whole note). My interpretation is to play the first note double the note value (half note becoming whole note) and prolong the second note a bit more than double the note value. In this way, the first note preserves the rhythmic momentum while still observing the fermata, and the second note allows the motion to calm down slightly, aiding the diminuendo marking that transitions from the *forte* of the middle section back to the *piano* of the return of the opening idea.
B. Dynamics

In the climax of “Transcendental Blues” (m. 26), there is a diminuendo from forte to piano over a full pedal marking (see Figure 3.3). The trill in the right hand needs special attention so that it remains clear and so that the pedal does not blur the diminuendo. The pianist has to control finger pressure, especially after the second note in the left hand. He or she might also consider using a less-than-full pedal to enhance the clarity of the notes.
When I performed this piece for Joel Hoffman, he told me to imagine a “disappearing balloon” for the passage in the final measure (see Figure 3.4). On the score, he writes the indication of fluttering pedal. However, this “disappearing balloon” effect could be achieved better by adding the soft pedal (una corda). Also, reducing the flutter pedal by using no pedal at all for the last few notes will help control the clarity of the sound.

One of the most challenging aspects at performing the second movement is maintaining the soft dynamic while playing hand-crossing perpetual motion arpeggios. Another technical challenge of this passage is to maintain the legato effect between the
right and the left hands. The best way to achieve this is to slowly practice only the arpeggios with fingers close to the keys (to avoid any loud attacks) and to make sure that the change between the two hands is smooth (connected and using the same dynamic level).

In mm. 32 to 36 of the fourth movement, Hoffman marks the half pedal for five consecutive measures (see Figure 3.5). Even though it is not marked with a full pedal, the overlapping of sound could be overwhelming if the full pedal is maintained for that long, especially considering the presence of clusters in the right hand. It is important to articulate all of the clusters very softly, perhaps using una corda, since this passage is marked pianissimo. If necessary, reduce the pedal not only to half, but to a third or more for better clarity.
Fig. 3.5. Hoffman, each for himself? fourth movement, “Patches Purple,” mm. 32–38. Half pedal over clusters for five measures in pianissimo.

C. Pedaling

Anton Rubinstein referred to the damper pedal as the soul of the piano.² Pedal should not function as a tool to play legato, as legato playing should always be achieved through the fingers. However, effective pedaling is an important tool for pianists to

explore the most ideal sound by giving a richer quality to the tones of the piano with more varied color and timbre. I will discuss a few passages with some pedaling issues.

In the second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” the pedal marking for the blues section usually starts in the bass (the middle of the measure) and the pedal marking for the non-blues section usually starts at the beginning of the measure (see Figure 3.6 and 3.7). However in measure 13, the pedal marking starts at the beginning of the measure even though it is part of the blues section. In the interview, Hoffman mentions that in measure three is the first time that the bass appears, therefore it is necessary to highlight that with a pedal change (see Figure 3.6). In measure 13, it is necessary to change the pedal at the beginning of the measure, because the measure before that consists of a different harmony, and the effect will be blurry if the pedal is held.

Fig. 3.6. Hoffman, each for himself? second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” mm. 2–3. Pedal marking on the bass (in middle of the measure) in measure 3.
In measure 47, Hoffman indicates a full pedal marking over a *diminuendo* sign. This could be a problem, because when you start a trill at a louder dynamic, the volume will be retained with the pedal. Later in measure 48, he writes an indication of flutter pedal in order to capture the “disappearing balloon effect,” but not when the trill occurs. Using the fluttering pedal earlier (starting from the beginning of measure 48) or reducing the amount pedal pressed can enhance the *diminuendo*.

In the third movement, “Machine Flats,” Hoffman marks the pedaling change right on the note C, but if a performer changes the pedal at the note C, the pedal will capture that note into the next section. Perhaps if the pedal change is delayed a little bit, the separation between the two sections can be clearer (see Figure 3.8).
In the fifth movement, “Returns,” Hoffman marks measure 27 with “ped. II.”

Looking at the music, it is clear that Hoffman refers the “pedal II” as the middle pedal in the grand piano (the middle pedal in an upright piano functions differently) or sostenuto pedal. The sostenuto pedal can sustain selected notes, while other notes remain unaffected. In this movement, this sostenuto pedal is intended to capture the octave C in the left hand. The upper voices are very chromatic and need frequent pedal changes, but at the same time the bass C needs to sustain. Without the sostenuto pedal, the frequent pedal changes will quickly diminish the sound of the bass C. In general, the sostenuto pedal is played with the left foot. In this particular passage, the performer does not have any other choice, because the composer marks two simultaneous pedal markings (see Figure 3.9).

---

3 Other composers have referred to the sostenuto pedal as ped. III instead of ped. II. For example, Ferruccio Busoni wrote a piece for the use of sostenuto pedal: Sieben kurze Stücke zur Pflege des polyphonen Spiels No. 7, “Mit Anwendung des III. Pedals,” (with the use of the third pedal).
There are many leaps throughout the first movement, “The Five,” especially in the final three measures, mm. 40–41. The leaps in the left hand range from the interval of the 19th to the 33rd. It is possible to play it as written, but there is an alternative way to play this left hand passage. I propose to distribute some notes of the left hand to the right hand by taking the first note of each beat from the left hand to the right hand (see Figure 3.10).

D. Hand distribution in “The Five”
E. Glissandi

A glissando is a glide from one pitch to another. Performing glissandi on the piano is often tricky and painful for the fingers. This discomfort is partly due to the heavy action of modern pianos. The commonly taught approach for performing glissandi is to avoid pressing too hard into the keys and to use mostly the fingernails, rather than the flesh to slide on the keys. The disadvantage of such light pressing is that the volume will not be very loud. Because glissando is mostly used only for an effect, this low volume will usually not be a problem.
This particular glissando passage in measure 43 of “Rap Rag Red” is quite tricky because the performer has to slide two notes on different levels (black and white keys) simultaneously. As we can see in measure 43, Hoffman writes not only a glissando on two notes, but also he marks that part with crescendo to forte (see Figure 3.11).

Pianist Josef Hofmann explains his approach to glissandi in his book:

In playing glissando in the right hand use the index finger when going upward, the thumb when going downward. In the left hand—where it hardly ever occurs—use the middle finger in either direction, or, if you should find it easier, the index finger downward.  

I use finger number one and two for this glissando passage. One way to do this is to make sure that the hand is facing to the left with elbow moving toward the body. It is easier to slide on the white keys than the black keys, therefore, a performer should make sure that he gets a good solid glissando sound on the white keys. This could be done by placing the thumb slightly under to the right of the second finger and slide it using the top part of the fingernail.

---

Another crucial point of performing a glissando is the arrival point. In this case, the arrival point is marked *forte*. I feel that it is necessary to emphasize the arrival notes (C and D-flat) by detaching the fingers slightly after the glissando, so that the notes can be heard clearly.

**F. Clarity**

One of the passages in the seventh movement is a challenge to play with a clear articulation in a fast tempo (see Figure 3.13). Development of rigorous rhythmic articulation can be developed by the technique of finger tapping outlined in Fraser’s book. He said that the practice of finger-tapping gives a graphic kinesthetic picture of the
natural alignment of limbs that results from good physical organizations. The Canadian virtuoso William Aide writes:

Finger-tapping is a lowly, obsessive and cultish exercise for acquiring absolute evenness and ease in tricky passages work. It eliminates excess motion in the hand and ensures intimate tactile connection with pattern in question.

As Fraser explains, the first step is to tap the fingers successively to the bottom of the keys and also make sure that the fingers are relaxed, as if “boneless.” The motion of the tapping should be as fast as possible. The second stage of this regimen is to play the notes with a quick staccato motion, one finger at a time, from the surface of the key, quick to the keybed, with a rebound back to the surface of the key. This requires slow practice, with each note being separated by about two seconds of silence. Fraser also claims that Glenn Gould tapped everything (passages, chords, whole pieces) everyday when he practiced.

---


6 Ibid., 135–6.

7 Ibid., 136.
Fig. 3.13. Hoffman, each for himself? seventh movement, “The Five Flat Machine’s Returns,” mm. 96–108. One of the challenging passages to play in a fast tempo with a clear articulation.

G. Fingerings

Determining effective fingerings is one of the most crucial considerations when learning a piece. In editions, they are intended to aid performers in playing certain musical passages.

The necessity for playing the correct notes is usually self-evident and rarely gives lasting trouble. The importance of precise, careful fingering and accurate counting, however, is not so clear to the student, who may continue to
neglect either or both with nearly fatal consequences to the music and his control of it, until stringent remedial measures are taken… Perhaps the importance of fingering can be stressed further by quoting Emanuel Bach to the effect that it “is inseparable related to the whole art of performance.”

Not only is the choice of fingerings on a keyboard instrument crucial to one’s performance, it can profoundly affect memorizing, stage poise, technical mastery, speed of learning, and general security at the piano. William Newman suggests that every pianist should experiment with different fingerings to discover the superiority of one fingering over another, and that overall planning is required to make the fingering consistent. He also suggests that often we could discover the best solutions by working backwards from the end of the passage. If, after considering the various determining factors, one finds no single best fingering, then an arbitrary decision must be made. Later he added:

When the student has decided upon a fingering, he should, without fail, write it in, with each number, small but clear, placed unambiguously near the note in concerns.

Because Hoffman does not provide any fingerings on the score, I will provide my own fingerings of certain passages in this chapter. I will provide the fingerings for a few of the most challenging passages that I have come across.

---


9 Ibid., 98.

10 Ibid., 100.
1. The Five

Fig. 3.14. Hoffman, *each for himself?* first movement, “The Five,” mm. 40–42. Right hand (m.d.: mano destra) take over the first note of the first and second beat of the left hand to sound smoother.

2. Transcendental Blues

Fig. 3.15. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” mm. 23–24. Parallel scales passages.

3. Machine Flats
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Fig. 3.16. Hoffman, *each for himself*? third movement, “Machine Flats” mm. 25–33. Left hand passages.

Fig. 3.17. Hoffman, *each for himself*? third movement, “Machine Flats” mm. 49–51. Left hand passages.
Fig. 3.18. Hoffman, *each for himself?* third movement, “Machine Flats” mm. 58–63. Left hand passages.

4. Patches Purple

Fig. 3.19. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” mm. 19–20. Left hand passages.
Fig. 3.20. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” 28–29. Left hand passages.

Fig. 3.21. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” m. 31. Left hand passages.
Fig. 3.22. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” mm. 38–41. Left hand passages.

Fig. 3.23. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” m. 48. Left hand passages.

Fig. 3.24. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” mm. 25. Leap in the left hand.
Fig. 3.25. Hoffman, *each for himself?* fourth movement, “Patches Purple” mm. 32–35.
Right hand clusters, the thumb will play the bottom two notes in measure 35.

6. Rap Rag Red
Fig. 3.26. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red” mm. 66–71. Extended blues passages.

![Musical notation](image1)

Fig. 3.27. Hoffman, *each for himself?* sixth movement, “Rap Rag Red,” mm. 72–77. Extended blues passages.

7. The Five-Flat Machine’s Returns
Fig. 3.28. Hoffman, *each for himself?* seventh movement, “The Five-Flat Machine’s Returns,” mm. 116–119. Scale passages.
Fig. 3.29. Hoffman, each for himself? seventh movement, “The Five Flat Machine’s Returns,” mm. 193–8. Six notes clusters on the right hand. The thumb plays the bottom two notes in measure 193–6.

H. The Order of the Movements

During the interview, the composer mentioned that his ordering of the movements does not have to be observed. The performer can re-arrange the order of movements of this piece, although certain things would be relatively obvious, like “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” should be the last movement.

I chose the order of each for himself? but if you or some other pianists were to play all the pieces in the set, but in a different order, it would be very intriguing to me. Certain things would be relatively obvious. The last movement, I think, has to be the last one. There are few possible candidates for the first movement. “Machine Flats,” “Transcendental Blues” could each be the first movement, for example.11

Emanuele Arciuli, who recorded this piece on the Stradivarius label, included only three of seven movements in this recording: “Machine Flats,” “Returns,” and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” When performing this piece myself, I usually play the whole set, but sometimes I only had the option to play a few movements from the set. In June 2011, for example, I was invited to play Joel Hoffman’s piece, but was only allotted ten minutes at the ACCENT music festival at the College-Conservatory of Music. I had to choose only a few movements to play. I decided to play the three movements “The Five,” “Rap Rag Red,” and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” These three movements are contrasting in style. They represent various aspects of the piece: connection of the titles (“The Five” as part of “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return”), and the color movement (the

---

11 Interview with Joel Hoffman, December 14, 2012.
color red from “Rap Rag Red”). With this order, one begins with an atonal-sounding movement and builds to a passionate climax at the end with “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” Both “Rap Rag Red” and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” are rhythmic driving music. However they are different in character, “Rap Rag Red” has to be played rather dry and clear compared to “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” to get the parlando effect, and “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” has to be played with more color.

