

musicians of the new group ‘play like swine—they will get the [state] money anyway’ (p. 184).

In a way, this volume provides the key to all of Varga’s other publications. His nuanced memoir provides the necessary context in which to understand the reflexivity of his decades-long ethnographical project. But upon reaching the last page of the ‘snippets’ section, one may get the impression that Varga’s material could be nearly mined out by now. The unevenness of this section sometimes yields nothing more than mere fragments. Still, like a cherished old photograph, a fragment may have enough aura to make it a worthwhile object of attention. Bálint András Varga’s latest book will prove an entertaining and useful work for a great variety of musicians, and may serve as a fitting crown for his many fine volumes.

PAUL MILLER

Cornell University

doi:10.1093/ml/gcu046

© The Author (2014). Published by Oxford University Press. All rights reserved.

*Tombeau: Facsimiles of the Draft Score and the First Fair Copy of the Full Score.* By Pierre Boulez, ed. Robert Piencikowski. (Paul Sacher Foundation/Universal Edition, 2010. pp. 154. €154. ISBN 978-3-7024-6861-3)

‘[L]es murs doivent vibrer.’ These words appear in Pierre Boulez’s earliest plans for *Tombeau*. In the essay that accompanies this edition of *Tombeau* sketches, Robert Piencikowski explains that the work might have provoked less critical interest than was expected at its Donaueschingen premiere precisely because the walls did *not* vibrate in the way Boulez had originally envisaged. Commissioned as a memorial to Prince Max Egon zu Fürstenberg, the Donaueschingen festival’s patron who died suddenly in April 1959, Boulez did not prioritize *Tombeau* until late that summer. Therefore, the initial version was written so rapidly for the October premiere that it was impractical to place the intended instrumental groups around the hall in an effort to magnify the reverberations and really make the walls vibrate. Instead, all the performers were massed on stage, flattening out the glistening textures Boulez had hoped to achieve by reflecting and reinforcing instrumental resonances around the space. Not long after its first hearing, subsequent enlargement, and ultimate assimilation as the last movement of the larger

work *Pli selon pli*, *Tombeau* earned a reputation as one of the key elements of the composer’s oeuvre. Other important aspects of *Tombeau*’s compositional history were affected by these initial constraints, as we learn in the notes accompanying this lavish new edition.

By releasing this trove of material to coincide with Boulez’s 85th birthday, the Paul Sacher Foundation and Universal Edition have provided a worthy sequel to their earlier publication of sketches to *Le Marteau sans Maître* (*Pierre Boulez: Le Marteau sans Maître. Facsimile of the Draft Score and the First Fair Copy of the Full Score*, ed. Pascal Decroupet (Mainz, 2005)). The justification for choosing *Tombeau* as the *Marteau*’s successor in this series was twofold. First, the pencil sketches and polychrome ink, both in Boulez’s notoriously precise and minuscule hand, have deteriorated due to their heavy use and inherently ephemeral quality. Second, there is something of a spectacular element to the *Tombeau* manuscripts, an attribute that one can observe not only in the obvious evidence of extreme dedication required to produce the score, but also in the edition’s Brobdingnagian dimensions (47 × 37.5 cm), several centimetres larger than the already oversized printed score (*Pierre Boulez, Pli selon pli / V. tombeau* (Vienna: Universal Edition 13616, 1971)).

Piencikowski’s dense commentary is a greatly expanded version of an earlier, shorter essay (*Boulez: Pli selon pli*, ed. Phillipe Alberà (Geneva, 2003), 45–8). Unlike Decroupet’s detailed analysis of the *Marteau* sketches, Piencikowski modestly aims only to supply the reader ‘with the primary constitutive elements of the organization, while inviting him, should his curiosity so take him, to imagine for himself the sometimes extremely refined prolongations by means of which the composer has made his deductions’ (p. 23). This is partly due to the fact that available documents ‘do not at present permit us to reconstruct every detail of the process of “manufacture” of the practical elements of the realization, notably that of the orchestral material’ (p. 26). Even so, these sketches shed much light on the genesis as well as the construction of the work’s edifice.

Apart from the practical reasons for releasing these sketches on the heels of *Marteau*, at least two aspects of *Tombeau* link it structurally to the earlier work. Although other technical means were available to him at the time, Boulez employed the same schemata of multiplied pitch-classes in both works, and therefore their pitch content derives from the same basic series. Piencikowski suggests several intriguing hypotheses for the reuse of previous materials (p. 29).

