

TONIC

The Journal of the
ROBERT SIMPSON SOCIETY

Vol 13
Summer 2003

<i>Editorial</i>	1
Greg Laybourn, <i>Robert Simpson's Dynamic Analogy: Techniques of Structural Re-Modelling (1996)</i>	2
<i>Tonic 1980-2003. A complete list of contents</i>	35

EDITORIAL

This MMus thesis for King's College, University of London of 1996 focusing on Robert Simpson's String Quartet No. 4 has never achieved a wide circulation – not even its author has now a paper-copy of it. Greg Laybourn, whose name may be known to the reader from TONIC 10 (1999), kindly supplied me with the file of this study which else might have been relegated to oblivion. Photocopies of the music examples were kindly supplied from one of the very few surviving paper-copies by Lionel Pike, Royal Holloway University of London/Robert Simpson Society Archive. We are very grateful that the author has agreed to the publication in TONIC 13.

The two remaining pages at the end of this issue are devoted to a complete listing of all substantial articles that appeared in the issues of TONIC from no. 1/1 until now. I would like to express my gratitude to Dick Edwards, Lionel Pike and our new chairman Terry Hazell for their constant kind help and assistance in this matter.

Jürgen Schaarwächter

Introduction	2
I. Initial Beethoven Analysis	6
Large Structural Divisions	6
Small Structural Divisions	8
II. Beethoven Analysis in Context	10
Large Structural Divisions	10
Small Structural Divisions	11
III. Initial Simpson Analysis	15
Large Structural Divisions	18
Small Structural Divisions	20
IV. Simpson Analysis in Context	22
V. Comparative Motivic & Harmonic Function	25
VI. Thematic Elements as Dynamic Variables	28
Conclusion	32
Bibliography	34
Ex. 1	7
Ex. 2	16-17
Ex. 3	26

INTRODUCTION

Robert Simpson prefaces the score of his Fourth String Quartet (1973) with the following:

“The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth quartets constitute a close study of Beethoven’s three Rasumovksy quartets, Op. 59; that is to say, the attempt to understand those great works resulted in, not a verbal analysis, but music. The hope is that anyone studying intelligently the musical analogies offered here will find the experience of benefit in approaching and entering Beethoven’s masterpieces. To try and describe such analogies in words would defeat the object; some are obvious, of the kind that Brahms would say any fool could see; others are much less so and reflect subtleties that defy language, that may be perceived only by those with ears to hear them. If these three string quartets enhance understanding of the genius of Beethoven at their own expense, their purpose will have been served.”

Far from existing as an exercise in compositional didactics, as might be inferred from this, Simpson, when challenged as to the modesty of this statement, describes the pieces as “what amount to variations on the Rasumovsky Quartets”¹. He later qualifies this somewhat with the following:

“... when you come to study some great masterpiece on a large scale, you immediately begin to sense tensions, and distributions of tensions and proportions, in the work as a whole. It teaches you something about momentum, about harmonic spacing, about counterpoint, about structure in general. ... although each one of my Quartets starts off in a way which is obviously similar to the Beethoven, each began to develop along lines of its own, so that in the end what I produced are not attempts to recapture the mood of Beethoven’s quartets ... but I took the Rasumovksys as their starting point, then allowed the music to develop, keeping an eye on the model all the time and seeing the interesting, fascinating, compelling things that can happen to one during this process. And so you find the proportions of the work are much the same as those of the Beethoven. But the material itself is different, therefore producing different key distributions in places, and so, in the end, different works. It is the differences, rather than the similarities, between my Quartets and the Beethoven which should shed light on both of us ...”².

¹ See *MacDonald*, p. 11.

² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Hence an analytic focus begins to emerge, further informed by the following hint at the compositional genesis:

“How can this kind of appreciation or knowledge be somehow reflected in another language, in one’s own contemporary language? Since one of my aims as a composer has always been to try to recapture classical momentum, which has largely been lost in a lot of contemporary music, this was one way of getting very close to the matter.”

Simpson’s prose descriptions are illuminating in that they identify several quite specific compositional and thus analytical perspectives of the piece, namely the organic (“each [quartet] began to develop along lines of its own”); mechanistic, or dynamic (distributions of tensions and proportions, momentum, and their structural function); and linguistic (reflection of knowledge in one’s own contemporary language). While none of these is entirely separable in their descriptive relevance towards a musical structure, the organic and mechanistic can be taken in this particular instance as constituents of a functioning linguistic metaphor. Given the significant differences between Beethoven’s triadic harmony with its intrinsic laws of consonance/dissonance which to some extent govern movement, and tonality in the late twentieth century which is, in these senses, essentially dysfunctional outside of each specific context created by a composer, Simpson’s conscious identification of compositional premises provides a key to an understanding of the motivic techniques through which he creates harmonic motion. It is through this that he establishes his own analogical language.

The inquiry into analogical function is justified here in part by its very invocation; Simpson has not always been so explicit about his compositional models – his Symphony no. 3 (1962), for instance, has been shown to be deliberately analogical to Beethoven’s Ninth³ without being publicly heralded as such by the composer. Moreover, taking a linguistic metaphor to represent the creation of new (musical) language patterns in imitation of existing norms, the quality of an analogy may be non-specific to the point of being attributable to pieces which achieve fairly broad semantic similarity to a prominent canonical work, and as such are seen as generically and pragmatically representative, often in a historically developmental way;⁴ thus even such a specific referral as Simpson’s requires qualification.

This is provided here in a non-musical context by his conscious desire to retain a classical momentum, through distribution of various forms of tension. Together with the claim that the piece developed according to its own nature although constantly rooted in the aesthetic proportions of the model, this indeed

³ See *Pickard*, 1994.

⁴ The resounding and multiform influence of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony is in fact a good example, see for instance *Dahlhaus*, 1980.

provides some supportive evidence of its existence and function as an *analogue* to the Beethoven; it is then the terms of this relationship which dictate the analytical method. A harmonic-prolongational approach would have to somehow evade the uncompromising hurdle of orthodox Schenkerism, wherein Simpson's claim to analogy is bound to appear meretricious when each composing out of an *Urfinie* (by Beethoven or any genius) is by analytic (and organic) nature to some extent analogous⁵. Since an ultimate aim of the study is to re-define the role of harmony as a compositional parameter in twentieth-century structural re-modelling, the contextual reinterpretation of Schenker's functional descriptions in an expressive sense⁶ would necessitate study of far more musical material than is analysed here⁷. A purely contextual study is negated by Simpson's above-quoted statement: "what I produced are not attempts to recapture the mood of Beethoven's quartets", given the pragmatically-splintered notions of twentieth century tonality, where stylistic norms are not firmly enough established to ground a definite perceptual or semantic framework comparable to those inferable in Beethoven.⁸ By taking, then, an approach whose aim is to arrive at a pragmatic discussion of syntactic function, Simpson's organic and dynamic descriptive modes can be incorporated into the analysis by placing initial observations on harmonic, melodic and rhythmic coherence in the context of a study of their dynamic⁹ function, thereby examining the syntax of the entire expression.

The fact that a study of this size cannot possibly deal in adequate detail with the whole of each quartet, or even a whole movement, renders a semantic study largely inappropriate. As Simpson explains, an opposition of expressive emphasis exists between his quartet as a whole and Beethoven's:

".... the first movement of my Quartet is shorter than Beethoven's first movement simply because ... it is in 3/4 time instead of 4/4. In other words, there is one beat less in each bar, and so the entire movement is considerably shorter. The effect is to lighten the movement, to make it generally feel quicker and more animated in a different way. This means that whereas Beethoven put the main weight of his argument in the first movement, mine has to go the other way: it expands, and the last movement tends to be bigger and weightier than Beethoven's, which is intentionally Arcadian after the dark slow movement."¹⁰

⁵ *Semper idem sed non eodem modo* [all is the same but not in the same way], title motto from Schenker 1979.

⁶ This would appear to be an ultimate problem in, for instance Derek Puffett's study of the fugue from Tippett's Second String Quartet, see Puffet, 1984.

⁷ As is suggested in Dunsby & Stopford, 1981.

⁸ See for example Hatten, 1994. This also negates the possibilities raised by a functional systematisation such as in Meyer, 1956.

⁹ The term *dynamic* in this study refers to the function of momentum, as opposed to implications of scored volume level.

¹⁰ MacDonald, p. 13.