I. Memorization

In the nineteenth century, Clara Schumann and Franz Liszt have set the practice of memorizing their pieces for public performances. Some pianists believe that memorization allows them more freedom of expression. Others believe that memorization creates unnecessary pressure. Nevertheless, memorization for a public recital has been the norm for pianists, unless they are playing complex, contemporary pieces.

Joel Hoffman does not have a strong opinion on whether this piece should be performed by memory or not. He suggests that the performer decide. If s/he is comfortable to play it from the memory, s/he should do so:

No more or less than any other solo work. In other words, someone who plays from memory in general should play this piece the same way. Someone who generally doesn't play from memory shouldn't make a special effort to play this piece from memory.¹²

¹² Interview with Joel Hoffman, December 12, 2012.
Frank Weinstock, who premiered this piece, could not remember if he played it by memory or not, but he has the whole piece memorized. However, he thinks that it is safer to perform a new piece not by memory.

In many cases, it's not fair to the composer to play a new piece by memory: if you have a major memory slip in Beethoven, everybody will know that it was your fault and not blame Beethoven; but if you have it in a piece that nobody knows, and you cover it up quite well, people are likely to blame their resulting discomfort on the piece and the composer.\(^{13}\)

There are many approaches to memorizing music. I would like to list a few of these by quoting famous pianists. Vladimir Ashkenazy believes memorizing music requires a combination of things. The fingers memorize music mechanically, but we should not rely only on our fingers, because doing so is very dangerous. Memorization should incorporate everything: mind, visual, and aural.\(^{14}\) British pianist Harold Bauer believes that he never knew a piece of music unless the process of memorization has been absolutely subconscious.\(^{15}\) Alicia de Larrocha’s approach to memorizing music is rather different than the two pianists mentioned above:

First, I sightread and then I look at the structure of the work and work on the fingering and write it in. I used to play without writing it in but now I have to do that. Then I memorize the piece from a visual point of view; and then the harmonies.\(^{16}\)

Edwin Hughes takes the idea of structural memorization even further than de Larrocha.

\(^{13}\) Interview with Frank Weinstock, December 19, 2012.


In memorizing a new composition, the first step should be to play the work through slowly, in order to find out how it sounds and to become acquainted with its general form and construction. Start to memorize it immediately, even though at first you may be able to retain only a few salient points. ... Play understandingly—and listen... Play the hands separately at first, noting and analyzing everything, letting the keyboard images, the feeling for the fingering-groups, and above all, the sound, impress themselves on your mind. Remember that the best memorizers are ear-memorizers.  

Olga Samaroff memorizes a piece of music in sections. She takes a passage of eight measures and practices it until it is memorized. After that, she does not just practice the beginning of the second eight measures, but she goes back two or three measure earlier.

Proceeding to practice the following passage, I always begin, not at the beginning of the second eight measures, but two or three measures back. In this way the joining-on measure between passage one and passage two gets double practice, and one has, so to speak, a cue before every passage, which greatly aids in sureness.

Samaroff also believes that one should think through a piece mentally, away from the piano. She thinks that one should live with a work for some time before venturing to perform it in public, at least for several months.

J. Interpretative Issue

In the second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” the composer marked both measures 16 and 31 with “new color.” How do we interpret this performance direction? What does he mean by “new color?” Professor Frank Weinstock, who premiered this

---


19 Ibid., 155–157.
piece, interprets these passages by playing the measures leading into them slower and softer (m. 15 and 30).

 Again, I don't remember too well; but what I think I did, and what I would do now, would probably be to take some time at the end of the previous bar and at the beginning of this bar, to better enjoy the beauty of the new harmony; probably use a less distinct sound; and probably a bit softer--quasi pp.

 When I played this movement, my interpretation of the “new color” direction was different from Professor Weinstock. I believe that the “new color” indication pertains not only to measure 16, but also for mm. 16 to 18, since those three measures are basically the same passage repeated three times. In each repetition (m. 17 and 18), I play it a little slower and softer. As for measure 31, the passage is not in the same pattern as measure 16; the nature of this passage is to be “going somewhere.” In this case, I interpret the “new color” by playing it softly in measure 31.
Fig. 3.30. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” mm. 16–18.

Fig. 3.31. Hoffman, *each for himself?* second movement, “Transcendental Blues,” mm. 30–32.
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APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW WITH JOEL HOFFMAN

General Questions

What motivated you to write this piece?
In this case, what actually motivated me to write the piece in the first place doesn’t have much to do with how the piece actually turned out. When I write a piece, I always have a concept. In this case, the thought was to see if I could compose a set of several pieces that were not related to each other in any way.

There are many, many multi-movement works in all kinds of media. Take, for example, four-movement symphonies. Consider any Beethoven symphony (with the exception of the fifth, sixth and ninth, which have some kind of linking mechanism across movements). If you consider the others - the seventh symphony, for example – they are all filled with absolutely wonderful and memorable movements. But try asking ‘why does the slow variation movement of the seventh symphony have to be in that symphony? Couldn’t a different movement be just as good? What’s the reason that this specific movement has to be the second movement of that symphony? Why does the scherzo of that symphony have to be that scherzo? If you know these pieces for decades, as I do, you can’t imagine the third movement being different than that one… but objectively speaking, what is the reason that this movement has to be in that symphony? Why can’t some other movement, similar maybe, in the same key, with the same tempo, be just as good? This kind of multi-movement arrangement seems to be arbitrary, and it sometimes bothers me. It also bothers me that people seem to accept this, without hesitation or question. So, I was interested in writing a set of pieces for piano in which I’d want to test the glue that may or may not hold the set together. I wanted to see what it felt like to write a set of pieces that would be very different from each other - so different that you wonder as you are listening ‘why does that piece called “Returns,” show up here?’ ‘What does that piece have to do with all the others?’ ‘It sounds so stylistically different from the others…’ ‘And what does “Rap Rag Red” have to do with the others?’

So I made a point of making each of those movements as substantially different from each other as I could, but with a paradoxical twist: I linked them by their titles and I gave a little bit of depth to the meaning of those titles, even if it’s a superficial meaning. For example, in the first movement “The Five,” there are a lot of things that happens in sets of five in that movement. Actually it’s mostly a superficial thing, this organization into sets of five: it’s a relationship that is real, but has almost no substance. Things happen in groups of five in that movement, and in the last movement “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return,” there is a key signature of five flats. Now obviously this is a connection, but just as obviously, a totally superficial one!

There’s a movement called “Machine Flats”. The words in this title come back in the title of the last movement (“The Five-Flat Machine’s Return,”), but the character of
“Machine Flats” is not related to that of the last movement, except that they are both very moto ric pieces. So I guess what I was really interested in conceptually at the beginning was this idea of probing the nature of a relationship among a group of pieces that is designed to be a set on one hand, but on the other hand they are meant to sound quite different from each other. There are lots of sets of pieces in the piano literature in which the movements are very different from each other, yet designed to be played together in order, as a set. The Chopin Preludes are a good example of this. Mendelssohn’s “Songs Without Words” is another. I just heard a fantastic piano recital several weeks ago by Jean Yves Thibaudet in Memorial Hall. He played the first book of Debussy Preludes. I never knew that those pieces would sound great as a set. Objectively speaking, the pieces are very different from each other, so when one says that they sound great as a set, what does that really mean? I guess it’s an ideal balance between sufficient contrast and stylistic connectivity.

I know that the first, third and fifth movements’ titles together make the seventh movement’s title, and the rest of the movements’ titles are about colors.
In fact, for my recital in March 2013, I decided that I am going to present nothing but pieces for which I’ve given titles with names of colors in them.

That has to do with synesthesia?
Yes, except that at the time I wrote most of those pieces, it was all under the surface. I wasn’t aware of synesthesia the way I am now. I started to realize somewhere around three years ago that I actually connect colors to musical notes. For a long time, I thought this wasn’t real. I had read about composers who claimed synesthesia but wasn’t very convinced. It’s not exactly that when I hear a note, I see a specific color immediately, and always only that color. I do see colors when I hear notes and chords, but it’s not an absolute thing. The more I think about these connections with respect to the pieces that I wrote before a few years ago, the more I realize that this connection was already there, but it was an evolving process. If you play a G, I think blue, but I cannot swear to you that it’s a simple truth as in ‘I am 59 years old’. It’s not like that. D sort of feels green to me, yellow is E (it always seems to be an E nowadays), but I slowly came to all of this.

Since you said that you only know this recently about pitch-color associations, that means at that time you wrote “Transcendental Blues,” “Rap Rag Red,” or “Patches Purple,” you didn’t associated the colors with specific notes, right?
At that time no, the idea of associating colors with musical sounds was attractive to me, but I thought that a fixed relationship between a specific color and a musical sound (whether a note, chord, or motive) was something for other people, not for me. I really liked the idea at that time, but that was not who I was then. Now that I look back at it, I can see that there was already a tiniest awakening of that kind of awareness.

So are blue, purple and red your favorite colors?
Not now. If you ask a child ‘what’s your favorite color’, he/she will typically answer you with one color and will really mean it. When my son Benjamin was little, his favorite number was four and his favorite color was orange. That’s just the way it was, and the piece I wrote for him called Three Oranges is a result of that. Somehow in the last few
years, along with this slow awakening of synesthetic identity, I have come to realize that I do have a favorite color: yellow. I recently bought a yellow tablecloth and a yellow shirt. It’s funny: until very recently this was arbitrary. Whenever someone said ‘my favorite color is x’, my thought was, well, he likes that color, but how can he say it’s his favorite? Well, we change!

That’s why the title “each for himself?” has a question mark at the end. That’s the very essence of the original concept, the question mark. This was the motivation to write it, the challenge of connectivity among a set of pieces that are deliberately very different from each other. However, this problem doesn’t really matter to me anymore. It was just something that got me started working.

The genesis of each piece in the set is a small collection of musical ideas. For example, in the last movement, it was all about the rhythm at the beginning. Once I had the idea and was working on stretching it out and making a coherent and satisfying whole out of it, the question of connectivity to the other movements faded away. By then, all I cared about was how to turn this musical idea into a really strong, memorable, exciting composition. The same with all the others: there is some kind of musical idea, sound idea, which becomes the burning core or center of the piece that then has to be completed. That’s why the connectivity idea eventually became secondary.

Did you have a specific person in mind when you wrote this piece?
I wrote it for my friend Frank Weinstock. However, I was not thinking about Frank’s unique way of playing while I was working on the piece. Sometimes I do think of the musicians for whom I’m composing, but not in this case.

Like Mozart?
Well, in the case of the piece I’m working on now, for actor and orchestra, there is no specific intended performing group yet. I recently wrote a set of piano variations called Amethyst Variations. My friend and colleague James Tocco is going to premiere it on a recital here at the school in March. But I didn’t write that piece with him in mind. In a very real sense, when I write piano music, I’m writing it for myself. When I write for the piano, I always like to try things out on the instrument. I like to make music that is ergonomic, that feels good to play. So inevitably, it ends up fitting my hands and my own particular collection of strengths and weaknesses.

That is one of the reasons that I really like playing your music, not only because it is great music to listen to, but because it feels good under the fingers. Some composers like to make it really hard for the performer by making tiny changes here and there, things that don’t really affect the music that much.
The best example of ergonomic piano music that I can think of is the music of Frederic Rzewski. Although Frederic is a very good friend of mine, I actually have only played one piece of his, which I commissioned for the MusicX festival, a piece for two pianos and two percussionists. We played it with the Percussion Group Cincinnati in the festival. When I received the music I panicked a little, because it looked very difficult. Since I had never had the experience of playing his music before (I knew a lot of his
piano music but only as a listener) I really didn’t know what was going to happen, but when I begin practicing it, I began to see that it fit under the hands almost in a magical way, yet the notation looked fierce! My initial sight-reading went slowly because his calligraphy is not that easy to read; on top of that there were a lot of notes and the texture looked really dense. How would I ever learn it? But if I took one page and practiced it for three or four days, slowly becoming familiar with it, I began to understand that this music had already been played by a pianist before I got to it. That pianist, Frederic, made sure that it feels good under the hands. So it’s interesting: my music feels good under the hands, and it looks that way, I think. His music feels good under the hands, but you wouldn’t guess by just looking at the score that it is going to be that way. I think that’s one of the reasons why so many people play his music: because you just feel great playing it. The four North American Ballads is played by a lot of people now. When you see someone playing “Winnsboro Cotton Mill Blues”, you can even see that it’s great fun to play it. Frederic is not just a composer, he is a piano composer, like Beethoven and Chopin and Bartok and Prokofiev.