His analysis of Boulez's deployment of pitch content admirably clarifies the basic cyclic implementation of pitch cells, a technique which aligns with the idea of an implied 'procession' by the six instrumental groups, resulting in a kind of 'serial relay' (p. 30). While he emphasizes overt cross-references and quotations in Boulez's oeuvre, Jonathan Goldman's understanding of a 'mother work' spawning multiple offshoots might be extended to embrace the more abstract rhizomal phenomenon of structural recombination that connects *Tombeau* to *Marteau* (Jonathan Goldman: *The Musical Language of Pierre Boulez* (Cambridge, 2011), 10, 33–4).

A second and more obvious resonance between *Marteau* and *Tombeau* can be located in the role of the human voice. As Piencikowski explains in his digression on the historical meaning and relevance of the word 'tombeau', the fact that Boulez has the singer intone only the last line of Mallarmé's poem (itself entitled *Le Tombeau de Verlaine*) relates to the concept of *bouche fermée* in the earlier work. Both techniques are effectively ways of 'silencing the text' (p. 35). By suppressing the poem until the coda, and then assigning it to the very highest recesses of the soprano's voice, Boulez sets up a dialectic between the text's semantic meaning and its phonetic content, a daring interpretative gesture that signals a conception of the composer's role as an actor who does not merely reproduce a text, but rather transforms it (Erling E. Gulbrandsen, 'Pierre Boulez in Interview', *Tempo*, 65/257 (1996), 14). Incidentally, there is more than a hint of irony in that Boulez thought of the Sacher Foundation as his own 'future tombeau'. This edition reproduces that witty dedication, scribbled into the Foundation's guestbook in 1985.

The *Tombeau* sketches allow one to follow the extraordinary amount of enlargement that the work went through. It was ultimately cast in six sections or 'sequences' plus a coda, though Boulez had composed only the first four sequences (174 bars) and the coda at the time of the premiere. The composer divided his instrumental resources (which were culled from the players available in other works performed at the October 1959 premiere) into six groups of homogenous timbre, plus the soprano vocalist. After its first performance, Boulez quickly set to work expanding *Tombeau*. In a letter to Stockhausen written shortly after Donaueschingen, Boulez indicates that he is 'in the process of expanding the Tombeau (if I dare risk this macabre comparison)... to the point of turning it into a mausoleum!!' (p. 33). The newly

appended fifth and sixth sequences effectively doubled the length of the work and include the most dense orchestral writing.

The first step in folding the newer material into the original 1959 version was an astonishing pencil score, referred to as 'Score A'. The last four pages of Score A present the most extraordinary manuscript detail. Contributing to its remarkable appearance, Boulez wrote this sketch out in rhythmic durations four times faster than the final published score. The reason for this, according to Piencikowski, was so that Boulez could more easily see the relationships among blocks of sounds. He writes 'this extreme economy of space was necessary to the composer: in order not to lose sight of the relationship of the whole to the detail... without having to accumulate pages' (p. 31). But was this way of atomizing the material—where semihemidemisemiquavers (or 128th notes) are commonplace—also calculated to intimidate? In the context of Boulez's highly technical discourse on music at this time, evident in *Penser la musique aujourd'hui* (Geneva, 1963) and other essays, it is hard not to feel that an element of compositional machismo manifests itself here.

Upon closer inspection of Score A, it becomes apparent that this is not at all a score wherein the individual parts are consistently aligned in the conventional sense. Rather, it appears that two different strategies are in play. While Score A does indeed contain the essential pitch and rhythmic material of the final published edition, its character changes abruptly after bar 174, the point at which the 1959 premiere left off and sequences 5 and 6 begin. Up to bar 175, one can discern many long notes added to reinforce resonances, but the same is not true in the two newer sequences, which are in comparison far more spatially compressed on the page. Even more telling is the fact that the blocks of music between heterogeneous orchestral groups are aligned more or less vertically with one another in the older part, while the superordinate bar-lines do not generally line up in the newer material. This suggests that masses of instrumental sound have not yet found their place relative to one another in the newer music, and that Score A therefore represents material that is in two distinct stages of development. Is there a comparable compressed score of the first four sequences that might be more developed than the short score (Illustration 24, p. 64)? Whatever the case may be, it would be accurate to say that the content of Score A after bar 175 is a kind of 'reservoir' of material,

and the composer was still in the process of finding its temporal arrangement.