He goes on to elucidate another key difference between the two: the utilisation throughout his entire quartet “in a way Beethoven doesn’t entertain” of a characteristic of Beethoven’s finale, “... a very delicate contest between the very plain F major and the Dorian D minor of the Russian folk tune ...”. He describes how this governs the constitution and direction of the opening theme, and further states: “The whole thing builds up in a more ambiguous way than with Beethoven. ... that is the basic difference from which the rest of the work develops.”¹¹

In this more narrow context then, the question of expressive significance of structural manipulation is then virtually impossible to consider appropriately. This study will instead provide a close reading of the opening harmonic event of the Beethoven, the initial cadential unfolding, which represents a precisely identifiable sense of motion towards an orthodox harmonic goal, thus providing a strong focus for the study of Simpson’s corresponding (unorthodox) re-modelling.

¹¹ Ibid.

I. INITIAL BEETHOVEN ANALYSIS

An initial study of proportions reveals that Beethoven's first movement consists of 400 bars, of which the first 102 constitute the exposition section; Simpson's corresponding movement is 402 bars long, the exposition 102. Of this exposition, Beethoven's initial cadential approach occupies the first 18 bars, after which the tonic goal is a dotted minim; Simpson's corresponding opening lasts for 18 bars, the harmonic 'goal' chord structure(s) a further 4 crotchet beats. Thus in a pre-analytical way, the proportions can be seen to be virtually identical.

As can be seen from ex. 1, Beethoven's cadential approach is divided clearly into four segments, the fourth of which is elongated through the final cadence – the proportions of this opening then comprise 4+4+4+(4 (+2)) bars. The material as a whole will be referred to by bar numbers (i.e. in the Beethoven, 1-19); the sections identified within are numbered chronologically, and are referred to as sections 1-4 as in ex. 1; bars 17-19 are designated as part of section 4, but are referred to individually as the *final extension*; the term *segments* will then refer to further divisions within the four sections. Finally, the term dynamic is somewhat problematic in this context, referring to both indications of scored volume, and also forward movement for which it is probably the best descriptive term. For this reason, the term will be italicised when referring to movement.

Large Structural Divisions

Harmonically, as has been stated above, and by Simpson¹², bars 1-19 represent a prolongation of a $I^6_4-V^7-I$ cadence in F.

Rhythmically, as is clear from ex. 1, it consists of a statement and three repetitions of the initial rhythmic phrase, the third repetition (section 4) containing in itself a double repetition of its final semibreve before the arrival on the dotted minim goal. This forms the basis of the above-stated proportions and brings to light that the large rhythm is non-developmental, serving primarily to elucidate the pitch divisions. The harmonic structure is broadly twofold, the division occurring halfway (without taking into account the proportional asymmetry present via the *final extension*), where the harmony shifts from the implied I to V^7 . Within this

¹² "If you listen to the opening of the Beethoven you will hear how the second violin and the viola are playing in thirds, while the 'cello plays his plain F major theme underneath it. The effect is like a sustained, extended 6/4 chord of F; there's no real doubt about where the tonality is going to go." Ibid.

Ex. 1

- 1a. Arrival at chordal root ($I_4^6-5_3$)
- b. Arrival at chordal root ($V_4^6-5_3$)

- 2a. Melodic tone which constitutes bass of chord.
- b. Melodic tone which constitutes bass of chord.
- c. Melodic tone which constitutes octave doubling of bass.
- d. Melodic tone does not double bass.
- e. Melodic tone which constitutes octave doubling of bass.

- 3a. Registral span of 1 octave including 3 pitches, 2 pitch classes.
- b. Registral span of 5 octaves including 6 pitches, 3 pitch classes.

- 4a. Addition of accompanimental tone.
- b. Addition of accompanimental tone.
- c. Lack of expected accompanimental addition.
- d. Registral expansion through voice exchange.
- e. Registral expansion and addition of 2 accompanimental tones.
- f. Registral contraction and reduction of 1 accompanimental tone.

- 5a. Prolonged melodic tone constitutes dominant tone.
- b. Prolonged melodic tone constitutes tonic.
- c. Prolonged melodic tone constitutes melodic appoggiatura.
- d. Prolonged melodic tone constitutes resolvable, non-triadic seventh.

- 6a. Neighbour-note construction, central melodic polarity, enforces dominant-tonic ambiguity.
- bi. Neighbour-note construction, arpeggiates harmony to root position.
- bii. Neighbour-note construction, forms 2nd inversion bass of shifted dominant harmony.
- ci. Neighbour-note construction, forms small-scale melodic downward appoggiatura, larger scale upward prolongation to dominant tone, thus continuing prolonged melodic arpeggiation.
- cii. resolution of ci.
- di. Neighbour-note construction, forms chordal seventh which requires small scale downward resolution, and constitutes larger scale prolongation through upward resolution to tonic, thus completing prolonged melodic arpeggiation.
- dii. resolution of di.

The image shows a handwritten musical score for piano, consisting of four sections. Each section is written on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs).
 - **Section 1 (Bars 1-4):** Starts with a piano (*p*) dynamic and a *mf dolce* marking. The melody in the right hand is characterized by a long, sustained note in the bass register. The left hand provides a simple accompaniment. A box labeled '2a' is placed under the final note of the first section.
 - **Section 2 (Bars 5-8):** Features a *cresc.* (crescendo) marking. The melody continues with similar characteristics. A box labeled '2b' is placed under the final note of the second section.
 - **Section 3 (Bars 9-12):** Starts with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The melody shows more movement. A box labeled '2c' is placed under the final note of the third section.
 - **Section 4 (Bars 13-19):** Includes *cresc*, *sf*, *pif*, *f*, and *ff* markings. The melody becomes more complex and dynamic. A box labeled '2d' is placed under the final note of the fourth section, which is labeled 'final extension'.
 The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, accents, and dynamic markings.

broad bi-partite shape, the harmony of section 2, as a result of the melody being in the bass, incorporates a brief arrival via inversion at root position in bar 6 (ex. 1a). A parallel can be drawn with the inversion of V^6_4 to root at a proportionally similar moment in the final extension, bar 17 (see ex. 1.1b). The latter completes a sense of balance between the second inversion tonic and dominant prolongations, and their respective root positions via a voice exchange which in this sense mirrors the harmonic movement of bar 6. The sectional melodic divisions correlate with the rhythmic structure; however, two distinct quasi-structural shapes are distinguishable through their differing properties:

1. Of the four sections, 2 & 3 are melodically identical (but span the harmonic divide) and are at different registers, while the fourth is intervallically identical to 2 & 3 but begins on a different scale degree – each of sections 2, 3, & 4 then, is melodically a variant of both the chronologically previous, and section 1, providing a broadly developmental melodic structure.

2. The four sections can be divided into two further melodic groups, where sections 1 & 2 contain no significant rhythmically accented appoggiaturas but the harmonic shift transforms the first long rhythmic note each of 3 & 4 (see ex. 1.5c & d) into non-triadic tones which require resolution.

Texturally, the piece expands from the opening to the closing moments in terms of register and in density of voicing (see ex. 1.3). The opening of bar 1 spans one octave which consists of three pitches and two pitch classes; the tonic of bar 19 spans five octaves and consists of six pitches and three pitch classes. The expansions in textural density (i.e. added accompanimental tones) occur in section 3, on the first and last crotchet beats (see ex. 1.4), and in bar 18; the one reduction in accompanimental pitches is then encountered between bars 18 and 19. Identifiable also are several somewhat less concrete textural events. The addition of bar 9 could in effect be identified in the preceding bar, as the melodic G of bar 8 and the accompanimental addition of bar 9 occupy the same pitch. This is affirmed also through the *sfp* of bar 8, and would correlate with the textural addition of section 3; mention should also be made of the final extension, where the first of the two harmonies before the tonic goal (bar 17) is registrally expanded by way of a voice exchange, and the second (bar 18) is expanded through both register and textural addition.

Small Structural Divisions

The rhythm of each section (excluding the *final extension*) can, informed by the above proportional observations, be identified as a developmental bi-partite structure: the divisions can themselves be divided into two segmental categories, of long and short durations (see ex. 3.1). The segmental construction can be seen to be based on a four crotchet-semibreve pattern; this is, however, never fully achieved

in context, as the pattern is disrupted through the dotted minim-quaver elaboration in the second and third segments, before returning to complete the pattern in its original form. Each melodic section has several key points in common:

1. Firstly, in correlation with the small rhythmic segmentation, each represents a bi-partite structure, where the second division represents an elaboration of the first. This is manifest through a registral expansion as each section contains the expansion through the first and second segment of a perfect fourth to a major sixth – within this is however a subtle shift in expressive emphasis between section 1 & sections 2, 3 & 4 ascertainable through the following observations.