Beethoven? Isn’t his music kind of awkward under the hands? It’s awkward but fundamentally it’s about the piano, by which I mean that it is conceived idiomatically at the piano. But you are right, Beethoven isn’t comfortable the way Chopin is.

Your music is more comfortable than Beethoven, I think. Musically it’s harder for some people, because we hear Beethoven’s music so much, but it fits really well. My music is going fit my hand, the physiognomy of my hand, because these are the only hands that I know. The same thing happens with all other composers. I could never play Rachmaninoff. I know that the physiognomy of his hands was unique - almost as if he were from a different species! I cannot play his music; I can’t get my hands on it. But there are other composers whose music feels great to play, such as Liszt or Scriabin. Anyway, when other pianists play my piano music I get this huge range of responses: some people say “Wow, your music fits so easily under the hands” while others say “You must be a much better pianist than I, because you can play your music very well, and I can just barely manage it.” Wait a minute, I say; you can play the Rachmaninoff piano concertos, and I can’t touch those, so don’t tell me that I am a better pianist than you are! So it’s all about the hands, or at least a lot of it is.

Let’s talk about some details of each for himself? Why the title “The Five?” This set of pieces grew in two distinct ways: there were three pieces I started with, for which I had a clear conceptual idea. “Patches Purple” was one, “Returns” was another - that was a clear concept from the beginning as well. I wanted to see what happens when you take the harmonic syntax, the logical flow of chords that sound like a recognizable 19th century composer and see what happen when you turn it backwards. What does it sound like? It’s simplistic to put it this way, but I discovered that up to a point, Faure backwards sounds like Schumann. I discovered that in working on this piece. Again, I don’t mean this to be taken too seriously, because harmonic flow and logic are subtle, delicate and complex things. Certain chords convincingly follows other chords, others just don’t. Without this subtle logic, Schumann’s chords sound arbitrary. It would be as
if I suddenly began speaking to you with no grammar left in my language. The words would sort of convey what I’m trying to say, but the thoughts wouldn’t be clear, because one needs the grammar to make it clear. So this was the experiment: what happens if you take Faure and run it backwards, what do you get? It was a weird concept, but it was a clear one. The other piece that was born of a simple and clear concept was “Rap Rag Red”. I had never heard a classical take on rap. This was in 1990, when rap was still relatively new. I was wondering what would happen if you tried to capture the wildness and the energy of rap in the world of classical piano; what would it sound like? That was my concept. On the other hand, the concept for “The Five” was born of the title. By then, I knew that there was going to be a piece called “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return.” So, the words ‘flats’, ‘machines’ and ‘returns’ had already been taken, so what was left to do was write a piece that would reflect the word ‘five’ or more precisely ‘the five’. I was looking to make a piece that in some way was organized around the concept of the number five. So, whereas in “Patches Purple” and the other color-titled pieces, the musical ideas came first and the titles came later, in “The Five,” and the other three movements whose titles play with those words (‘five, ‘flats’, ‘machines’ and ‘returns’), the music is actually about trying to make sense of the titles!

What was the concept for “Transcendental Blues?”
The concept for that one is an imaginary scenario: if Franz Liszt had tried to write the blues one day, what would that have sounded like? Lots of arpeggios, for sure, but also there is a blues progression outlined in the bass. One thing I want to say is that I have become more comfortable over the years finding titles for pieces. Even as late as 1990, I was a little embarrassed and awkward with titles. I just didn’t feel like I understood the real purpose of musical titles. Many times I said to my teachers and friends, ‘these are abstract musical works; I would much prefer just numbering them. This is no. 71, for example, almost like opus numbers, but then I thought that’s a bit bleak. Titles help provide some kind of window into the music. It’s funny how titles are interesting things, in the sense that they grow on you. It’s like peoples’ names. You could have been someone else than Stephanie, but by now neither you or anybody else could imagine any other name for you than Stephanie. You have become the embodiment of Stephanie. I am Joel, I just am. I am not Bruce, Frank, or Elmer. There is a Joelness about me.

Here’s a funny little story: I wrote a piano piece in 1986 called Hands Down. The way that title came up was totally bizarre. I was a resident composer at the Hindemith Foundation in Switzerland and while there, I wrote a ten-minute piano piece, in three movements. Right after that, I went to visit a very dear friend of mine, who is no longer alive. His name was Henk Romijn Meijer and he was a writer from Amsterdam, a novelist and short story writer, who later became the librettist of my opera. I went to visit him and his wife Molly in their second home in the Dordogne region of France. Henk was a wonderful and gifted writer. He was also an amateur jazz guitar player, but he couldn’t read music. He learned music by ear. There, in Le Roc, he didn’t have a piano and it was just a tiny little village, no piano anywhere around there. I had just finished this piece, and since Henk was a writer, I thought he could give me some ideas for the title. Of course, if you are a writer and I am a composer and I can play my new piano piece for you, I can ask you to suggest a title as a response to what you’ve heard. But I
couldn’t play my piece for him because there was no piano and since he couldn’t read music, we were reduced to ‘Here’s this piece. What should I call it?’ He didn’t miss a beat; he immediately said ‘Call it “Hands Down.”’ So in another words, this title has nothing to do with the piece of music, and yet that piece has become as much ‘Hands Down’ now after all those years as I am ‘Joel’ and you are ‘Stephanie’. I can’t imagine that piece by any other name, in spite of the fact that it started its life in such an arbitrary way! It took on its ‘hands down’-ness over the years. That’s just what it is. So to me, that’s why even the two most arbitrary titles in each for himself?, ‘Machine Flats’ and ‘The Five’ fit for me. The titles have acquired their legitimacy through the passing of time.

So, you think that the titles fit because they grow on you over the years like peoples’ names?
Well, it’s that plus the fact that in some cases the titles really do describe something meaningful in the music. As I said, I made a piece that would justify the title “The Five”. Or, in the case of “Machine Flats,” there’s the distinction between handmade and machine-made. When something is machine made, no thought went in to the actual manufacturing of the product; the thought went to creating the machine that manufactures the product. The actual manufacturer of the product is an automated thing. Somehow the idea of machine-made me thing of something hard and sharp like metal. I thought of flats that are made by the machines. So, the feeling of an automated piece, made by metallic components, led to this kind of hard driving music.

The motoric rhythm represents the machines that keep going?
Yes, the machines are cranking out the product.

What is the last movement about?
Many decades ago, there was a fad in the movie industry of producing science fiction/horror movies that were all about bringing back very popular characters that provoke a lot of fear, like ‘The Mummy’, ‘The Wolfman’, and ‘Frankenstein’. These movies are called ‘The return of’ something, as in ‘The Return of the Mummy’. It’s basically an old fashioned way to title the sequel of a movie. If ‘Return of the Mummy’ were to be made today, it would be called ‘Mummy 2’. The idea is that the monster returns; it died, but it’s not really dead; it’s coming back to get us again! So the return in this case is of ‘The Five-Flat Machine’, which is the motive in mm. 37–41. The crazy monster keeps coming back: no matter how many times you shoot it between the eyes, it keeps coming back again. That’s the idea of “The Five-flat Machine’s Return”. Well, it’s just youthful exuberance! Despite the allusion to horror movies, in reality there’s nothing dark or scary at all; in fact it’s more like a bunch of Brazilian people dancing on the street. It’s filled with sun, light and energy.

So to sum up, the basic concept of the whole set is not really very tight. One thread of titles with color names in them, and another thread with the title “The Five-flat Machine’s Return” deconstructed. By the time I finished the piece, I guess what I taught myself was that the only thing that holds these pieces together as a set is the simple fact that they are being played as a set. And that’s enough!
Do you think *Each for Himself?* should be performed by memory?
No more or less than any other solo work. In other words, someone who plays from memory in general should play this piece the same way. Someone who generally doesn't play from memory shouldn't make a special effort to play this piece from memory.

Is there a reason that you did not put any fingerings in *Each for Himself?* Do you also not put fingerings on your other piano works as well?
I hardly ever put fingerings in my piano pieces. To me, that's the pianist's job. And anyway, there are several different attitudes about fingerling so the only reason I'd ever do it if I was 100% sure that there was only one fingering possible that gets the idea of that phrase across...but I never feel that way! I really don't think there is the 'right' fingering ever, although there is certainly the 'best' fingering for each pianist.

Would you tell me where and by whom this piece has been performed since it was written?
A number of pianists have requested the music from me over the years, but I have not kept track of performances. The only thing that I know for sure is that Frank Weinstock and Emanuele Arciuli have played it. Arciuli played the whole set a few times in the United States and in Italy. He also recorded three of the movements on a CD in Italy on the Stradivarius label. In addition, he recorded the whole set here in Cincinnati a few years ago. Unfortunately, when it came time to do the editing, the raw tape went missing. I was there for the recording, and he did a beautiful performance of the pieces...and it just got lost! It was going to be part of a new CD. I was very upset and disappointed. The three movements that Arciuli recorded for the Stradivarius label are from an earlier recording session. There have been several pianists in Europe that have requested the score, but I don’t know about any performances they may have done. I had a very interesting request from a Dutch pianist a few years ago. It was interesting because he identified himself as an amateur pianist, not as a professional and he said that he had heard Arciuli’s performance on the Stradivarius disc and really liked the pieces and wanted me to send him the score. He wrote about these pieces in a very complimentary way, differently from the way professional musicians write. I mean that he wrote with very florid prose, relating my music to visual art works he knows and other things like that. It was fascinating to get this different perspective. He is a medical doctor, whose hobby is playing the piano. He said he would give a concert and perform these piece in Amsterdam. Maybe he did, maybe he didn’t. I get things like that from time to time.

You told me before that a group of students performed this piece, each pianist playing one movement. Would you tell me more about this project?
In October 2011, I had a two-day residency at Belmont University in Nashville, Tennessee and this piece was to be performed by one of the piano students there. I was informed by the composer who runs the composition department, a former student of mine at CCM, that the student who was assigned to play the piece liked the piece very much but felt overwhelmed by the whole thing, so they decided to divide the work among several different pianists. They played the whole thing, but each movement was played by a different student. It was a slightly weird experience, but it all went well.
When they performed this piece, did the audience applaud between the movements, or did they wait until the end of the performance of the whole set?

When I was told that this is the way it was going to be, I realized that the best thing to do was not to break up the set. So I told the audience in advance of the performance. And I asked all of the pianists to come up to the stage at the end to take a group bow, which they did. In this way, it seemed like one performance instead of seven.

This is relevant to our discussion because it brings up, once again, the question of separate vs together. Also, the CD that Emanuele Arciuli did brings this question up in another way. Emanuele decided to make a CD of pieces by five different composers, Adams, Barber, Rzewski, Crumb, and me. Obviously, if he played the whole set of my pieces, it would restrict the number of other works on the disc. It was his idea to play those three in that order and it worked out well.

Actually, figuring out great programs and program orders is something Emanuele does very, very well. Now I’m talking about the “Round Midnight” project on which he and I collaborated. The idea of this project was his, but the choice of the composers of each variation was mine, although it was Emanuele’s idea that all the variations should be composed by Americans. I contacted the composers and set it up. Our thought was that each composer should not know anything at all about what any of the other composers were doing in their variations, so the whole thing would be kind of blind. For example, George Crumb would write a variation having no idea what Milton Babbitt’s variation was going to be like. The only people that would see all eighteen of them before the set was performed would be Emanuele and me. The idea was that when the last person had completed his or her variation, we would put them together to see if we had a viable, coherent set. The original group consisted of 18 American composers, but then some other composers (including a few Italians) asked, ‘can I do one please?’…and Emanuele said OK. I am mentioning all of this because it relates to the each for himself? project. In each for himself? I was trying to create a set that had some ambiguity regarding the extent to which these pieces are free-standing individual works as opposed to their making musical sense only when presented as a complete group. In Round Midnight Variations, obviously each of these composers could only operate in relation to the Thelonious Monk tune and couldn’t even begin to guess how his or her variation would possibly fit effectively inside of a whole set. But Emanuele took all the pieces, spent some thinking about them, arranging and rearranging them and when he was done with that, the order that emerged was so convincing that to me it seemed magical.