After this concentrated pencil sketch, Boulez wrote out an ink copy of the score in which the diminutive rhythmic values remain, but the bars are spread out in a more readable fashion. This impressive polychrome sketch reproduced as ‘Score B’ appears in black, green, blue, violet, and red inks. The colours indicate various ways in which instrumental groups may enter. At one extreme, black ink indicates that an orchestral group enters on a distinct signal from the conductor. At the other, red ink denotes ‘quite free rhythmic execution, within limits of starting and ending arrows’ (p. 32). One can read this as a step towards forming the temporal character of musical content while still retaining a calculated element of ‘fuzziness’. The optimism Boulez registered here with regard to the ability of discrete instrumental groups to coordinate their entrances soon gave way to a more pragmatic view.

After the extraordinary labour of creating Scores A and B, Boulez wrote out a 64-page fair copy (‘Score C’), in which he eliminated the variable performance possibilities (except in the coda) and augmented all of the rhythmic values fourfold. This sketch is written in black, since the coloured inks were no longer necessary. Crucially, Boulez specified that this score ought to be understood only as ‘une Version fixe’, indicating that it was only one possible fixed version of a fundamentally mobile work. Universal Edition’s proofreader, Roman Haubenstock-Ramati, confirmed this by writing ‘Diese Version ist keine definitive’ (p. 33). As Piencikowski rightly points out, sacrificing the mobile aspect of the score was ‘compensated by a not-negligible reduction in rehearsal time’ (p. 129). Although Score C eliminated the variability of group entries, it still did not definitively fix those entries relative to one another. Consequently, the bar numbers Boulez wrote into Score C correspond only loosely to the final version of *Tombeau*. Undoubtedly, Score C moves us a step further towards the work’s final form, but the impression that it is still a reservoir of musical material lingers.

There was one final step required before Boulez submitted the score to his publisher. The composer photocopied Score C, cut instrumental segments out, pasted those segments on card stock, and created a cutout version or montage. A portion of this sketch is reproduced as Score D. The super-dense textures of Scores A, B, and C have finally opened out, revealing

a much more transparent, airy, and ‘resonant’ musical space. In sequences 5 and 6, Boulez finally inserted resonance notes in the parts of instruments as he had earlier in the pencil sketch (Score A) for the first 174 bars. These long, held pitches in Score D appear above and below the pasted blocks of Score C, resulting in a collage-like appearance.

In providing the framework for understanding this complex, labour-intensive process, Piencikowski’s work is first-rate. His footnotes alone are a model of erudition. But elucidating the techniques and practices that generated the rhythmic and temporal structure—elements which, as we have seen, underwent considerable transformation in the work’s evolution—remain far less of a priority for Piencikowski than one might hope, although the material for a more thorough analysis of this dimension is everywhere in evidence. During the earliest stages of composition, Boulez made sketches for the layout of durational fields that beg for closer examination (Illustration 21, p. 60). Due to the understandable constraints of space in this edition, only a few pages of Score C and Score D are reproduced: it is in these sketches that Boulez finally fixed blocks of sound in temporal relationships. For a more thorough study that addresses the gradual reification and arrangement of Boulez’s musical reservoir, one would have to consult the sketches in their entirety. Even so, the material released in this spectacular edition is more than sufficient to form a basic idea of the course of composition, and a necessary first step to gaining a more nuanced understanding of *Tombeau*. One wonders what treasures the Sacher Foundation might release on Boulez’s 90th birthday in 2015. Whatever they may consist of, it will be difficult to improve upon this edition.

PAUL MILLER

Cornell University

doi:10.1093/ml/gcu060

© The Author (2014). Published by Oxford University Press. All rights reserved.

*Konzert-Szenen: Bewegung, Performance, Medien. Musik zwischen performativer Expansion und medialer Integration 1950–2000.* By Christa Brüstle. pp. 416. Beihefte zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft. 73. (Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2013, €68. ISBN 978-3-515-10397-8.)

In recent years, ‘interarts’ has become a bit of a buzzword in the humanities. Various authors