2. Each section contains a distinct structural pitch balance or polarity. In correlation with point 1 of the large scale observations, that of section 1 is in the centre, where the central C represents a triadic division of the octave and is emphasised through neighbour-notes. The following three sections display a different neighbour-note emphasis: the registral expansions can be seen as prolonged neighbouring note constructions, operating at the extremes of the sectional registers – these extremes are also emphasised through contiguous neighbour-notes. This can be seen to represent a large scale expansion from one pitch centre (section 1) to two (sections 2, 3 & 4).

3. The ascertainable 1+3 shape is complemented by examining the final notes of each section, the first, second and third of which all double the bass of the 6/4 harmony, while the fourth falls on scale degree 1 of the 6/4, providing a 3+1 shape (see ex. 1.2).

4. Finally, each of the four sections retains the initial upwards motion by step of a perfect fourth; this is reflected in the final extension which itself represents the same perfect fourth in terms of pitch (although at a higher register) as the opening. This, together with the total stepwise coverage (again, excluding registral concerns) of an octave through the four sections, provides a cyclic quality to the whole.

Thus already the dominance of harmonic concerns can be established, as two conflicting melodic shapes are determined by taking the four melodic sections firstly in abstraction, and secondly in interaction with the tonic-dominant structural pattern of the harmony. This crucial feature will be seen to determine also the momentum-giving functions of the above small scale observations in the following *dynamic* context.

II. BEETHOVEN ANALYSIS IN CONTEXT

This analysis of the same material then, takes into account the observations previously outlined, but focuses on significance arising from issues concerning dynamism and tension, i.e. from a more perceptual viewpoint.

Large Structural Divisions

As before, the large rhythm, via its repetitive and non-developmental nature, serves largely to facilitate the other aspects. This point is emphasised by observing a distinction between melody and accompaniment, which brings to light the lack of any operative sectional divisions in the rhythmic accompaniment (any divisions therefore arising from other concerns). The salience of the large scale harmonic structure here correlates with the previous discussion. The twofold division of tonic 6/4 to dominant becomes a tension-building progression and the further elaborative parallel between the 2nd inversion and root position harmonies outlined previously can also be emphasised here: the arrival of the cello part on the root in section 2, thus inverting the 6/4 chord, while although perhaps stabilising the harmony by moving from an 'unfinished' to a 'complete' chordal unit, cannot really be considered a resolution, due to a lack of intrinsic harmonic necessity to pass from a 6/4 tonic to root position. Add to this the registral issue of the F of bar 6 falling between the prolonged C of bar 4 and G of 8, and the description of a tonicising passing chord becomes more accurate. Similarly, the voice exchange in the final extension has the effect not of resolving the dominant chord, but of emphasising the cadence and the ensuing tonic harmony. Despite this being the more hierarchically prominent harmony, it still contains some sense of passing here, in much the same way as the upper melody in the same segment. Thus the tonic root arrival of bar 6 through a combination of the above, and a non-correlation with the small rhythmic structure (the root position chord coincides with the beginning of the disruptive elaboration, see previous chapter) cannot be seen as climactic; the corresponding inversion of bar 17 is a more powerful climactic precursor through expected correlation with the large rhythmic climax (completion of the 4 by 4 phrase structure), and the registral expansion and increase in dynamic markings. This all provides a focus of tension, culminative in the interaction of the earlier inversional device's repetition with the increase in tension through harmonic and chronological concerns, where the climax is delayed only via the double melodic appoggiatura. Thus, appoggiaturas aside, the final extension incorporating the ultimate cadence provides the only tangible instance of resolution in bars 1-19.

The prolongational qualities of arpeggiation intrinsic in the large scale melody (see ex. 3.3) become highly significant in terms of momentum. This is elaborated by the appoggiaturas, which take on added significance in this context – the appoggiatura in bar 10 (ex. 1.5c), as has been stated, was made functional by the shift in the underlying harmony. This serves to emphasise the need for ultimate resolution (inherent obviously in bars 1-19 as a whole), as what was the harmonic root arrived at through arpeggiation in the previous statement (section 2, bar 6) now becomes a propelling device through transformation into a 4-3 appoggiatura. Due to the nature of the large-scale prolonged harmony, in combination with additive textural concerns (see previous chapter), neither of the prolonged appoggiaturas (F-G section 3, B-C section 4) can be interpreted as a complete or closed harmonic event until the final extension, and cadential arrival on the tonic F. Thus in prolongational combination, they achieve larger scale momentum towards ultimate resolution.

Through the textural concerns, can be traced a subtle manipulation of the large scale interaction between harmony and rhythm. The first major textural shift, between sections 2 & 3, (ex. 1.4a) correlates broadly with the harmonic structure. As the melody shifts to the upper voice, the accompanying harmony takes on greater *dynamic* emphasis, by way of firstly, the achievement of a stable and explicit harmonic root (that of the V^7_4 with its *dynamic* as opposed to arpeggiative implications); secondly, the establishment of a stable, close, accompanimental texture via the addition of third accompanimental tone – this is emphasised by the upward shift of the melody to a contrasting register and timbre, thus making clearer the distinction between melody and accompaniment which in turn emphasises the continuous quaver pulse. The second textural shift achieves a dynamism through what can be termed the textural rhythm. A metric syncopation is created by the addition of a fourth accompanimental tone in bar 12, the final bar of section 3 (ex. 1.4b), preceding the metric divide by one bar. Thus the correlation with bar 8, which in turn correlates with the harmony (counterpointed by the actual textural addition in the following bar) establishes a pattern through the interaction of textural addition and metre. The expected repetition in the corresponding part of section 4 does not occur, enhancing a *dynamic* expectancy which is emphatically fulfilled in the following bar, the first of the final extension.

Small Structural Divisions

In this context, the properties of each section's initial rhythmic segmental category (of short durations) and the second category (of long durations) can be seen to translate into *dynamic* and static qualities respectively. The phrasing of these sections corresponds with the metre (ex. 3.5): the first and second bars (of each section) represent one phrase each, the fourth consists of one note, while the third consists

of slurred, then staccato, then slurred staccato, couplets, but still falling within the bar. Similarly, the contour of each bar is also uni-directional. This principle of the slurs mirroring the contour is consistent through section 1, as displayed in the first bar; after this, the significance of the long central C in bar 2 is underlined through the slurring of each of its neighbour notes, a phrase which runs across the bar line to the second crotchet beat of bar 3, disrupting to some extent the metre. The natural metric accent at the start of bar 3 (whose counterpart in bar 7 represents the start of the climax through arpeggiation of the first two sections) still operates to some extent, as the B neighbour presents a more powerful dissonance than the preceding D; however this accent serves to check rather than precipitate forward motion, as it is slurred and thus subordinated ultimately to, the prolonged dotted minim C of the previous bar. The following instance of this provides a break also in the downward contour leading to the registral expansion to a major sixth. The differing neighbour-note structures in correlation with the phrasing then, become significant in terms of momentum: in sections 2,3 & 4, the phrasing correlates with the metre in preference to the rhythmic paradigms of ex. 3.1. In section 1, the phrasing emphasises the central neighbour-note structure in preference to the metre.

The dynamism of section 3 arises primarily from a powerful appoggiatura in the upper voice (F, bar 10) which demands immediate (foreground) resolution, followed by the above-mentioned textural syncopation in bar 12, all this in combination with repetition (of the previous section's melody) and therefore inherent expectation. The fourth section's appoggiatura, being a doubling of a note already present in the accompaniment is not so operative in terms of momentum, and with no increase in the texture until the final extension, the dynamism here can be said to result from the sequential nature of the melody rather than small-scale harmonic concerns.

As has been outlined, the opening as a whole represents a prolongation of a $I_4^6-V^7-I$ cadence, incorporating increase in dynamics and registral breadth, the climactic point being the final root position V^7 harmony of bar 18. Within these broad descriptions, a subtle network of *dynamic* devices is in operation, combining all the above compositional facets in both large and small scales:

Due to the fluctuating harmonic effects which result from the placing of the melody in the bass at the opening (i.e. section 1) combined with the need to establish a tonality, the melodic harmony is overtly triadic. The melody is marked *mf e dolce* in contrast to the accompaniment which is marked simply *p*. The only hint at harmonic or metric disruption is the neighbour note B in bar 3, which produces a momentary vertical dissonance on a rhythmically strong beat. As has been shown, the *dynamic* significance of phrasing as is manifest through sections 2-4 is not as substantially realised here due to a non-correlation of phrase and metre; the dynamism of the accompaniment is subordinated to the non-*dynamic* melody by way of *mf/p* scoring indications.