Does it sound like one person did the whole thing?

Well, I wouldn’t put it that way because obviously Milton Babbitt’s variation sounds like Babbitt and George Crumb’s variation really does sound like George Crumb and so on. So there are stylistic or dialectical differences among them, but in terms of the emotional arch of the whole thing, it’s remarkably successful. If I had had the job of putting it all together like that, I seriously doubt whether I would have been able to do as well as Emanuele did, which was incredible. He has played this piece many times, and has recorded it on the Stradivarius label. I have heard him played it three times, once in New
York, once in Cincinnati, and once in Italy. Every time I’ve heard him play the piece, I am just knocked out by how much sense it makes as a set. So the reason that I am bringing this up is that with this perspective, we can once again consider each for himself? With the Round Midnight Variations, there was every reason to think beforehand that the pieces could not sound like a coherent set…and yet they really do! So the conclusion I draw is that, potentially, any group of musical components can be made to work together artistically if you give some thought to the organization of it. Well, of course I chose the order of the movements of each for himself? but if you or some other pianist were to play all the pieces in the set, but in a different order, that would be very intriguing to me. What order would you create? Certain things would be relatively obvious. The last movement really has to be the last one. There are few possible candidates for the first movement. Either Machine Flats or Transcendental Blues could be the first movement. So some things are obvious and others are ambiguous.

I remember you telling me that you orchestrated each for himself? for the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra. Can you tell me more about this? The orchestra version is called Millennium Dances and was commissioned by the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra’s music director at the time, Jesus Lopez-Cobos, back in 1996. The piece is essentially a reworking of six of the seven movements of each for himself? for full orchestra. The piece was played on two successive subscription seasons and then taken to Carnegie Hall. The one movement from each for himself? that is not included in Millennium Dances is Machine Flats. This movement struck me as being very problematic to orchestrate and of course with it, the set would have been a few minutes longer, and it is already quite long. Transcendental Blues was also very difficult to orchestrate, but somehow I felt like I knew how to deal with that one. I think the other movements were more straightforward in their conversion to orchestra music.

Are the pieces that you composed in the same year (1991) with each for himself? in the same style? Well in general, it’s difficult to ask a composer about his ‘style’ because that’s something he’s so close to and therefore it’s very difficult to assess with any objectivity. But I think the short answer to your question is ‘no’: there is quite a lot of diversity in my music and that year was no exception.

Does "Carnivalfinale" have the same orchestration as the Carnival of the Animals? (with two pianos?) Yes. It was written as a commission from Cincinnati’s “Music Nova” series. I was one of several composers, each of whom was asked to contribute a companion movement to each of the movements from the “Carnival of the Animals”. Mine was the companion to the finale. Yes, the instrumentation is identical.

Looking at the list of compositions that you have on your website, each for himself? is the only piano piece that you wrote in the 90s. Is that correct? If so, is there a story behind it? Yes, that’s correct. I wrote the piece for my good friend Frank Weinstock, who
premiered the piece the year I wrote it. Mostly during that period, I was writing orchestral and chamber music. And in general, I haven’t written as much piano music as you might imagine I would, considering that I’m a pianist. Probably this is because as a pianist, it’s harder to find my voice in piano music than in other media.

What was it like to grow up in a musical family?
There are a few things to be said about this. All my siblings are professional musicians, my two brothers and my sister, as are my parents. My two children are also wonderful musicians, but that’s of course another story. I think if someone were to ask me this question (and over the years people have asked me and I am sure they asked my brothers and sister as well), “Did you choose to be a musician or were you forced to be a musician?” there is only one honest answer that I can tell you, which is that I don’t know. It’s impossible for me to answer this question, and actually I’m not sure how my two brothers and my sister answer it. Obviously I was exposed to music in a way that few other children are, since both of my parents were professional musicians as I was growing up. But it would be false to say that my parents forced me to be a professional musician, and I’m sure that my brothers and my sister would say the same about themselves. What they did force me to do was to practice when I was little. Many times I resisted that, but they really did insist. Certainly the choice of career was mine even though the family environment obviously facilitated that decision. On the other hand, with a different family background, would I have chosen music as a profession? Impossible to say.

When people asked me if I chose to be a professional pianist, when I think back, I actually did not feel that I had a choice. When I was going to college, I always knew that I was going to do music and never thought of doing something else. What about for you? Do you have any brothers or sisters?

My brother is a professional pianist and so is my mother.
Let’s just say hypothetically that your brother was a very talented pianist, but at some point he wanted instead to be a doctor. If that had become reality, then your own view of your situation would have changed too, I think. You would have said to yourself, ‘well, my brother did not have any more or less choice than I did, so the fact that I chose to be a professional musician really was my choice. But because your mother is a professional musician and your brother is, and so are you, it seems more difficult to believe that the choice really was yours.

Is it like your case?
It’s seems like exactly the same thing. If one of my brothers or my sister had done something else, I would have felt that I had that choice too. Actually, when my sister left Juilliard, she got a job as the second harpist in the Pittsburgh Symphony. But that didn’t seem enough for her, so she decided to take principal harp auditions and actually made up her mind to go to veterinary school if she didn’t get a principal job within a certain time period. When the position of principal harpist at the Metropolitan Opera came up, and she won the job, the veterinary school idea was thrown out. But I know she was very
serious about leaving the harp profession if something hadn’t worked out. In my own
case, I never had a strong desire to get out of the music world. For me, the main question
was should I try to be a professional pianist or should I be a composer? Fortunately, I
had a role model that reinforced the idea that that’s a false choice. There is no reason to
choose. You can do both.

Who was that role model?
My first composition teacher, Easley Blackwood. He is a super composer and pianist,
and still does both.

Is he Canadian?
No, I studied with him when I was living in Chicago during my high school years. For
many years, he was on the faculty of University of Chicago until he retired. He is a
remarkable composer and also a really great pianist. I took piano and composition
lessons from him—we often spent entire Saturday afternoons together doing one and then
the other. So as I said, he was a wonderful role model for me in this very specific way.
He chose both…and I had other role models, of this kind; not my own personal teachers,
but other people that I knew about who also reinforced this idea that it was not necessary
to choose one or the other; that in fact both activities compliment each other. Many of
the historical composers I knew about were the same.

Who is/are your favorite composer(s)?
When I was very young, it was all about Prokofiev, Bartok, Chopin and Debussy. The
piano pieces especially, because that was what I was practicing all the time. I loved the
freshness and percussive character of the first two, and the sensuous sound world of the
latter two. Later, as a teenager, I discovered the erotic harmonies of Scriabin and
Messiaen, the massive power of Shostakovich and Bruckner, and the intoxicating
complexity of Schoenberg and Carter. Once in university, I began devouring everything
and keeping notes about it all. I can’t begin to name all the jewels I discovered! I’ve kept
all my concert programs since I was about 16 and one day I’m going to try and cross-
reference them all – I think I’d be shocked at how many Pierrot Lunaires I’ve heard!
There was one performance of Les Noces that Boulez conducted in London that might be
the single most influential performance of anything I’ve ever heard, although Kristian
Zimerman’s performance of the Lutoslawski Piano Concerto with Bernstein and the New
York Philharmonic is right up there as well. That performance was pretty much the
genesis of my own piano concerto.

So how did they influence your composition?
They influenced me in a number of ways, but less now than before. I think this is
normal. I suppose that some composers wake up one day and realize that they know their
own unique musical language, a unique language that is only theirs. But I think I’m an
example of the more typical story, in which little by little, one comes to realize who one
is as a composer. One comes to realize what one does well, and other things that don’t go
so well. One tries to shore up weaknesses and capitalize on strengths but ultimately
there’s only so much one can do to remake oneself.
You said that you see colors when you hear music and that certain notes project certain colors to you. Can you tell me more about this condition, synesthesia? I believe that many musicians experience synesthesia. How does this condition affect the music you create? For example, would you tell me what you see when you hear each for himself?

First of all, when I wrote each for himself? the awareness of the relationship between colors and musical sound was very nascent. I wasn’t yet attached to an idea about color/pitch relationships at that stage. It felt like this playing with the titles that contained color names – “Patches Purple”, “Transcendental Blues”, and “Rap Rag Red” – this was more like a game than an identification or a description of something. But looking back now, I think it was a game I played because there was something behind it, something in the back of my mind that hadn’t yet become formed. I had a subconscious awareness of it that later became much more real. So I can’t say that while I was composing each for himself?, those colors meant anything specific to me. The purple of “Patches Purple”, that was very specific, but it wasn’t my idea; it was an idea that came from a teacher of mine in Wales who told me about the great British musicologist and pianist, Donald Francis Tovey, who coined the term “Purple Patch,” which is a term that is used in music a lot in Great Britain; it’s a very common term there. We don’t call temporary and unexpected musical excursions to another key ‘purple patches’ in this country, but it is just one of countless examples of British and American English being different from each other.

Nowadays for me, the color/pitch relationship has become more purposeful and focused. I think the first piece where I really felt like I was making a connection between pitches and colors was in an orchestra piece called Music in Blue and Green. At the beginning of my work on that piece, there was an image I had which was very powerful and which dictated the whole character of the piece for me. I had this image of standing in the Mediterranean sea in about two feet of water, staring out into the sea with the beach to my back, looking at the sunset. The sun was setting over the water, because I spent a lot of time on the western coast of Italy, where the sun sets in the water. I was there many, many times over the years, either standing in the water or swimming, looking at the sunset. The colors that I saw were blue in front of me and green behind me (the hills beyond the beach) and the two notes that came to my mind were D and A, specifically played by two French horns.

I thought that you said the color blue represent the note G?

Yes, I do...that is, now I do. This was back in 1992. I heard not only these notes but specifically the timbre of two horns playing these notes and so that piece starts off with two horns just sustaining those two notes. For me, that pitch and timbre combination really powerfully represented the colors blue and green. That was the first time I felt a strong connection between colors and musical sounds. I use the word sound rather than notes because it wasn’t just the notes; it was the notes as played by French horns – the whole timbre and pitch package. Later on, little by little, it became more evident that notes and colors were starting to get sort of fixed. As I said to you the other day, the E become yellow over time, so that now when I see yellow my mind’s ear hears E.
You said that your favorite color is yellow. So E is your favorite note?

That is a very clever question, but no, E is not my favorite note. I don’t have a favorite note. But blue is really G now and it wasn’t in those days. But even that isn’t exactly it: I don’t just automatically associate colors with notes as if it were some kind of Pavlovian reaction. It’s more that when I hear a sustained note in which I’m encouraged to reflect on it or contemplate it a little bit, I begin to see the blueness of G. But, it doesn’t go in the opposite direction. It’s not as if I see the cap of this tube of hand cream, which is green, and then I think of D; no, this goes only in the other direction. My guess is that people who experience synesthesia all tell unique and different stories. In my case, if you were to play me a D Major scale, it’s not as if I am going to see a string of different colors, one after the other. It is far more subtle than that. A better way of describing my experience is to say this: if you played me the Goldberg variations, pretty soon I’ll start seeing blue because it’s all in G. The 30 variations, plus the aria in the beginning and at the end, are all in G. There are a couple of variations in g minor, but almost all of them are in G Major. So it’s all in G.

You told me that when you composed each for himself? you weren’t aware of your synesthesia as much as you are now. Now that you are more aware, do you see different color in different movements when you listen to each for himself?

The movements that have more pitch focus, yes. Take the beginning of the last movement, for example, which is in E-flat Major. So E-flat is a closely related note to E for me. The fact that it’s half step away means that it’s not that different in color. So, E-flat is more like an orange-yellow. It’s a little deeper and darker than yellow. When I hear that opening, since it has a strong grounding in E-flat Major, with the E-flat triad, I tend to hear a yellow-orange, but of course I didn’t in those days. I hear that now because I let myself hear it that way. In effect, I am allowing that to happen. Probably it was always there, but earlier it just seemed preposterous to me: there can’t be a relationship between colors and notes. Even now, I’m not 100% confident of what I am saying. It’s there for sure, but I can’t explain it. It’s just there. And I don’t even know if it means anything that it’s there!

So, it doesn’t really affect your composition that much?

