Stravinsky and Boulez: Compositional Process, Form and Development

ABSTRACT

Background

Commentators on Boulez’s music, from early ones (e.g. Bradshaw and Bennett 1963, Rosen 1986) to recent (e.g. Edwards 2006, Campbell 2010, Goldman 2011, Losada 2014), have noted the influence of Stravinsky’s juxtapositions on Boulez’s approach to form. O’Hagan (1997, 60,112) and Piencikowski (2010, 33) have mentioned isolated instances of cut and paste techniques, reminiscent of Stravinsky’s, in Boulez’s sketches. Others have mentioned the importance of sectional or block forms (e.g Campbell 2010, 206), puzzle forms (Goldman 74-75, 78, 91-92, 129) or braiding techniques (e.g. Adamowicz 2015 citing Boulez 1991, 155) in his output as a whole. The composer himself motivated this line of commentary, acknowledging his debt to Stravinsky by explicitly giving him credit for the formal conception and also the developmental concept which, in his mind, renders this conception most fruitful. Although Stravinsky’s influence has been shown to have important ramifications in the realm of structure, for example, in the “dialogue of oppositions” that Goldman considers essential to Boulez’s later works, the precise workings of this influence on Boulez’s compositional process and the techniques underlying the concept of development have not been addressed in detail.

Aims and repertoire studied

This paper clarifies the central role of Stravinsky’s influence on these aspects of Boulez’s compositional process. It presents two sketches from Domaines (2nd version, 1968) that relate to one another such that one could be derived from the other through a straightforward application of Stravinsky’s cut and paste techniques (Nabokov 1951, Horlacher 2001, Carr 2002).

Methods

Due to the fact that Boulez’s analyses of works by other composers tend to create spaces for his compositional aesthetics. (Goldman 2011, Chapter 5; Salem 2014,29), one can critically examine Boulez’s discourse to understand exactly how his compositional process both draws from and differs from Stravinsky’s. In Boulez’s words: ‘Analysis can only be this description of ourselves by ourselves and is, in this sense, completely unusable by anyone else’. (Boulez 2005, 105; Quoted in Goldman 2011,87). Boulez’s debt to Stravinsky for the formal approach and the concept of development can be seen in the following quotes: ‘Les Noces and the Symphonies of Wind Instruments have shown the way towards new schemas which are absolutely appropriate to this type of development. I am referring to a kaleidoscopic form in which the alternation of cumulative developments creates the form, while constructing components of the global form on characteristics of tempo, density and timbre’ (Boulez (1983) 2005, 235; quoted in Goldman 2011, 75 and Campbell 2010, 207). ‘Such a form in sections only becomes legitimate and interesting if the developments overlap, that is, only if there is interference between the organic and the segmented. This is what Stravinsky does in the Symphonies of Wind Instruments, and, in a more complex way, what Berg does in Lulu; this is what I created in Le Marteaux sans maitre, and what Stockhausen arrived at in Momente’ (Boulez (1988) 2005, 462; quoted in Goldman 2011, 75).

As a close reading of Boulez ((1953) 1991) indicates, he openly admired Stravinsky’s rhythmic structures and, in his analyses of Stravinsky’s music, explicitly credited the sophistication of the developmental techniques to his innovations in the realm of rhythm. He was critical of Stravinsky’s approach to pitch organization, and particularly his tendency to repeat pitch material with little variation: ‘Where there are superimpositions of motifs, they are carried out in an extremely rigid fashion, each motif unrolling obstinately on the same intervals. In sum, there is no development, properly speaking, but only varied repetition, no chemical reaction, but only a physical mixing; we can allow ourselves to see in that difference a great lowering of level’ (Boulez (1951) 1968, 139; quoted in Horlacher 1992, 173). Inspired by Messiaen, Boulez’s analyses of Stravinsky’s rhythmic structures led to the development of systematic approaches to rhythmic organization. Likewise, his awareness of Stravinsky’s formal approach in pieces like The Rite of Spring (Boulez (1953) 1991) and Symphonies of Wind Instruments (Boulez (1983) 2005) led to an approach to formal organization structured by juxtaposition incorporating, as a response to his concerns with Stravinsky’s approach, a concept of pitch-based development. Extending beyond previous scholarship, this essay discusses the way Boulez adapted Stravinsky’s approach to move away from simple juxtaposition (including straightforward repetition) and towards contrasts incorporating continuous development. It provides a detailed description, grounded in sketch-work, of developmental processes.