The first section, through its melodic polarity manifest through its particular neighbour-note structure, features an accented (through the extended durations)

return to C and thus unresolved 6/4 harmony. The only extensive tonic note in the melody/bass (and thus tonic harmony), of bars 1-8, the F of bar 6 has been shown to function primarily as a passing chord due to: the directional impetus (through the phrase markings elucidating melodic direction); the expansion of pitch collection from the first to second half of the section (spanning a perfect fourth to a major sixth) implicit in which is an upward directional impetus, realised from section 2 onwards between the upper tones of the collection (F bar 6, G bar 8); and the lack of any cadential structure to emphasise the tonic as a goal, as the prolonged harmonies represent different inversions of the tonic chord. Further to this, the final harmony of the first eight bars is the shift to the prolonged V^7 2nd inversion, which also represents a reduction in dynamic markings from *mf cresc* to *p*. This checks any momentum achieved through the (rather predominantly textural) appoggiatura G-A of bar 7. Thus, primarily through the technique of inversion in combination with dynamic markings, the initial tonic harmony is denied its full impact, as is the ensuing V^7 which is prolonged over a longer period (some 11 bars) than would probably be suitable at this stage of the piece in its root position.

Bars 9-18 are developmental texturally as opposed to harmonically, the harmony being a comparatively stable dominant 7th. The harmonic shift between sections 2 & 3, transforms the prolonged melodic F of bar 10, from being a stable harmonic moment, as in section 2, to a non-harmonic tone that requires resolution. The melodic C of bar 16 is the only final sectional tone not to be the root or the doubling of the root of the underlying harmony, thus the extended melodic appoggiaturas of the final extension, bars 18-19, complement the inversion and perfect cadence of the harmony by completing the melodic cycle and resolving the pattern of octave doublings on goal tones. The dynamic markings here are significant, in comparison with those sections 1 & 2. As has been examined, the registral shift in the melody at bar 9 emphasises somewhat the momentum of the accompaniment by placing it in a separate register. The melody here is marked at the same dynamic level, thus in effect marking up the accompaniment and further emphasising it. The crescendo begins here with section 4, i.e. from bar 13, and rather than being checked with a sudden *piano* (as in bar 8), it is further enforced with each bar of the final extension, *sf* (in the melody, emphasising the harmonic clash through the appoggiatura), *più f*, and finally *ff* at the tonic arrival. This regularity of crescendo indications serves to highlight the irregularity of the same in bars 1-8, where the crescendo begins on the second bar of the second phrase, and is checked in the final bar of the same phrase, giving the effect of a disruptive swell as opposed to measured climax. In this respect, the textural syncopation instigated in bar 12, can be seen as a counterpart to the sudden *p* of bar 8, given the two phrases' identical melodic material.

The first half of section 3 (bars 8-9) can be seen to be more melodically *dynamic* than the second (bars 10-11), where the rhythmically accented notes are all contained in the harmony; the dynamism in the second half therefore arises mainly

from the textural addition. The fourth section (without the *final extension*) represents a check in momentum in terms of the above: the first half (bars 13-14), as with the second half of the previous section, contains no rhythmically accented non-harmonic pitches; this changes in the second half (bars 15-16), but the quaver pulse of the ascending line here correlates with the accompaniment, rather than reacting against it, thus rendering the appoggiaturas less *dynamic*. The prolonged B of bar 14 performs a similar but lesser function to its counterpart of bar 10, being a seventh; this, while not being a stable triadic element, does not however necessitate immediate resolution. The momentum here arises from a learned expectancy, that of sequential repetition; this is the second repetition of the same melodic pattern, but achieves an increase in intensity due to the increase in pitch, dynamics (the *cresc.* is marked at the beginning of the section), and textural density through the accompaniment. Essentially, no new devices are introduced in this section, the dynamism resulting through received expectations from previous sections facilitated via the regularity of rhythm, phrasing and melodic pattern.

The final extension alongside the harmonic qualities outlined above, uses primarily textural devices to increase tension prior to the resolution. The accompanimental harmony has through its build-up displayed a certain tonal symmetry, the ultimate dominant seventh chord being arranged in inversion as the verticalisation of two thirds, major on minor. This symmetry is exploited in the final two bars, firstly in bar 17 by way of a voice exchange, which broadens the register by verticalising fifths (in the 2nd violin and cello), creating greater resonance through stronger intervallic consonance, and intensity through double-stopping; secondly, in bar 18, through the return to the closed texture of the initial dominant seventh (although here in root position), in the two middle parts, and double-stopped octaves of the root and the third, above and beneath in the 1st violin and cello. These, through their octave doubling, and separation from the rest of the texture, emphasise the harmonic and melodic concerns which each demand separate though not unconnected resolution.

In summary, then, bars 9-18 make play texturally and melodically of the need for resolution inherent in the underlying harmony. Bars 1-8 in opposition, display something of a harmonic flux due to the uniquely unstable 6/4 tonic implications which through implied harmonic arpeggiation and non-correlation of firstly, phrase and metric structure (bars 2-3) and when this is achieved, dynamic markings and phrase structure, never achieve resolution. Thus, broadly it can be concluded that bars 1-8 contain less momentum, due to the dynamism being manifest largely through inversional, thus non-specifically directional harmonic shifts, whereas the second half exploits extensive textural tension-building devices, over a forwardly-motivated dominant seventh harmony.

III. INITIAL SIMPSON ANALYSIS

As referred to in the introduction, Simpson provides a cursory description of the initial thematic qualities of each piece, the full context of which is as follows:

“... the very first theme of the first movement of this [Simpson’s] Quartet oscillates between F and D. If you listen to the opening of the Beethoven, you will hear how the second violin and the viola are playing in thirds, while the ‘cello plays his plain F major theme underneath it. The effect is like a sustained, extended 6/4 chord of F; there’s no real doubt about where the tonality is going to go. Now, Beethoven makes that plain F major and what I have done in this case is, instead of putting a simple third on the two other instruments against the ‘cello, I have made a simple change to accompany the ‘cello – an A and a G which immediately suggest the possibility of D minor. If you listened to the ‘cello, you will see that he very soon does a little twist out of F and back again, and the same thing happens when the violin comes in. The whole thing builds up in a more ambiguous way than with Beethoven.”

Thus Simpson elucidates the key point that governs virtually every aspect of his analogical composition – the difference in his and Beethoven’s tonality as an expressive and structural force. Whatever the complications inherent in Beethoven’s first eight bars, as Simpson says, there is ‘no real doubt’ about the direction of Beethoven’s harmony through its prolonged cadential structure. In this sense, Simpson’s language represents the opposite view, as his direction hinges upon ‘doubt’ through ambiguity as the presiding governing premise. This is observable on the broadest scale from the prolongational diagram, ex. 2.12 where the goal harmony consists of G-A-D-E, a firmly non-triadic entity. By examination of bars 19-20, it is apparent that the ‘cadence’ consists of three identifiable chordal structures, rather than the single tonic of the Beethoven. Thus Beethoven’s harmony here is essentially a dual structure, consisting of the distinct tonic and dominant polarities, which share between them only one pitch, the dominant root. Simpson’s harmony, as will be elucidated, does not contain this structure-defining property; his goal harmony is arrived at through a non-triadic, additive method, which places an onus on the melody as a force which governs harmony in its own right through its horizontal movement, rather than reacting with the vertical concerns to produce *dynamic* linear necessity of motion (through resolution of dissonance), as with Beethoven’s. Thus in the following analysis, labels pertaining to represented tonalities in the Simpson will be suggested; however, the function of his harmonic

Ex. 2

The image shows a handwritten musical score for Ex. 2, consisting of two systems of staves. The top system is labeled 'Allegro (d. = c. 52)' and includes dynamics such as 'mf' and 'cresc.'. It features a series of notes with various markings, including circled numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) and boxed numbers (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20). The bottom system is labeled 'And. sostenuto' and includes dynamics like 'f' and 'p'. It also features circled numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) and boxed numbers (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20). The score is annotated with various symbols and markings, including 'SECTION 1', 'SECTION 2', and 'SECTION 3'. A legend at the bottom right explains the symbols: a circled number for 'GREATER HARMONIC CONTRADICTION' and a boxed number for 'LESSER HARMONIC CONTRADICTION'. The staves are numbered 1 through 20 at the bottom.

Allegro (d. = c. 52)

mf

cresc.

SECTION 1

SECTION 2

SECTION 3

And. sostenuto

f

p

GREATER HARMONIC CONTRADICTION

LESSER HARMONIC CONTRADICTION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

- 1 a. accompanimental tie missing - pattern stretches across metre.
b. accompanimental ties missing - pattern stretches across metre.
c. accompanimental ties missing - pattern falls within metre.
d. All accompanimental ties missing.

- 2 Unique rhythmic material.