Your question before was ‘how does this color awareness affect the creation of your music?’ I think that for the most part, this is just another compositional tool like any other.

Speaking of compositional tools, one I use a great deal is something called manmade scales. This is a technique for developing the harmonic world of a piece. It generates specific harmonic material that I then use in the piece on which I’m working. But going back to colors, the piece I’m working on now, Amethyst Variations for solo piano, is very much involved with the color idea. There is a purpleness to the theme which informs all of the variations.

So for Amethyst Variations, you thought about colors before you composed it?

Yes. I thought about the actual color amethyst moving directionally, from more intense
to more pale, or changing to a completely different color. But this kind of thinking just suggests ideas; it doesn’t tell me what’s good or bad or what I’m going to actually incorporate in the piece. I still use my musical judgment and throw away what I don’t like.

**I would like to expand your biography a little bit for my document. Since I will be writing about one of your piano compositions, it would be nice to write more about you as a pianist and also to write more about your piano works in general.**

I am quite a prolific composer - I have more than 100 pieces now, and I am nowhere near done, that is if I live a long time! Considering how much music I have written, it’s pretty remarkable how little of it is solo piano music, given that I am a pianist. It’s always felt difficult to write piano music, because I have so much piano music in my ears and in my fingers. I played a lot of Chopin, Brahms, Beethoven, Schubert, Bach…the usual things young pianists learn…and they all got into my fingers and my brain. That created a problem for writing piano music, because it was really hard to find myself in the middle of all of that. It was easier to find myself in media which with I was far less familiar. So it took me a long time before I felt confident enough to able to write piano music and not feel like it would just be repeating what I already knew. In fact, the little pieces I wrote as a child, before I was ten, eleven, or twelve, all sound like imitations of Bartok and Prokofiev, because those were my favorite composers then. On the other hand, even though I was afraid I wouldn’t speak with my own voice when I was writing piano music, I really learned how to write idiomatically for the instrument. We were talking about this a couple days ago: I mentioned to you Frederic Rzewski’s music and how incredibly ergonomic it is for exactly the same reason - because he is a pianist. He is incapable of writing piano music that doesn’t fit well under the hand for this reason. It would happen this way to any composer who is also a pianist. But what was really difficult was to write piano music that pushed aside all that stuff that I already learned and invent something that felt really my own. So it’s kind of a weird combination of something that’s simultaneously really easy and really difficult. Over the years, I think I have gotten less obsessed with this problem. With this new piece, *Amethyst Variations*, it felt as natural as writing a string quartet, which has felt like a natural thing for a long time now.

**So now you are more comfortable?**

Yes, because enough pieces have gone by. Now I think I know now who I am, regardless of the medium.

**Then, are you going to write more piano music?**

I’d like to. That brings up an interesting question: How does one decide what to write next? There are basically two answers to that. One is that I choose to do what people pay me to do, which is essentially another way of saying I think I’m at my best when I don’t exercise any control over this question and I just look at myself as the composer equivalent of a house painter. I don’t choose which house I am going to paint. I paint the houses of the people who pay me to paint their houses. That’s one way of thinking of composing, which actually is very healthy, because it gives you opportunities that you would never have thought of on your own. For example, I would never have written a concerto for oud, cello and orchestra if somebody hadn’t commissioned me to do that and
I would never have written a piece for violin, percussion, mandolin, and banjo. On the other hand, being like a piece of musical driftwood and going only wherever the water takes you, which in this case is where the money takes you, isn’t ideal either, I think. So the other way is, I put together a grand plan for myself. I try to persuade people to pay me for writing the works I want to write, but I am going to write those pieces whether they pay me or not. If I am really lucky, then people will pay me what I wanted to do in the first place. One of my teachers at Juilliard, Vincent Persichetti, said to me once that he was very fortunate because he writes exactly the music that he wants to write and he gets commissioned to do it. In other words, it sort of magically happens that just when he wanted to write another tuba and piano sonata, somebody came along and commissioned him to write a tuba and piano sonata. Do I believe that everything he said was accurate? No, I imagine he exaggerated a little. Every now and then you can benefit from a nice coincidence, but all the time? Hmmm…

Anyway, there have been periods in my life when I’ve had a whole lineup of commissions in front of me and that really felt good. Sometimes I’ve had pieces stacked up three and four years in advance. It’s a nice feeling to be wanted three years in advance! But there have also been periods in which there is nothing in front of me at all, so either I wasn’t going to compose until somebody asked me to or I was going to do a project that I really wanted to do and maybe find somebody to play it, but I was not going to get paid. These recent piano variations, *Amethyst Variations* are an example. I didn’t have any commissions at that time. I said to myself, do I want to just take a break from composing for a few months or do I write a piece that I want to write? So I decided on this set of piano variations. About a year ago, I completed a set of variations for string quartet and really enjoyed that project. In the course of that piece, called *another time*, I think I may have invented a new variation technique. It’s impossible for me to say how unique it is, because in order to stand by that claim I would need to know about every principle behind all sets of variations ever composed, and I can’t know that. Nevertheless, I believe it may be something new. The piece will be performed soon in Madison, Wisconsin and after that, we’ll see how it’s received.

Rzewski also has an interesting way of writing his piano variations, *The People United Will Never Be Defeated*. Yes, I don’t think he really re-invented the concept of variation technique, but it’s a great variation set. It’s a fantastic piece, actually. What I did is something a little bit different from the standard variation technique. I have not used the traditional method of generating variations, that is, a group of movements or sections of music all related to an initial theme. Instead, the equivalent of an opening theme is the seventh movement, called “source”. Sitting right in the middle of the piece, this “source” is in fact the source material for all of the other 13 variations, beginning with the very first movement. Except for the 14th and last movement, “release”, every variation is related to the source movement in that it is ‘carved out’ of the source. With each variation, the music is building up to a climactic moment in the middle where you hear everything. You have heard hints of everything on the way to the source and then you hear the source, and then the material is taken away from you little by little again. Michelangelo is believed to have said, “Every block of stone has a statue inside it, and it is the task of the sculptor to
discover it.” This is what I have done with these variations: the ‘source’ is the block of musical stone and each variation is a unique carving out of that material in that I literally removed material from the source movement to create each musical ‘statue’. In this way, all the variations are very closely related to each other and they also are very different from each other. In contrast, the 14th movement is not based on the whole ‘musical stone’ but rather from only a small fragment of it. The last movement is literally ‘released’ from the stone itself and thus the piece can find its conclusion.

As far as I know, nobody ever thought of creating variations this way, through subtraction. So this is what I did with the string quartet and I wanted to try a pianistic version of that. But I chose not to be as strict with the piano variation as I was with the string quartet. In Amethyst Variations, there is flexibility: each variation has a different number of bars, but it is still all in the same tempo. Things from the variations don’t map onto the source as literally as the way they do in the quartet.

What is the title of the string quartet variations?
The name of the piece is another time. Here, let me show you the music. Here is the source; as you can see it is really dense. It continues like this, very intensely, for 67 bars.

Is this string quartet connected thematically to Amethyst Variations?
No, the concept is very similar but the source material is not. I like the symbolism of this technique - the idea of always subtracting. I don’t mean to sound morbid, but a lot of coping with life is about coping with loss. We are losing things in our lives, all the time. Part of growing up is learning how to lose things and go on anyway. But there is one place in the middle of the quartet (and also in the piano variations) where it’s all there. That’s a great and unique moment in the piece.

Is there another reason why you put the source in the middle?
This might be one of those moments in which musicologists are right when they say that you cannot trust what the composer tell you! The honest answer is I don’t really know why I did it this way. It just felt right. I can’t prove it had to be that way; I don’t fully understand it, but it feels right. I can tell you that since I am a composer who teaches young composers, sometimes it can get pretty bizarre. As in when I say to a student, ‘why did you do it that way?’ ‘Why is that bar the way it is?’ I am always trying to help the student make a stronger piece through objective analysis. But if the student says ‘I did it that way because that’s the way I like it’, I am basically stuck, because sometimes there simply is no rational explanation – it’s just a purely intuitive thing.

For the piano teacher, it can be the same. When the student says ‘I played it that way because I like it’, I feel stuck too.
The best you can do in that situation is to try to articulate why you don’t agree. You might not change his mind but at least you can be analytical as to why you don’t agree with that point of view. That can be valuable to the student. He can then step back and say ‘well ok, my teacher seems to understand why she feels that way. Can I say the same? Can I make the same claim? Instead of just saying I like it that way, can
I say why I like it that way?’ With that kind of self-analysis comes wisdom and perspective. I might become more convinced by why I do…or perhaps I will even come to the point of seeing that my teacher could have been right after all! Maybe I said I like it that way because I am just being stubborn and I’m not willing to consider alternative approaches. But these are the kind of lessons that students usually learn long after they stop studying with those teachers. Ten years later, they get that. But during the time that they are studying with the teacher, the teacher is probably pulling her hair out!!

Can you tell me who were your piano teachers?
I had really some great piano teachers and really lousy ones. My first piano teacher might still be alive. She was a really good teacher. Her name is Irene Grau, and I studies with her in Vancouver when I was very young. She later moved to the United States and taught at Converse College, a small liberal arts college in South Carolina. I think she’s had a really good reputation as a piano teacher. I was really lucky to study with her. She was married to the concertmaster to the Vancouver Symphony and I knew them both because my father was the conductor of the orchestra. I studied with her for a few years, then with another teacher I don’t want to talk about because he was one of the lousy ones. Then we moved to Chicago and I studied with Mollie Margolies. She was a very well-known and highly respected piano teacher in Chicago. A number of competition winners who came out of Chicago anywhere from the 50s to the 80s were students of hers. She was a very small woman for being such a big teacher! She was about five feet, very thin, wiry, chain smoker, and she was very destructive. She said a lot of mean and nasty things to a lot of her students, including me.

Did it work?
No, I thought it was horrible. Mollie really turned a lot of people off music, but some people, I guess, benefited from that approach. For me, it was bad. For a little while I was studying piano with her at Roosevelt University in downtown Chicago and then I would go down to Hyde Park and have my composition lessons with Easley Blackwood at his house near the University of Chicago. It went like that for a little while, maybe a year and a half or two years. After awhile, I pleaded with my parents to let me have piano lessons from Mr. Blackwood as well. I knew that I got along with him so much better and I knew that this negativity from Mollie was no good for me. So they agreed and my lessons with Blackwood were on Saturday afternoons. I went there at 2 in the afternoon and I went home at 6. We did a piano lesson, a composition lesson, and then musicianship and music history. His hobby is American history, so we often talked about that too. So for the last few years in Chicago, before I went to college, I had these amazing lessons with Blackwood. He was literally a one-man music school! Then I went to the University of Wales and I studied with a very fine British pianist, Martin Jones. Martin still plays a lot of recitals and concertos; he’s a very fine pianist.

You studied piano with him at the same time you were a composition major?
That concept doesn’t exist in British universities, or at least it didn’t then. One did a music major, meaning study of an instrument, composition, music history, theory and musicianship. Getting back to Martin: he is a wonderful, naturally gifted pianist, who can really play anything. While I was there, he played on a chamber music concert series
every week. I learned a ton from him in terms of getting to know repertoire, but we didn’t really work on technique much. Martin was the last teacher from whom I took formal piano lessons. By the time I got to Juilliard, I had to specialize. I couldn’t have piano lessons with one of the major piano teachers there because I was a composition major. However, most of my friends at Juilliard were pianists. I used to go to a lot of the piano master classes and many concerts. But my piano playing stop improving; I was falling off the wagon as far as serious playing was concerned. On the other hand, a funny thing happened in my very first semester at Juilliard: there was a piano major who was scheduled to play the piano part of a really great piece by the young Hindemith, the *Kammermusik* no. 1. The piano part is quite demanding. I happened to know the person who was scheduled to play it but he injured one of his hands one week before the concert. On very short notice he had to find a sub, so he asked if I would do it, and I said yes, maybe a bit foolishly. There I was playing in Alice Tully Hall and I wasn’t even a piano major, but I was acting like one. That was really nice! The rest of the time I was at Juilliard, I played my own music quite a bit in concerts, and sometimes music of other composition students, but nothing else.

*So you premiered a lot of your own piano works, right? You also recorded the Cubist Blues.*

Yes, that’s right. And I’ve recorded other pieces of mine as well, including, most recently, *9 Pieces for Piano*. But unfortunately I don’t practice every day anymore.