The relationship between Après D and Cahier D, two successive movements from the solo clarinet with chamber ensemble version of Domaines (1968), will be the focus of the analysis. Significantly, the two movements are closely related and the relationship between the two is an important perceptual aspect of the piece. Initial sketches for Après D outline an essentially tri-partite structure consisting of three self-contained sections that repeat in a straightforward ABCABC structure. Each section is clearly distinct in terms of rhythm, tempo, articulation, timbre and texture, exhibiting the contrast between smooth and striated spaces that have been described as basic to Boulez’s compositional style (Campbell 2010, Chapter 10). Later sketches take two of these sections and parse them into subsections which are then set in opposition, resulting in a structure characterized by irregular and rapid juxtaposi-
tion and contrasts. As is typical for Boulez, the surface contrasts reflect distinct materials and approaches to pitch organization. The pitch content of these sections derives directly from the first and last fragments of Cahier D (fragment 1/6 and fragment 3). The relationship is particularly audible at the opening of Après D, a passage which presents an embellished version of the material that opens Cahier D (fragment 6/1) and concludes fragment 1/6 of Cahier D. In this passage, the embellishments (which correspond to what Boulez would call développement) occur on two different levels. At the middle-ground level, main notes are generated that are symmetrically related to the original material around the opening pitch-class of Cahier D (F). At a foreground level, these notes are embellished chordally by a consistent intervallic structure, creating harmonic continuity within the passage. By taking materials that are essentially derived in a similar way from the same materials (sometimes subjected to additional development), as the basis for the partitioned, juxtaposed passages that characterize the second half of the movement, Boulez establishes pitch continuity between temporally distant passages, which also associate clearly through mere surface musical parameters.

Boulez’s approach to form features an alternation of passages that are straightforward and others that are sonically saturated and extremely complex, this complexity resulting from developmental techniques and reflecting his concept of ‘organized delirium’ (Boulez 1958) 1991, 43). As Boulez stated: ‘I like to create a contrast between structures that are extremely clear and those that are so overloaded that they cannot possibly be assimilated... The contrast between really total perception and an overall perception where details are lost, is one of the things that means most to me’ (Boulez 1976, 51-52). Straightforward and complex passages are subsumed within orthogonal perceptible, large-scale juxtapositions, defined by tempo, texture, rhythmic, dynamic and expressive content, as well as inner qualities revealed by examination of the harmonic language, a central focus of the analysis. Applying transformational theory, the analysis explains the correlation of the harmonic content with these other musical parameters and its implications in terms of formal function.

Implications

One of the most fascinating elements brought out by the analysis is how the developmental processes can bridge the sharp contrasts of the oppositions. This is achieved by using some of the base material from one fragment for the middle-ground development of the material based on the other fragment, as well as foreground embellishment techniques that occasionally create identical chordal structures. Significantly, this is one of the aspects Boulez’s admires about Stravinsky’s approach: ‘Beneath a structure articulated on specific planes by principal motifs, secondary motifs are inserted so as to soften and shade off that structure by a constant process of renewal and by their diverse ways of combining with the principal motifs. It is this dual plan of development—dual as much by function as by modality—that may be reckoned one of the most profitable lessons to be drawn from this Introduction to The Rite’ (Boulez 1953) 1991, 105). This illustrates an unexpected depth to the influence, which traverses the space between radically different realms of musical experience, the domains of rhythmic and pitch organization.
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