- 3 a. Textural expansion through accompanimental addition.
b. Textural expansion through chordal inversion.
c. Textural expansion through accompanimental addition.
d. Textural expansion through melodic trill.
e. Textural expansion through two accompanimental additions.

- 4 a. Pitch collection from section 1: 8 pitches, 1 chromatic alteration.
b. Pitch collection from section 2: 9 pitches, 2 chromatic alterations.
c. Pitch collection from section 3: 9 pitches, 2 chromatic alterations.
d. Pitch collection from section 4: 7 pitches, no chromatic alterations.

- 5 a. Registral span of 22 semitones, including 3 pitches.
b. Registral span of 33 semitones, including 8 pitches, 4 pitch classes.

- 6 a. Initial generative 4-note [0135] motif.
b. Altered elided repetition.
c. Altered repetition.
d. Altered elided repetition.
e. Altered repetition.
f. Altered elided repetition.
g. Altered repetition.

7. Repetition of pitch sequence.

- 8 a. Quaver ascent. Note correlation in dynamics.
b. Quaver ascent.
c. Quaver ascent.

- 9 a. Closural octave descent
b. Expanded closural octave descent.

- 10a. Closural motive.
b. Closural motive, 1st and 2nd pitches retrograded.
c. Closural motive as at b.
d. Closural motive as at b.

- 11a. Opening [02] statement.
b. Harmonically contradictory [02] statement.
c. Metrically disruptive [02] statement.
d. Harmonically disruptive [02] statement.
e. Harmonically disruptive [02] statement.

12. Prolongational model.

motion, with particular reference to the manipulative force of motive, will be examined in the following chapter.

From even a cursory examination of his opening, the perceptible complexity of harmony, rhythm and phrase structure can be seen to be significantly greater than in the Beethoven. However, the opening 20 bars of Simpson's quartet can still be convincingly divided into four broad sections of similar duration: section 1, bars 1-4, section 2, 5-8, section 3, 9-13 and section 4, 14-16. As in the Beethoven, the *final extension* is technically included in section 4, but will be referred to in its own right, constituting bars 17-20 (ex. 2).

Large Structural Divisions

Rhythmically, the opening is developmental, both in terms of accompaniment and melody. The accompaniment consists largely of regular crotchet durations. These begin on the second quaver beat and are thus formed from pairs of tied quavers which run across the metre in a syncopated manner. This regularity is punctuated by four occasions in which the ties are not present, and the quavers marked staccato. As can be seen from ex. 2.1, these are developmental in that the amount of single quavers increases in each occasion. They also occur in pairs – the first pair in section 1 on quavers 12 & 13 and then 22, 23, 24 & 25, thus at the middle and the end of the section, each occupying the first quaver of the following bar. The next occurrence is at the close of section 3, occupying firstly quavers 26, 27, 28 & 29 of section 3 and then 8-17 of 4. These can both be construed as occurring at the close of each section (although that of section 4 runs almost throughout), and both fall within the metre, thereby constituting a shift in metric emphasis with the first pair on both large and small scales. The extension to section 4 consists almost exclusively of single staccato quavers, the tie over bars 16-17 suggesting a repeat of 15-16, although significantly the last quaver of bar 18 (before the harmonic goal) is not tied.

The rhythmic and melodic elements combine in such a way that separation into distinct sections is not generally straightforward. However, taking into account the slurring indications brings a clarity of phrasing to bear, and makes the fourfold sectional structure apparent. Of these four sections, section 2 can be seen as developmental of section 1, and three and four can then be seen to constitute a further re-organisation of one and two. Although developmental, only section 1 contains unique rhythmic material which is not repeated in its initial form (ex. 2.2). Of note also, is the fact that not until the final extension is a dotted value found in the melody, the previous material consisting exclusively of quavers, crotchets and minims. In terms of pitch, the accompaniment falls into two broad sections where sections 1 & 2 are accompanied by a G and A, after which at bar 9, a D is added (ex. 2.3). In the melody, three distinct pitch collections are identifiable from, respec-

tively, section 1, sections 2 & 3, and section 4 (including the final extension). Given that the melody of sections 1 & 2 span octaves, and in 3 & 4, the final notes are accentuated in a goal-orientated manner, the prolongational model of ex. 2.5 is observable in the opening, showing the final chord to be achieved through a symmetrical path. The registral divide¹³ after section 2 serves to give some sense of harmonic stability due to a thickening of accompanimental texture which now forms the bass of the harmony. Analysing the four melodic collections, it can be observed that they each form a type of mode, the first containing eight pitches, the second nine, and the third seven. This discrepancy results from chromatic alterations of the seven basic pitches where the first set contains one, between F and F[#], the second and third two, F-F[#] and also B-B[#], while the fourth contains none. In the context of the piece, these alterations take the form of melodic contradictions – thus section 3 contains three contradictions, while sections 1 & 2 produce two contradictions from each pair, thus section one contains 2, and section 2 four. These can be further categorised as greater and lesser contradictions, the greater contradictions being identifiable when the conflicting notes are chronologically separated by a single pitch. As can be seen from ex. 2, sections 1& 2 derive from each chromatic alteration one greater and one lesser melodic contradiction. Analysing section 3 reveals that despite being identical to section 2 in its abstract collection, there are only three actual melodic contradictions in context, and just one of these can be considered greater according to the above criterion; moreover, this is accented less due to the separating tone being of a minim's duration, and a difference in note values between the contradictory tones as they are articulated as part of separate phrases; section 4 obviously contains no such contradictions. Two quasi-structural broad melodic shapes are discernible in bars 1-16:

1. In terms of melodic register, contour, and rhythm, the sections are divided thus: the first and third feature a rise in contour followed by a staccato octave descent to the initial register, the third through an enlarged registral span, while the second and fourth each rise through two octaves, and are virtually uni-directional. The second and fourth also consist rhythmically of exclusively crotchets and quavers.

2. The distribution of melodic tensions correlates with that of the registral shift, in that here, the first two sections are distinct from the third and fourth. Similarly, the first two sections begin and end on octave equivalents, while the third and fourth both finish on the octave equivalent of an ascending major sixth.

As has been stated, the sectional construction is here determined largely by the rhythmic and phrasing considerations; texturally, the bars 1-20 can be seen as a registral ascent followed by an elaborative cadence. An increase in both registral

¹³ This is referred to as such, for ease of comparison with the Beethoven, although it more accurately constitutes the unbroken continuation of the melodic ascent, resulting in its climbing above the accompaniment in register.

span, from 21 semitones at the opening (ex. 2.5a) to 33 at bar 20 (ex. 2.5b), and in density where the opening contains three notes and three pitches, and bar 20 6 notes and 4 pitches, can be ascertained. The textural additions occur between sections 2 & 3, where a third tone is added to the accompaniment (ex. 2.3a), and in the final extension where the initial two accompanimental tones are doubled at the upper octave (ex. 2.3c) – the final addition can be read as the trill in bar 18 (ex. 2.3d). A further broad pattern also exists in the registral interaction of the melody and accompaniment in that the melodies in sections 2 & 3, in correlation with their pitch set properties, both cross registers with the accompaniment.

Small Structural Divisions

Melodically, each section has a strongly developmental character –

1. The pitch collection, or $\#$ mode of section 1 when arranged from C to C $i\#$ divided equally by the tritone F ; in the context of the actual piece, this dividing F occupies also the middle temporal position, and also represents the only greater harmonic contradiction. Motivically, three segments can be identified within the section. The initial phrase represents the first motif (ex. 2.6a), the final note of which is also the first of its (elided) altered repetition (ex. 2.6b). This is altered due to the establishment of an orthodox F major tonality in bars 3 & 4, of which bar 4 represents a closural segment. Thus the governing priority of the harmony can be construed as being the tonal centre as opposed to intervallic symmetry, which although is present, takes a subsidiary role.

2. A greater directional impetus is identifiable in this section, due to the increased registral coverage of two octaves as opposed to one. The initial phrase is reorganised through shifted rhythmic emphasis which correlates more closely with the metre, and extension of the phrase to include the first six tones. The remainder of the section takes the form of an ascending quaver ascent – the closural motif is also identifiable here through rhythmic and intervallic ordering, although the octave descent is missing, and the first two pitches are retrograded (ex. 2.10a & b). This ascent correlates functionally if not temporally with the rhythmic re-organisation, in that the accelerando effect is achieved in tandem through the regulating of the rhythmic units into crotchets (the first eight tones) followed by quavers. The previous tonal properties of F major are challenged (although not fully usurped) after the initial phrase, through B harmonic contradictions, and the quaver ascent (ex. 2.8a) which affirms the octave of D suggested via the phrasing indications at the start of the section. Thus this ascent differs from its counterpart in bars 3-4 by affirming direction rather than tonality which due to the chromaticism is here necessarily ambiguous.