*You told me that you played as a soloist with the Chicago Symphony. Which concerto did you play with them?*

I played the Beethoven first piano concerto, which was the result of winning a competition, the Chicago Symphony Youth Auditions. The competition still exists, and although it’s a regional (not a national) competition, it’s not a small thing. I won when I was fifteen; I got first place, and I got to play with the Chicago Symphony.

*Since piano is your instrument, do you compose differently for piano than for other instruments? If so, how?*

As a teenager I began to focus more on composing and less on the piano, although I began composing at the age of six. I did learn a lot of piano repertoire and won a few competitions as a teenager. That certainly has affected how I write for the instrument. I have not written a great many solo piano pieces, mostly because I felt too close to the piano and to its repertoire as a player to feel like I could find my own voice as a composer. That changed gradually, though, and now I am happy to write for the piano, which is my oldest and best musical friend.

*About Arciuli’s Book*

*According to the book, each for himself? was subject to slight revision in 2003, Would you tell me what are the differences between the 1991 version and the 2003 revision?*

First of all, part of the reason why this revision happened is because in the late 90s I turned the original piano pieces into a set for orchestra. That caused me to rethink the
piano pieces as well. I made some changes in the musical structure when it became an orchestra piece; in other words I didn’t just orchestrate it. For example, the length of the last section of the last movement is greater in the orchestra version than in the piano piece. I realized that I wanted a tremendous and exciting ending. The piano piece, the way it was originally written just didn’t cut it, it just wasn’t strong enough. So after I made the orchestra version longer, I looked at the piano piece and I realized it needed the same kind of revision.

Are you talking about the clusters at the end?
Yes, exactly. So, that was an example of a little fix, and there were a lot of little fixes like that. Mini-expansion was one of many things that I did to make the piano pieces stronger than they were originally. You might call the whole thing a refining operation.

In the interview, you said that you wrote each for himself? for Frank Weinstock, who premiered the piece the year you wrote it. Did Weinstock played the original version (1991)? or the revised version (2003)?
Original version. By the way, the differences between the original and revised versions are very small.

You gave me a recording of the performance of Millennium Dances [the orchestral version of this piece]. To me, it doesn’t sound that similar; some of the notes were similar, but there are also things that are different.
Of course, that’s true. The orchestra version is a significant expansion. I wanted Millennium Dances to be a very colorful and spectacular orchestra piece. The two media are very different from each other; therefore the same basic musical idea needs a different treatment when one moves it from one medium to the other.

It was premiered in 1997, right? So, does it have to do with the anticipation of the year 2000? Is that why you called it Millennium Dances?
Yes. I like titles that have more than one meaning. I had this idea that the phrase “Millennium Dances” could be understood with the word ‘dances’ parsed either as a noun or a verb. So it’s a dance, it’s a party, its very colorful, alive and spectacular. So it is not exactly correct to called Millennium Dances an orchestration of each for himself?
A better word would be ‘adaptation’.

Arciuli mentions that “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” is the only movement to use the twelve-tone technique, which is surprising to me. What is your opinion about that?
I have no idea what he was talking about. First of all, I am sure that I wasn’t thinking of twelve-tone music when I wrote that piece. Years before I wrote twelve-tone music. So it’s not that I don’t have experience doing that. But that piece has nothing to do with twelve-tone music. Probably what Emanuele found was an instance, somewhere in that piece, where the most basic, fundamental property of twelve-tone technique occurs. Namely that there is an instance of all pitch classes sounding once and only once before any of them cycle through again. But that doesn’t mean it’s a twelve-tone piece! In the tone poem of Strauss, Death and Transfiguration, the same thing happens once or twice.
Does that make that piece twelve-tone? Of course not. Emanuele is using that term in reference to my piece in a superficial way.

**The one movement that uses twelve-tone technique is “The Five” right?**
Yes, definitely. I was thinking that way when I wrote it, so it makes sense that it should appear that way to others.

Later in the article he compares the movement called “Purple Patches” as homage to Scarlatti, as a joke, and an ironic reflection on the neoclassical style. To me, this movement is more related to Bach’s *Inventions* than it is to Scarlatti. From our conversation before, you mentioned that you didn’t like the label neo-baroque. What is your opinion on this matter?
I agree with you. My intention was to copy the style of Bach’s *Inventions* in that movement. If Emanuele or a musicologist hears Scarlatti instead of Bach, then are they wrong? No. Emanuele is wrong if he is making the claim that that was my intention, but if he says that it sounds like Scarlatti, who am I to argue with him? I don’t agree, but it doesn’t matter if I agree. Living inside of Scarlatti’s dialect in that movement was not my intention, but if that’s what he hears, that’s what he hears.

Again, Arciuli writes that another movement of this piece, “Returns,” uses the twelve-tone technique in a tonal context, which I cannot relate to. The only thing that refer this movement to the twelve-tone technique is the fact that the second half of the piece is almost an exact retrograde of the first. What is your opinion on this matter?
Maybe that’s all he meant. Again, he is using the term twelve-tone in a superficial way.

**Can you tell me if there is anything else in that movement that has anything to do with twelve-tone?**
No there isn’t. I was brought up with serial music while I was studying with Blackwood, and again when I was studying with Elliot Carter in New York. I was very much involved in writing twelve-tone music during those years, not because my teachers specifically influenced me to do it, but because the general environment did. A young composer at that time wasn’t taken seriously by the musical community if he didn’t write serial music. Once that technique gets into your ear and into your toolbox, it’s there, and it’s not going to go away. It’s part of the technique that you have acquired, so it is not at all surprising to me, that without trying consciously, elements of serial technique are still everywhere in my music. To me, a genuine twelve-tone piece is one in which the majority of material of the piece is derived from a twelve-tone row. If you have twelve pitches one after another, and don’t repeat any of them until they are all done, that in itself does not make a twelve-tone piece. This is similar to my own definition of tonal music. Tonal music to me doesn’t have to have major or minor triads in order to be tonal. To me, what constitutes tonality is the presence in a piece of one pitch that has a hierarchical relationship to the others – that in some way it is the most important. As long as that is generally true in a piece, then I am happy to call it tonal. Which is why in the “Five Flat Machine’s Return,” you might disagree with me, but I don’t think that piece is tonal, because it doesn’t have one clear tonal center. It is in a mode. It is in a
five-flat mode, but this doesn’t mean that it’s in D-flat major. To be in D-flat major, the piece would have to have one central pitch, functioning as the point of departure and the point of return.

-In Juilliard, you studied with Elliott Carter and Vincent Persichetti, anyone else?
Yes: Milton Babbitt.

-You studied a lot of atonal music with Carter, can you elaborate on this? also what about with Persichetti?
With all three of my teachers at Juilliard, we often discussed repertoire of various composers, mostly current composers. I listened to a great deal of music during that time, by my teachers, by my fellow students and also many concerts of new music in Juilliard and around New York. This was the late ’70s, so most of that was advanced chromatic music (I do not use the word 'atonal'). Boulez was the music director of the NY Philharmonic, so I also got to hear a lot of 2nd Viennese school music and recent French music (Messiaen etc.) at the Philharmonic. I did a certain amount of score study but mostly it was a lot of listening.

Lastly, he wrote that “The Five-Flat Machine’s Return” is comparable to Copland’s El Salon Mexico. Do you think it is?
Yes, to the extent that it was my attempt in that piece to make a reference to Latin music.

The samba?
Yes, although I wasn’t trying to specifically reference the rhythms of the samba. I was just thinking of something very brilliant, dance-like, and more or less Latin American in character.

Are any other parts of the piece influenced by Latin rhythms?
No. The very beginning of the movement has a pattern that is absolutely fixed. Inside the pattern, there are sub-units that are a little bit variable. There is sometimes some ambiguity inside of the unit. It’s not always 8+8; sometimes it’s (3+3+2) + (2+3+3). A lot of Latin American rhythms are like that. Ambiguity on the smallest scale, but simplicity on the larger scales.

About “The Five”

I notice that you wrote D sharp instead of D natural in measure 15. In looking at the structure of the piece, you use the same notes in the later sections. Everything else is D natural, except for measure 15. Is this intentional or is this an editing error?
This is intentional. If you listen carefully to that moment, I think you’ll understand why the exception.

All the sections marked Tempo II are marked with pp and sereno, with no gradation of dynamic, except in measure 15, where you marked poco crescendo. Is there a reason behind this?
When you were playing this piece for me, we talked about each of the tempo II parts. Each one is a progressive expansion of the one before and the reason for the \textit{poco crescendo} is that now the expansion is taking place on the dynamic level as well as the contrapuntal and harmonic levels.

Perhaps it has to do with the note D sharp instead of D natural? Yes, it’s part of the same idea.

I notice that this movement is mostly based on the note D and G. Does this mean anything? Is it supposed to affect one’s interpretation? Its meaning is purely musical and the pianist’s interpretation is affected by these notes, certainly. But the notes are part of the complete collection of musical facts, all of which affect the pianist’s interpretation. I’m referring of course to the texture, the rhythms, the timing of the gestures and so on.

Is the focus on D and G there to hold the piece together? Exactly, it is one tool for achieving unity. It’s a point of departure that allows me to create connectivity in the piece.

You marked the end of all the Tempo I sections \textit{poco rall.} except for mm. 37. Is this because of the fermata sign? That seems correct.

About “Transcendental Blues”

The pedal marking for the blues section usually starts in the bass (the middle of the measure), and the pedal marking for the non-blues section usually starts at the beginning of the measure. But in mm. 13, why does the pedal marking start at the beginning of the measure even though it is part of the blues section? Is this intentional? This is the point where the whole harmonic cycle begins, so I want the pianist to clear the pedal before that, even though the bass doesn’t come until the middle of the bar. This is part of the first chord in the blues sequence. These notes should be captured as part of that first chord.

Also it’s a different chord before this bar, so you have to change it right at the beginning of measure 13? Correct. It is a different harmony, so if you didn’t change the pedal, it would be blurred.

But I would change the pedal both times. If one day you are teaching this piece, and you said the composer told me these reasons why it should be done this way, but you really prefer it your way, I would say thank you Stephanie. First of all, it shows me that you listening to the meaning of these notes and you take the trouble to make distinctions, which I think is a great thing. This is not science. Sometimes there can be at least two competing reasons for something to be the way it is and you can’t decide between them. You just have to go with your instincts.
Would you mind if change the pedal the same way both times?
No, I wouldn’t mind at all. It’s absolutely fine. The point is that you understand why I did what I did and you choose to make the musical idea clear in a slightly different way – in the way that makes more sense to you.

About “Machine Flats”

You mentioned before that this movement is similar to your work for piano trio, Cubist Blues. Besides the fact that they share a lot of melodic material, how are they connected?
All the material in “Machine Flats” is contained in a certain section of Cubist Blues. But Cubist Blues includes tons of other stuff that is not included in “Machine Flats”.

I notice that both each for himself? and Cubist Blues were composed in 1991. Which piece was composed first?
Machine Flats was written first. Here’s how I can explain the relationship between them: When I went to artist colonies such as MacDowell and Yaddo, I became friends with visual artists as well as other composers and writers. I saw first-hand something that I had already known from my awareness of art history and from going to many of the great European and North American museums: multiple paintings by Monet of one theme or subject, such as haystacks or the Rouen Cathedral. Monet has seemingly infinite numbers of ways of interpreting the same subject. This made an impact on me – I became very attracted to the idea of reusing one musical idea in many different contexts. I also asked myself the question, ‘Why exactly is it that there is this belief that musical ideas cannot be reused from one piece to another?’ I’m not talking about simply repeating the same idea in another piece; I’m talking about recasting it, re-interpreting it. So I have done this a lot in my work.

Haydn recycled a lot of musical materials in his music.
But generally speaking, this is frowned upon. I think composers are expected not to use the same piece of material across different pieces. But I was very stimulated by this concept. So after I wrote “Machine Flats” I decided that Cubist Blues should incorporate the same idea. But I didn’t just repeat it – I developed many more materials around it.

About “Patches Purple”

You told me that this piece was modeled after J. S. Bach’s Inventions, but you appropriate it with your own musical language. Besides use of pedal, extreme registers, use of clusters, use of octave doubling, extended or prolonged sequences, use of dynamic markings, written out rallentando markings, are there any other elements that you added to this movement which are not typically Bach’s?
There are huge differences among those things that you just said. The one thing that towers above all the others is the prolongation of sequences. All the others are little details; they are meaningful but small in comparison. There are several examples of typical circle of fifth sequences that happen all over the place in Bach’s music, but he
runs the sequence a certain number of times, say, three or four at most. I’m talking about both real as well as tonal sequences. But if you do real sequences by perfect 5ths, you pretty quickly move far away from the key in which you started. I did that kind of thing in this piece – and Bach would never have moved so far away from the home key of any given piece, at least not in a short composition like an Invention. So, the main thing that I was playing with in this piece is the idea of distorting proportion. This piece originally started as a model I composed for my students in counterpoint class. My aim was to give them some encouragement - that it was not easy to write a piece in the style of Bach, but it is not impossible. One of the things that the students were persistently getting wrong was that they weren’t paying attention to how many times sequential units repeat in Bach. In some cases it would be too few, in others too much. There is a sense of proportion and balance in Bach, which is one big reason that Bach is such a great composer. So this piece – *Patches Purple* - is all about what if Bach had had a very eccentric sense of balance; what if he got off on some tangent and kept going and there was nothing called good taste to stop him. This piece is what might have happened in that case! The idea of running a sequence far too many times is what this piece is about, and that’s why its called purple patches, because this piece has gone to some crazy places that Bach would never have visited. You could say that what I was doing was a caricature of what my students were doing. In the orchestral version of this piece, I used instruments that Bach never heard of, such as pitched percussion instruments. I wanted to distance *Purple Patches* even more from Bach.

**About “Rap Rag Red”**

I know that you wrote a piece based on Monk’s “*’Round Midnight*”. There are blues elements in the movement “*Transcendental Blues*” and in your trio *Cubist Blues*, and there’s rap in this movement. In addition to these pieces, are there works of yours that were influenced by other genres of music?

A lot of my music is directly inspired by non-western and western non-classical music. The piece that I am working on right now has quotes of pop songs in it. There’s a song by the Police called *King of Pain* that makes a very brief visit. The piece I am about to start working on soon has a lot of Chinese traditional music in it and uses Chinese traditional instruments as well. I’ve written a piece for clarinet and guzheng. And while I was writing “The Forty Steps” for cello, oud and orchestra, I spent considerable time learning the Arabic scales, called maqamat.

**How much music of yours is purely European classical?**

Zero percent. I say this because the word ‘classical’ is such a damaged word. The string quartet I showed you before doesn’t have anything specific in it that I can pinpoint as ‘European’, but that doesn’t mean it wasn’t influenced by what non-musicians call ‘classical music’. Because what is ‘classical’? Is it restricted to Bach, Beethoven, Schubert and Mozart? Does it include Stravinsky? And if it includes Stravinsky, doesn’t it include Russian folk music? So Russian folk music is part of classical music? You’ll tear your hair out if you start thinking about this too much. That’s why I’d like to say that my music doesn’t have anything to do with classical music because there is no such
Do you think it is important for classical composers to include popular musical genres in their work?

Do I think this is a good thing for other composers to do, besides me? I don’t have the right to say what’s good for anybody else!

And by the way, I don’t ‘use’ or ‘include’ things in my music. My music is a digest of what’s around me in the present as well as a distillation of my memory, my past. I can’t help ‘including’ Charles Mingus in my music any more than Bach could help ‘including’ Lutheran hymns in his. It’s not exactly the conscious decision that your question suggests; it is an honest attempt at representing the world as I experience it in musical terms. Writers write about their interior and exterior world as they understand it, trying to turn it into memorable work. I’m doing the same, but with sounds. That’s all any composer does.

One of the good things about becoming older is that one begins to develop an understanding of who one is and who one is not.

Sometimes I envy composers who are stylistically very focused and remain consistent throughout their careers. One thing that does for them is that it’s helpful for career development. If I say Crumb, you immediately think of a certain type of sound, right? If I play you a recording and I don’t tell you what it is, and if it has those typical Crumb-like sounds, you’ll say that it’s George Crumb. That’s very good for George, because it makes it possible for him to be instantly identifiable and therefore he becomes a recognizable commodity. That’s good for career, although I am certainly not saying that this is why he has remained stylistically consistent – he does that because that’s who he is. But there are other composers who just don’t work that way. I like to try many things. That’s who I am. For me it’s fascinating and fun to take things that don’t seem to belong together on the surface and try to make them work together. I am beginning work on a new piece for an amazing young group in Hong Kong called Siu2. I’m planning a concerto for Siu2 plus Chinese traditional orchestra. They are intrigued to do it, and it will be breaking new ground. That really excites me. I think that great breakthroughs happen when one takes things that have some affinity and put them together. Maybe something ignites, and whole new dialects can develop. Jazz didn’t come out of nowhere; it is the marriage of African rhythm and European harmony. When one puts these things together, there is the possibility of something new and exciting. Rap is another example. Rap didn’t come out of nowhere. And then, once these discoveries are made, other people can build on them. Consider the K-pop song, Gangnam Style: look at all the things that this song has given birth to - so many parodies and so many adaptations in so many different directions! The other thing that Psy did that was incredibly smart: he made it open source. You can’t steal the song because he just gave it away…although just recently it was reported that he made millions from all the youtube plays!

Still, this gives people all over the world the right to adapt it, and they don’t owe him any
royalties at all. This is an example of what I’m saying: if you put something like this out in the world, it opens up a whole new avenue of creativity for countless artists. That’s how music really develops. But then there are composers like Bach who are not interested in that. Bach wanted to put things together, to synthesize, not to invent. It’s a big world; there is plenty of room for lots of people, each with his own motivations. So if you ask me the question ‘should composers do X, or should composers do Y?’, I simply can’t answer that.

You told me before that there is nothing pretty about this movement. It is brutal and grotesque. Also you marked this movement aggressively. Why do you feel that it is necessary to perform this piece that way?
Do you know why I said that? Musical notation is contextual. The reason that I wrote those things and said those things, is because you are a classically trained pianist, which means that grotesque and aggressive are not part of your normal repertoire of thoughts in the world of music. Many composers have asked string players to do what they (the string players) think is ugly. But the reality is that it’s ugly from one perspective, but not from another. I didn’t mean that I want you to play in an ugly way. I was just trying to get you out of your box. In an ideal situation, I shouldn’t have to write that at all, because the music itself should tell the pianist that this is hard-hitting street music. Frederic Rzewski’s “Winnsboro Cotton Mill Blues,” is like this. Should that sound ‘ugly’? What is ‘ugly’? It depends on your concept of beauty. I do know pianists that play enough different kinds of music such that when they see a title like “Rap Rag Red”, they don’t need to be told to play ‘aggressively’. But again, I’m not trying to be offensive or condescending towards you – I just needed to take you outside of the context of your training so you could understand the dialect of this piece.

About “The Five Flat Machine’s Return”

Since mm. 39 is in a kind of latin rhythm, do you think that the performer should play this section differently from the other sections?
Yes. It has to do with the concept of sound. What I was looking for there is a sharp and hard-edged sound. Not only no pedal, but no roundedness. It should be crisp and tight. I associate that kind of sound with pop music and some jazz far more than I do with so-called ‘classical’. This music is not intended to be subtle; it should be high energy. But of course other parts of the movement don’t have the same kind of raw power; there is some subtlety in the other parts. This just points out the shortcomings of our western notational system. Here we come to a paradox: a professional composer is required to notate his or her music with accuracy and precision and yet even when that happens, the composer cannot capture everything he/she wants to convey. A certain amount of the composer’s ideas can be communicated only through oral tradition. For example, there is no way I could notate what I played on the piano for you just now in such a way that all pianists will clearly understand what to do from the notation alone. Emanuele did play this piece the way I want it to be played – he’s very intuitive in that way.

In the middle of this movement, from mm. 121–147, you marked sempre in tempo, but in the same measure, you wrote begin to push, also later you wrote keep pushing,
even harder, and to the limit. I assume you are not talking about the tempo right?
Yes.

Perhaps you are referring to the dynamic or the intensity?
What I am referring to is the way it is phrased. There is only so much one can do with
dynamics, although dynamic shaping helps as well. It has been really difficult for me to
convince pianists to play that part of the movement without rushing, to make the music
grow in intensity not through tempo, but through phrasing. At the beginning, there
should be long phrases and then progressively shorter phrases, so that it gets more and
more bumpy. Think of being on a rollercoaster, going first very smoothly, but after a
while getting crazier and crazier as you go up and down. To some extent this is already
composed into the piece, because at first it’s just one note at a time and then little by little
you get a couple notes together, then three notes and then more. It’s a concept that is
hard to pull off. Even in the orchestra version, it’s difficult for the conductor to hold
back the tempo. There is a natural wish to make it go faster. My feeling is that there’s
more power when the tempo is held steady. This is a concept that I found in non-
classical music. In the world of jazz, for example, you get this bundle of energy that feels
as though it’s going to explode, but the one thing that never changes is the tempo.
Sometimes when I hear great jazz playing, I am so amazed by the internal metronome the
musicians have; this is really, really great. Classically trained musicians have no end of
trouble working like this. Often when classical musicians try to play jazz, this is the part
they screw up the most; they just don’t get the concept of steady tempo. But let’s face it -
it’s difficult! I don’t know how to do it either, but I am not a jazz musician. But those
who have mastered this have extraordinary power.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW WITH FRANK WEINSTOCK

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Which movement(s) do you think is or are the most challenging out of the 7 movements?
Probably The Five-Flat Machine's Return gave me the most problem learning it, but I would suspect that this would be different for each person, depending on his/her traits as a pianist/musician. Patches Purple gave me fits as well. Transcendental Blues may well be the hardest to play convincingly well. Transcendental Blues presents many problems of tonal colors, clarity, and balance.

What kind of skill does a pianist ought to have to play this piece well?
A general musical intelligence; a familiarity, or at least a comfort, with music of many styles; a good sense of musical humor; a wide emotional palette. It takes a fairly comprehensive pianist to play this music well, so it's hard to isolate one, or even a few, skills.

How should a student learn a piece? Should he start with listening to recordings or with learning the notes?
This question could be the subject of a book. The short answer would be neither of your suggested answers, in my opinion. One of the pleasures of learning new music is that one doesn't have to be biased by having heard zillions of performances of the piece beforehand, but can learn the piece from scratch, using only what the composer has left for us (in the score, plus possibly verbal comments). And of course one starts learning the notes when one first reads through a piece, or even looks at the score; but the fairly popular notion of learning the notes before making musical decisions doesn't sit too well with me, I'm afraid. We must approach a piece by learning all about it from the very beginning, which is so much more than just the notes.

Do you think this is a good teaching piece? if so, why?
This piece is a bit technically more demanding than most music that is considered "teaching music" (and I have never taught it myself--but would love to!). However, it would certainly be a good piece to have a serious piano major, and possibly an advanced pre-college pianist, play--there is indeed a lot to learn from it--such as the skills mentioned in #2 above. Playing it was certainly good for my own education, and I see no reason why it shouldn't be for others!

How important is it for a pianist to play a recently composed pieces in their recital?
VERY important! First of all, it's important that a serious music student study music of all styles, even those that they are not inclined to be interested in--sometimes an interest is kindled where it had not been expected; and it's important to develop a perspective on all music, not just that which one is most comfortable with. And, who knows, if one becomes a teacher, for sure one will have to (and should) teach music that he/she doesn't particularly like. So, sticking with comfortable styles is a big mistake.

But your question refers specifically to recent music, which is partially covered by the above. But even more, the chance to work on a new piece which hasn't been recorded (one has to develop ideas and understanding from the score alone) is invaluable. Also, the opportunity to interact with a living composer, who also may be hearing the piece for the first time, is unique.

Whether this applies to an established professional pianist depends partly on the circumstances. Probably one can argue that Emanuel Ax plays better Mozart because of his experience performing John Adams. But there's no point in compelling an artist to play music of any specific repertoire--if, after struggling through ones formative years to develop an affinity with music of all styles, some of those styles just doesn't resonate, then there's no point in performing them in Carnegie Hall--whether those styles be Handel, Haydn, or Hoffman. But a mature artist should still continue to study all music.

What was your reaction to this piece when you first played it?
I enjoyed it very much, and got a good reaction from those who heard it.

Did you perform this piece from memory? Do you think that it should be perform by memory?
I honestly don't remember if I played it by memory or not. I certainly had it memorized, or darn close at least; but whether I did that on stage, I don't remember. In many cases, it's not fair to the composer to play a new piece by memory: if you have a major memory slip in Beethoven, everybody will know that it was your fault and not blame Beethoven; but if you have it in a piece that nobody knows, and you cover it up quite well, people are likely to blame their resulting discomfort on the piece and the composer.