Inherent in the melodic qualities of the first eight bars are manipulations of the opening motivic shape [0135]. These patterns run across the phrase and estab-

lished sectional structure. After the first eleven pitches, the sequence is repeated (see ex. 2.7), taking account the retrogradation of G and A in bar 6, for the first seven pitches, after which the remaining scalic ascent to the closural motif can be extensively divided into [0135] segments. Again, the modal harmonic qualities accommodate to some extent both tonality and symmetry.

3. Section 3 opens with the [0135] motif similarly to section 1, again with an altered repetition (see ex. 2.6c & d). While the scalic ascent (ex. 2.8b) is similar to section 2, the closural motif (ex. 2.9b) is a registral extension of that seen in section 1 (ex. 2.9a). This is significant in two ways: firstly, it retains the prolongational properties of the first section, where the final octave repetitions serve to highlight a prominent existing tone, here the B from bar 10, rather than form the directional goal of the melodic line – similarly, when viewed in combination with the underlying harmony, they can be seen to affirm a (this time G minor) tonality; secondly, and partly resultantly, the pitches from the scalic ascent and the closural motif in section 3 are identical to those in the scalic ascent of section 2, providing a sense of tangible repetition without introducing new harmonic material but still continuing the chronological development.

4. Section 4 retains the idea of the extended opening phrase from section 2. The scalic ascent is that encountered in the previous two sections, retaining the directional quality again of section 2, where the scalic ascent and the closural motif together span an octave. Thus essentially, the fourth section represents a truncated repetition of the third, via omission of the sixth and seventh pitches, and is transposed up a perfect fourth. It is not a direct transposition, however due to the B of bar 16, and thus invites sequential interpretations. Due to the lack of harmonic contradictions a further possible tonal shift can be ascertained, to A minor (this is enhanced somewhat by the accompanimental doublings).

Sections 3 & 4, due to the disruption of the four-bar phrase structure vary their counterparts 1 & 2 in different ways – each displays the basic motivic features, yet while section 3 is broadly an extension of 1, repeating the initial motif rhythmically, while still retaining the minim, and extending the closural motif, section 4 represents a truncation of the notions of section 2, the scalic ascent being elided with the initial motif. This highlights a similarity with section 1, where in order to complete the initial motivic repetition, elision with the ensuing material is necessary. Thus each section in turn can be seen as separately developmental of all previous sections, while retaining a presiding developmental contiguity achieved through combination of the above and the tonality. A separately identifiable aspect of this is the 'sequential' nature of the scalic ascents in sections 2, 3 & 4, which each begin and end on different pitches.

IV. SIMPSON ANALYSIS IN CONTEXT

Perhaps Beethoven's broadest compositional distinction that can be identified in this context is that between harmony and texture. As has been ascertained, the key point with respect to this is bar 8, where a registral shift in the melody to the upper voice slows the harmonic rhythm, and leads to a textural exploitation of the tension-forming dominant seventh harmony.

In Simpson's opening, a division halfway into two sections can be made, but the textural/harmonic opposition is not operative. The melodic cycle is continuous, i.e. there is no registral gap between sections 2 & 3 as in the Beethoven. Similarly, there is no direct repetition of melodic phrase – as has been shown, the repetition between sections 2 & 3 is of the pitch collection, where sections 2 & 3 contain the most different pitches, and thus the most contradictions. However, the manipulations of this collection can be seen to differ *motivically*. Each of the four sections can be divided into two, where the first half contains crotchet (and minim) manipulations of the opening [0135] shape. In sections 1 & 2, the predominant interval in these manipulations is the major second, characterised specifically in the tritones between the C's of bars 1 & 4 and F's[#] of bars 2 & 6. Taking [02] itself as a motif, occurring firstly in bars 1 & 3 (C-D, E-F), it can be seen in section 2 to shift the metric emphasis across the bar. In this section, there are three motivic occurrences of the interval (bars 4(3)-5(1), 5(3)-6(1), 6(3)-7(1)), all of which provide an upward-moving¹ harmonic momentum, the first two in the same way as in section 1, while the A-B extends this by contradicting the received harmonic centre of the mode whose properties were firmly established in bars 3(2)-4. Finally the major second motif is present in, indeed forms the basis of, the accompaniment. This motif is not so frequent in the second half, sections 3 & 4, to the extent that it is noteworthy only by its absence. It can be found in the opening two notes of each section, bars 9 & 14, and although still present in the accompaniment, it forms part of a three-note chordal structure.

The dynamic markings, as in the Beethoven are important here. In the first two sections, they emphasise the reworking of the initial pitch collection in opposition to the phrase structure, by beginning a crescendo at the start of the second section (although this is not strictly at the beginning of the second pitch collection, its marking one beat late is probably more of a performance-oriented positioning in correlation with the phrase structure), and ending immediately after its *forte* culmination with the beginning of the quaver ascent through the D spans (see ex. 2.8a).

The function of the major second motif provides a key to understanding Simpson's analogical re-workings of Beethoven's harmonic/textural divide

between bars 8-9. The motif can be seen as a primarily contradictory device through the following examples:

- A contradictory reading is obviously not strictly applicable to the opening two notes of the piece, (ex. 2.11a) although the premise of establishing an opposite identity (the function of a contradiction) still applies.

- The second occurrence in bar 2 (ex. 2.11b) correlates with the first greater melodic contradiction and can also be seen to contradict the established crotchet pattern as well as the metre.

- The third and fourth occurrences (ex. 2.11c & d) contradict the phrase structure by retaining (almost) the motivic shape of the first two bars while contradicting them metrically. Harmonically, as has been stated, the tonal centre of the first section and also then the harmonic rhythm is contradicted with the B of bar 7.

Thus it can be seen that sections 1 & 2 are in a state of flux in terms of metre and harmony, primarily through the function of the [02] motive. Add to this that the lower octave C in bar 4 can then be interpreted not as a closural registral regression but the beginning of a fresh ascent, and a strong directional impetus is identified.

Section 3, then, contains only one instance of the [02] motive (ex. 2.11e), and this is contradictory only in the sense of the establishment of a new section. This section displays the first correlation between pitch-motive and phrase structure in bars 8-10(2). Similarly, the melodic rhythm is entirely consistent with the metre, as opposed to section 1. Significantly, there are no melodic contradictions until the quaver ascent at (10(3)). This ascent spans a diminished octave (as opposed to an octave at (7(3)-8)) thus acting as a check to the directional impetus, and ends in a staccato descent through two octaves as opposed to one at 4(2-3) – here, due to correlation of phrase and pitch-motive, there is no ambiguity concerning its closural function. The truncated Section 4 (excluding the final extension) then contains no melodic contradictions, an identical instance of the [02] motive, and the pitch ascent as in section 2, covers a clear octave. The truncation, apart from simply shortening the section has further *dynamic* effect by removing the melodic contradiction (between the sixth and eighth tones – see section 3), and also the semitone descent to the minim, which checks momentum. Thus, the correlation of rhythm and metre is retained from the third section. The final extension is here expanded from the simple D of section 2 to two pitches (E & D, see ex. 2.11f) forming once again the motif [02]. It is disruptive in terms of direction, as the added note is a lower tone, and the ultimate goal an upper F; also metrically, as the motive takes the shape of three dotted crotchet-quaver patterns, thus producing a metric hemiola effect.

The lack of the motivic [02] shape in the melody of bars 9-16 itself engenders an additional motive, that of the chromatic neighbour note. The lack of the second [02] occurrence in bar 10(2) (as opposed to its counterpart in bar 2(3)) creates a repeated G preceded by a lower neighbour. Similarly, the diminished octave of the quaver ascent provides an interpretation of a prolonged neighbour to the minim A, and also the upper neighbour of the B, which although not a rhythmically promi-

ment tone, is salient due to its melodically contradictory properties. Finally, the descent from F to E in bar 19 creates the duality of a neighbour note function being attributable to the F which is also something (at least analogically) of a goal tone. In this final extension, the melodic material then exclusively consists of the [01] and [02] motifs.

The [02] shape also gives an organic coherence to the whole. The beginning and goal tones of the first two sections, C & D (whether they therefore constitute prolongations is an additional concern) form the [02] shape. In sections 3 & 4, the melodic spans of a major sixth constitute a stepwise movement from the octaves of sections 1 & 2, taking into account the actual pitches of section 3 (D & B) in comparison with section 1 (C's) combined with the similarity of opening and closing phrases between the sections.