In what year did you premiere this piece? Was the performance at CCM? Did you play it in your recital, If not, do you remember what the event was?
It was in 1992-93, but I don't know the date. Yes, it was on my annual faculty recital at CCM in Corbett Auditorium. The title of the piece at the time was each for himself?/90, but he subsequently removed the "/90" from the title. It also seems to me that "each" and "himself" started with capital letters, but I'm not sure about that; I know that they're all lower-case now.

About “The Five”

Does the standard musical approach of playing louder when the notes move higher and playing softer when the notes move lower still apply in “The Five?” or do you
think that it should be performed more straight in dynamics?
I would never think one way or the other. However, I would certainly not stifle a phrase from varying in loudness from note to note in an effort to keep dynamics "straight". In practice, it's probably true that the Tempo II portions would have less contour than the Tempo I passages.

Since this movement is quite abstract, did you emphasize specific notes?
I don't remember, but I doubt it, other than those indicated with accents. I actually find the Tempo I music very lyrical and expressive.

I find it tricky to play huge leaps on the left hand part in the last two measures of this movement. I took the first note on every beat with the right hand. I am curious if you agree with me on this matter?
I'd be concerned that it might start sounding like four notes (right hand) against two (left hand), rather than three against three. If you could make it sound like it looks on the page, I wouldn't object. But I do think the widening of the left-left hand interval until it's over three octaves is paramount, and the audience must be able to feel the increasing distance traveled; perhaps an element of physical difficulty is part of that sound--just as it's harder for a singer to make a large leap than small. I'm 100% sure I made quite a ritard over these couple bars, in order to emphasize the greater distances being traveled in both hands.

Do you think a performer should follow the composer’s direction religiously?
We are fortunate to have every hint the composer has given us as to what sound (s)he was hearing when writing a piece. But it also should be remembered that, in most cases, they are dealing with sound, not the physical aspect of playing an instrument (notwithstanding, in this case, that Joel is a very fine pianist). Thus we must do our best to recreate that sound in our minds, and then do our best to do whatever we need to do at our instrument to bring that sound into reality.

I had a conversation with Mr. Tocco the other day about how Claudio Arrau refused to play any other fingering than Beethoven’s for his works, even though Beethoven’s fingering is almost impossible to play with, for example in the first movement of Beethoven’s Op. 2 No. 2, first movement (the octave arpeggio passage). What is your opinion on this matter?
Rudolf Serkin also felt strongly along these lines. There's risk in such dogmatic thinking, but a great reward as well. As you've probably guessed from the previous couple answers, the fingerings should be worshiped, but not necessarily followed. I wish I could use Beethoven's fingering in Op. 2 #2; but if I restricted myself to it, I'd either never play the piece, or would royally mess up that passage. But, to simply dismiss the fingering as ridiculousness is to miss so much that he's saying by writing it.

About “Transcendental Blues”
The second movement "Transcendental Blues," in mm. 16 and 31, they are marked "new color", what did you do there?
Again, I don't remember too well; but what I think I did, and what I would do now, would probably be to take some time at the end of the previous bar and at the beginning of this bar, to better enjoy the beauty of the new harmony; probably use a less distinct sound; and probably a bit softer--quasi pp?

In mm. 9–12, the notes change rapidly. When I practice this section, I practice the L.H. as block chords, what is your opinion about that? How did you learn it? Do you have other suggestions that would help pianist to learn this section effectively?
If that helps you, then it's a good thing to do. I have no recollection how I learned it, but I probably did what I usually do, which is to play it slow enough that I can play it beautifully, and then as my skill improved, play it faster and faster. What suggestion I would give to a pianist would depend on what specifically was needed for that pianist to improve.

In mm. 16–18, the exact same passage is repeated three times, Hoffman only indicate “new color” in mm. 16. Would you do it differently? If so, How?
Do you mean differently from one bar to the next within these three bars? Certainly not for the sake of being different; but, even if one tries to play them the same, the fact that we're hearing it for the second, and then third, time already makes them different.

Do you do it differently or the same when it appears for the second time?
Similar to previous response. Again, I don't remember what I did--it's been twenty years since I've played the piece--and I could see doing it one way one day becoming convinced that that was stupid and doing it a differently three days later.

In measure 26, Hoffman marks pedal marking over a diminuendo sign. Would you decrease the amount of the pedal to reduce the dynamic, or do you think it is better if it is all done from finger control?
I'd probably flutter away the sound, but it would depend on what I was hearing while playing. With the fermatas, it's possible that there's enough time to make the diminuendo without fluttering.

In measure 42, the note B-flat on the left hand for the first time is in an octave. B-flat is also the last note on the left hand that indicate the end of the blues pattern. Perhaps the composer intends something different to happen from the performer. Did you play differently there?
I have no recollection. But this is clearly the final arrival of the movement.

The notes in the bass that indicate, I-I-IV-I blues pattern, do you play the IV louder and play the I chord more stable or more like a resolution?
Likely, all other things being equal.

About “Machine Flats”
Looking at this movement, it does not look terribly challenging technically for well-trained pianist, in the past I have seen a classical-trained pianists played this kind of music and of course they got all the notes and the technique to play it, but it did not sound exciting, unlike jazz musicians. Do you agree with me? Do you think it has to do with the personality of the pianists and or their exposure to good performance of modern music? Or do you think there is something missing and what would you suggest?

It's certainly true that some people simply don't feel comfortable in styles like this--just like some pianists play Beethoven badly or Rachmaninoff badly. But the reasons are as many and varied as the number of such pianists, so I wouldn't want to make a general statement about what causes such deficiencies.

How do you think a performer should interpret the indication scorrevole in this movement?

I believe that it literally means "flowing", but I usually think there's a nervous, scurrying feeling about it as well. (I think Joel uses this marking more than most any other composer; I suspect it comes from his admiration for Elliott Carter!)

At the coda of this movement, it is marked with full pedal until the last note, but the whole section is marked p leggero and senza rit. Since this movement is supposed to end surprisingly, I find it impossible to hold the full pedal until the end to get the effect. Would you suggest flutter pedal or perhaps reducing the pedal at the end? Absolutely if necessary. But not noticeably--it seems that his indication of the pedal line (in addition to the Ped symbol) implies that he's pretty concerned that the pedal sound like it's flat down the whole time.

About “Patches Purple”

This movement was modeled after J.S. Bach’s Inventions, but it is more challenging in many ways, do you agree with me? If so, what is your opinion on this matter? See Rudolph Serkin's comment at the beginning. But, yes, this is probably more technically challenging than a two-part invention--the tempo, etc. This was a tough one for me...

Interpretation wise, what would you do differently in this movement than playing Bach’s Inventions?

Since the style is so different than an invention, it shouldn't sound the same at all. More dramatic dynamics, quirky accents, wider leaps, etc. I would notice that this piece is similar to an invention, but then probably wouldn't think about the inventions at all after that, but would approach it on its own terms.

About “Returns”

In “Returns,” did you always voice it to the top or did you focus more on the full
**harmony effect?**
I'm quite confident that my approach would be neither extreme, although some passages might be one and others the other.
# APPENDIX D

## WORKS FOR PIANO SOLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLES</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>PUBLISHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td><em>Fantasy Pieces</em></td>
<td>18’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td><em>Concert-Study</em></td>
<td>4’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Hands Down</em></td>
<td>11’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td><em>each for himself?</em></td>
<td>22’</td>
<td>RAI Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>‘Round Midnight Variation*</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>For Bill</em></td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>at what price?</em></td>
<td>13’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9 pieces for piano</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td><em>Un petit endroit très profond à l'intérieur de Dante</em></td>
<td>2’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td><em>Amethyst Variations</em></td>
<td>11’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PIANO WITH ORCHESTRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLES</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>PUBLISHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><em>Piano Concerto</em></td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TWO PIANOS WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLES</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>PUBLISHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1983 | *Five Pieces for Two Pianos*  
for William Black | 16’ | Galaxy Music Corporation |

## OTHER WORKS THAT INCLUDE THE PIANO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLES</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>PUBLISHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td><em>Variations for violin, cello and harp or piano</em></td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>Lyra Music Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td><em>Nocturne for violin and piano</em></td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1977 | *Horn Concerto*  
solo hrn + clt, vln, vc, pno | 18’ | Onibatan Music |
| 1977 | *Bagatelles for harp and piano* | 14’ | Onibatan Music |
| 1980 | *Three Bagatelles*  
ob, bsn, pno | 14’ | Onibatan Music |
| 1980 | *Divertimento*  
string quartet, hp + pno | 12’ | Onibatan Music |
| 1981 | *Nirvana the Waterfall*  
sop, vc, pno (text: Shunryu Suzuki) | 16’ | Onibatan Music |
<p>| 1982 | <em>Sonata for Cello and Piano</em> | 22’ | Onibatan Music |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td><em>Five Pieces for Two Pianos</em></td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>E.C. Schirmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><em>Duo for Viola and Piano</em></td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td><em>Ricordanza</em></td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td><em>Hancock Trio</em></td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td><em>Fantasia Fiorentina</em></td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>RAI Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td><em>Cubist Blues</em></td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>RAI Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Self-Portrait with Mozart</em></td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>RAI Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td><em>L'Immensita dell' Attimo (song cycle)</em></td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td><em>L'Immensita dell’ Attimo</em></td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>The Music within the Words</em>, Part 1</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>The Music within the Words</em>, Part 1 alternate version*</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>The Music within the Words</em>, Part 2</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>Portogruaro Sextet</em></td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Gebirtig Speaks</em></td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Portogruaro Quartet</em></td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>RAI Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Piano Trio 2: Lost Traces</em></td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>Onibatan Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Piano Trio 3 on C#</td>
<td></td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Blue and Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Karptet</td>
<td></td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6-8-2-4-5-8 fl, clt, vln, vc, mar + pno</td>
<td></td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Three Paths</td>
<td></td>
<td>19'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Carnivalfinale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Piano Trio 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Music in Yellow and Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>7''</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX E**

**DISCOGRAPHY OF PIANO SOLO WORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERFORMER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy Pieces</td>
<td>Gasparo Records</td>
<td>GSCD-238</td>
<td>James Tocco, piano</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each for himself? for piano solo</td>
<td>Stradivarius</td>
<td>STR 33555</td>
<td>Emanuele Arciuli, piano</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Round Midnight Variation</td>
<td>Stradivarius</td>
<td>STR 33898</td>
<td>Emanuele Arciuli, piano</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pieces for piano</td>
<td>Albany Records</td>
<td>TROY 1372</td>
<td>Joel Hoffman, piano</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCOGRAPHY OF WORKS THAT INCLUDES THE PIANO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERFORMER(S)</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sonata for Cello and Piano</em></td>
<td>Albany Records</td>
<td>TROY 1045</td>
<td>Parry Karp, cello Christopher Karp, piano</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sonata for Cello and Piano</em></td>
<td>Gasparo Records</td>
<td>GSCD-326</td>
<td>Benjamin Karp, cello Joel Hoffman, piano</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Duo for Viola and Piano</em></td>
<td>CRI Recordings</td>
<td>CD 590</td>
<td>Toby Hoffman, viola Joel Hoffman, piano</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fantasia Fiorentina for violin and piano</em></td>
<td>Gasparo Records</td>
<td>GSCD-326</td>
<td>Daniel Mason, violin Joel Hoffman, piano</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Piano Trio 1: Cubist Blues** | Gasparo Records | GSCD-326 | Daniel Mason, violin  
Benjamin Karp, cello  
Joel Hoffman, piano | 2001 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Piano Trio 1: Cubist Blues** | Albany Records | TROY 864 | Christopher Karp, violin  
Parry Karp, cello  
Frances Karp, piano | 2006 |
| **Piano Trio 2: Lost Traces** | Albany Records | TROY 864 | Christopher Karp, violin  
Parry Karp, cello  
Howard Karp, piano | 2006 |
| **Piano Trio 3 on C#** | Albany Records | TROY 864 | Christopher Karp, violin  
Parry Karp, cello  
Howard Karp, piano | 2006 |
| **Karptet** | Albany Records | TROY 1045 | Christopher Karp, violin,  
Katrin Talbot, viola, Parry  
Karp, cello, Howard and  
Frances Karp, piano | 2008 |
| **Three Paths** | Albany Records | TROY 1372 | Parry Karp, cello,  
Christopher Karp, piano | 2012 |