On the broadest scale, bars 1-20 can be seen to ultimately constitute an completion of the final chord, (bar 20(1)). This chord is a vertical embodiment of the [02] motif, consisting of two pairs of the motive. The progression can be seen to occur through a combination of melodic and accompanimental concerns:

- The accompaniment initially consists of the lower [02] pairing of the final chord, which remains unchanged through the first two sections. The melody as has been investigated, consists of a stepwise broad-scale movement from C to D - significantly, the final goal D of the melody becomes the third tone added to the accompaniment at the opening of section 3 (bar 9).

- Despite voice exchanges in the final section, the pitches of the accompaniment remain constant until bar 19, the final cadence. The melodic movement in sections 3 & 4, again encompasses an [02] span, although this is achieved via a different method to the initial two sections, and as before, the goal tone becomes the upper most tone of the chord.

As with the Beethoven, the melodic cycle as a whole can be seen to mirror the opening melodic motive (referring to the first four melodic tones - the identification of the term motive with regards to the Beethoven will be examined rather than assumed) through the C-D & F-E movement of each sectional pair. While in sections 3 & 4 the melodic goal tones are not so obvious as in the opening two sections, and the two tones of the motive do not appear until the final cadence, each half of the opening utilises the motivic properties of its respective half of the motive ([02] in the first half, upper (and through inversion, lower) neighbour in the second). In this sense a reading can be made of the opening motive which designates the first half [02] as disruptive and the second (chromatic neighbour) as closural. Thus the final cadential dual chord-complex achieves the unification of both [02] and upper neighbour, but in the reverse order - in one sense this is therefore climactic and closural, but at the same time the harmony possesses an interruptive quality which is affirmed by the following bars. This correlates with the above interpretation of each constituent, as the closural neighbour motif is subsequently/simultaneously disrupted by the unstable [02].

V. COMPARATIVE MOTIVIC AND HARMONIC FUNCTION

Having established that each work contains its own organic coherence, the expression of which provides the momentum towards climax that each attains, to identify the nature of motivic and thematic elements in each clarifies the issue of analogy. The term motive is generally used to describe the smallest intelligible autonomous rhythmic or melodic figure – however, analytically, a further distinction needs to be made, that of salience. Thus a motive is here regarded as a statement and simultaneous manipulation of compositional material organised for specific compositional and expressive effect. As has been shown, the opening phrase of Simpson’s quartet is identifiable as such with its inherent qualities (manifest in its compositional deployment) of congruity and incongruity through [02] and chromatic neighbour constituents – by identifying the predominance of one element in each half of the opening, a related character is discernible in the music as a whole, through phrase structure, melodic and accompanimental rhythm, and melodic direction (both spatial and harmonic), each individually, and in correlation. The identification of a similar premise in the Beethoven is not possible on the same terms, as motive (if the term is applicable) takes a different form. The melodic counterpart to Simpson’s initial [0135] motive in the Beethoven is the opening ascent of a fourth. It is the cyclic completion of this motive’s registral ascent that culminates in the final semibreve statement and precipitates the ultimate perfect cadence and conclusive establishment of the tonic. Further, and on a smaller scale, it precipitates through sectional development, registral expansion from the interval of a fourth to a sixth within each phrase, and is quite clearly discernible as the opening portion of each of the four phrases. However, by the simple retrogradation of the third and fourth pitches, it becomes rather than the harmonically ambiguous counterpart in the Simpson, a directly functioning harmonic element in its resultant arpeggiation of the tonic chord. On its re-statement in the climax, it does not carry this arpeggiative power, but by way of *appoggiatura*, demands resolution through harmonic necessity to the tonic. Thus the function of the motive, which constitutes a virtually indistinguishable part of the harmony¹⁴, changes with the accompanying harmonic context to which it then appears to be subordinate to.

¹⁴ Hence the prolongational diagram of ex. 3.4 where identical melodic material is shown to have different harmonic function. This is not intended as an orthodox Schenkerian reading of the Beethoven, not least because due to the fragmentary quality of the section analysed, no Schenkerian goal-tones are discernible in the ascent. Nor is it an attempt to tackle the thorny issue of motivic constitution and function in Schenkerian analysis, but rather to shed some further light on the distinction between function and label that is pertinent here.

PARADIGMATIC RHYTHMIC MODEL

Basic durational
Strong across octaves
In contrast

2 PARADIGMATIC RHYTHMIC MODEL

Section 1.
Sections 2, 3

3

Section 1
Section 2
Section 3
Completion of
Metabolic Cycle via
Prolonged Aggregation

4

Changing harmonic functions of identical (or similar) melodic fragments

Metabolic Cycle via
Prolonged Aggregation
Completion of

5

Directional Implications of Diminishing Indications.

Correlation of Phrasing + Metrics

A distinction is therefore identifiable between motivic label and function, which serves to highlight fundamental differences in harmonic language between the two composers. The opening “motive” of the Beethoven does not function so strongly as a harmonically governing feature on a small scale when compared to Simpson’s counterpart. This is because the ascending four note pattern as it is originally stated represents motion from the dominant to the tonic, in other words a highly congruous functioning harmonic element within Beethoven’s triadic system. This overt congruity results in a lack of melodic salience within the I_4^6-V-I prolongational structure of which it is indeed, a small scale reflection. However, this congruity results in its function as itself a large scale prolongational element, which on the broadest scale can be seen to facilitate the entire introductory section of bars 1-19 (see ex. 3.3 & 3.4).

Simpson’s motivic workings operate conversely to this, retaining their function exclusively on the small scale as governing features of the harmonic character due to a lack of triadic reference. The harmony cannot be taken as prolongational to the same extent then, as a result of the ambiguous tonal centres, established through the (motivic) melody. Thus the attribution of large scale motivic observations outlined previously between the movement of the section 1 & 3 melodies, can only be taken as an inferential label although this undoubtedly still provides coherence; what is specifically ascertainable is that the function ascribed earlier to the [02] motive is not convincingly applicable to this large scale harmonic motion (at least in the context of the first 20 bars).

VI. THEMATIC ELEMENTS AS DYNAMIC VARIABLES

A discussion of Beethoven's thematic elements in this context is necessarily abstract, and centres on manipulative compositional devices rather than melodic or rhythmic aspects in separation. The $I^6_4-V^7-I$ cadence is intrinsically charged with tension and momentum, the resolution of which is inescapably pre-determined. The thematic devices employed here are then concerned with governing through melodic and textural manipulation of the harmony, the precise moment of climax. This then provides both organic coherence and the expressive effect of arriving at the necessary climax in line with received expectations. It is this received governing power of the harmony which enables analytic separation of other aspects as subordinate elements.

Firstly, the exact repetition and correlation of large rhythmic and phrase structure in the Beethoven's first 19 bars is an essential facet, given that the regular division of time provides concrete reference points from which play can be made of subtle expectations arising from harmonic rhythm, melody and texture. These repetitive aspects can be identified as:

1. The lack of an octave doubling in the melodic note of bar 16 (ex. 1.4c) (as opposed to the counterparts of the previous three phrases), compounded by the sequential nature of the melodic (rather than harmonic) phrase as a whole can be seen to necessitate the upward ascent to the tonic F, in combination obviously with the harmonic resolution.

2. The continuing lack of harmonic movement which raises expectation of the cadence: this is manifest both through firstly the registral shift in the melody which stabilises the harmony on the dominant 7th and also through the sequential nature of the fourth phrase which provides no significant appoggiaturas (the primary propelling melodic force of the previous phrase), relying on learned responses from the previous section.

3. The lack of a textural addition in bar 16 (taking the first textural addition (ex. 1.4a) as occurring with the last beat of bar 8, as opposed to the first of bar 9 (see initial Beethoven analysis); bar 12 contains the addition of a fourth accompanimental tone at an equivalent point in syncopation with the phrase structure) which raises heightened expectancy as to the fulfilment of the pattern.

4. The inversion of the dominant in bar 18 which heralds the final cadence. This displays equivalence with the implied harmonic inversion to the tonic root in bar 7 which directly precedes the harmonic shift away from the tonic to the dominant.

All this of course functions in combination with the previously explored textural devices such as the registral ascent, dynamic homogenising etc., themselves

further elucidating the *dynamic* implications of the $I_6^4-V^7-I$ cadence which is divided so as the I is harmonically unstable through prolonged arpeggiation and takes up essentially the first half of bars 1-19, the V^7 is harmonically stable, prey to textural devices, and takes up the second half. The cadence to I essentially occupies the final extension and incorporates a combination of textural and harmonic movement.

Simpson's twentieth century tonal language does not contain the harmonic properties of a $I-V-I$ cadence with all its received intrinsic dynamism. Thus in terms of analogy, the harmony of Simpson's first 19 bars is fundamentally complex, with no acceptable strictly harmonic unit functioning as the predominating axiom to be embellished. The equivalent to the tonic resolution in Beethoven as has been shown is the attainment of the four-note [02] structure of bar 20. This, however, is the motivic culmination and thus climax, as opposed to harmonic as there is no inherent harmonic necessity to resolve to this chord. Complexity, then, is interpretable as the product of contradiction, in this case of Beethoven's harmonic (with its related aspects) language. Simpson's momentum then, taking into account the lack of specific and widely-received harmonic reference, cannot realistically be expected to produce a necessity of climax with the precision of the Beethoven. The climactic moment is manufactured not through deflection of motion towards a pre-ordained goal with its resultant increase in tension, but through a reduction in initial complexity through changing motivic function, which focuses attention on the metric concerns in combination with an additive motivic process, culminating in the arrival on a goal (non-triadic) harmony which constitutes the equivalent to harmonic *labelling*.

Given that the total length of the four sections (excluding the final extension) is 16 bars, and the first two sections, for all their metric disruptions last for four bars each, the most obvious momentum building device then, is probably the truncation of the fourth and final section. The third section in compensation lasts for five bars, and through its expansion through partial repetition of the first and final phrases of section 1, represents a necessarily exaggerated reference point. This works in combination with the ensuing truncation by affirming a broad bi-sectional structure (sections 1&2/ 3&4), thus building the expectation of a repeat of the goal orientated directional qualities of the second section. With the previously examined results of the truncation (i.e. lack of melodic contradiction and neighbour note structure) an increase in momentum is effected, resulting in the thus premature arrival on the goal tone of E in bar 17. The extension then, through the hemiola effect acts as a check in momentum and through the dotted rhythm, necessitates the climactic shift at the beginning of bar 19. This follows the proportions of the (essentially) four-bar sectional structure, by forming a two-bar extension.

Equivalence can be made here with the lack of textural addition and octave doubling in bar 16 of the Beethoven, as outlined above, where the expectation of momentum-checking devices is denied then fulfilled in exaggeration via the final extension.

This adds a smaller scale precision to the broader *dynamic* issues as facilitated through the structural manifestations of the opening motif, as outlined above. In summation, they can be seen to represent a progressive increase in momentum thus:

1. The opening section establishes from the mode a basic F major tonal centre. The phrase structure is unclear, there is a strong tri-tonal structural feature and ambiguity in the final segment that represents either a downward closural motif, or a non-correlation of phrase and motivic structure.

2. The second section repeats via non-correlation of phrase and pitch structure, the first seven pitches of the opening section, and simultaneously presents via the marked phrases a prolonged pitch span that moves up from the previous section by a tone. Despite strong directional qualities to the melody, there is a lack of specific tonal focus caused by the ambiguity, and the dynamic drop before the final quaver ascent provides some contradiction to the momentum. The section can be seen to provide directional impetus to the tonality established in the previous section.

3. The third section represents an exaggerated reference to the first, yet with significant alterations: the phrase structure can be seen as clarification of that of section 1, there is less melodic contradiction, and the tonality here centres around (via accidentals) G minor, a tone up from section 1.

4. Section 4 re-presents the directional impetus of section 2, without the ambiguity of phrase and pitch structure, melodic contradiction, or drop in dynamics. It represents the virtual attainment of the goal chord structure, lacking only complete melodic stability. Just as section 2 prolongs melodically a tone which becomes the third addition to the accompaniment, the opening and closing tones (G & E) here also represent an arrival on the final chordal constituents. While in section 2, the tonality of the previous section was challenged[#] if not usurped by the B's, here there is a tangible shift via the total lack of B's and F's. Thus it can be interpreted (in this *dynamic* context) as a further stepwise shift up to an A minor tonal area, climaxing with the further step of the B before the motivic completion.

An attempt to tabulate direct equivalences between the two as thematic elements is obviously self-defeating – thus three common aspects of technique will be examined in the abstract, which will then serve to elucidate key analogical points of language.

1. Ambiguity as a broad compositional premise is important in both works: in Beethoven, it is manifest through the arpeggiative prolonged harmony of the first two sections, with its lack of directional necessity which is then clarified in the second half of the opening through the harmonic stabilisation on the dominant; the equivalent ambiguity in Simpson is concerned not with harmony *per se*, but in the correlation of pitch and phrase structure which is achieved in the sections 3 & 4, providing a functional clarification. Also, the changing motivic functions result in the lack of harmonic disruption (previously embodied through the [02] motive)

through sections 3 & 4 – instead the chromatic neighbour provides a reduction in chromatic complexity, which in this context effects stability.

Thus Beethoven's climax results from the deflection of motion towards the harmonic goal through complexity i.e. the inverted dominant seventh and necessary arpeggiation to complete the melodic cycle. Simpson sets out his harmonic premise through an initial chromatic complexity with subtle emphasis to suggest a tonal centre – his harmonic motion is then, conversely to Beethoven's achieved through a reduction in complexity as a focus for necessity of climax through metric patterns and spatial harmonic ascent.

2. The re-statement of identical material in a different context is also achieved in both – Beethoven via the identical melodies of sections 2 & 3 in different harmonic contexts, followed by a melodically sequential repetition with its *dynamic* implications as outlined previously; Simpson builds a new tonality in section 3 out of identical pitch material to section 2, mirroring to some extent Beethoven's harmonic shift – the fourth section as has been outlined, achieves a similar function to Beethoven's fourth section through truncated repetition and transposition.

Just as Simpson's progression towards his motivic verticalisation of bar 20 constitutes the equivalent (in this context) to Beethoven's cadential climax, so his motivic divide after bar 8 correlates with the harmonic divide in the Beethoven. Beethoven's harmonic shift as has been shown provides different *dynamic* function to identical melodic material; Simpson's chromatic neighbour motive establishes a tonality in section 3 out of re-organisation of an identical pitch collection to the harmonically disruptive section 2. This further underlines the ambiguity of Simpson's harmony which necessitates a governing feature such as this motivic melody.

3. The voice exchange immediately before the cadence, serves as a step in Beethoven between the V^7_4 and the tonic goal, and in Simpson emphasises the A minor step between the G tonality and B. In keeping with the harmonic properties of each language, however, in Beethoven it is a harmonic necessity, while in Simpson it takes a more motivic and textural significance through the stepwise pattern it creates.

A more pertinent equivalence can be drawn here: taking the chordal inversion of bar 17 in the Beethoven to be the counterpart to that of bar 7, Simpson's fusion of melody and accompaniment in bar 8 and its counterpart in bars 17-19 is equivalent in terms of organic integration through the process of motivic progression to Beethoven's process of harmonic motion. This of course is then qualified in Simpson with the above observation of spatial motion to provide *dynamic* impetus.

CONCLUSIONS

There are many other more obvious ways in which Simpson refers to Beethoven, exhaustive study of which would swamp the analysis in somewhat ambivalent detail, such as the striking similarity of pitch material, and of intervallic content throughout, and of scoring by way of melody/accompaniment distribution amongst instruments. Similarly, by referring back to Simpson's own discussion concerning his harmonic ambiguity, the examination of inferences towards dual interpretations of tonal centres (see quote, p. 15) is not feasible here, as given that his harmony does not convincingly facilitate broad scale functional prolongations, any such interpretation must take a tonal centre primarily as a reference point within a larger structure.¹⁵

As has been shown, the *dynamic* quality of Simpson's harmony is achieved texturally through spatial distribution in terms of melody, and the stepwise ascent of the tonal centres. This is demonstrable by comparing the establishment of the F major and G minor tonal centres, where the F is established melodically in bars 3-4 through a filled perfect fifth from F to C with appropriate rhythmic stress on the A shared with the accompaniment, and the G minor is (re-)established in bar 13 through three statements of one pitch, B, due to the slightly less ambiguous accompanimental root (as a result of the additional accompanimental tone). This works in combination with the textural concerns, which are discernible by taking into account the verticalisation B-A-G (bar 13) which represents the counterpart to the F-G-A of bar 2-3 (an observation which is lent further weight by the separation of accompanimental quavers at both these points, coupled with the disruptive nature of the F in bar 2-3, and the B's of bar 13 which complete the span of a diminished octave through the quaver ascent), thus shifting the harmonic (and here predominantly textural) polarity of the section.

An important interpretative element in Simpson's re-presentation of the Beethoven is thus highlighted, which is a view of Beethoven's opening melody (bars 1-8) as being intentionally harmonically disruptive in its scoring and subsequent harmonic effects, a stabilisation then occurring at least through a static chordal bass (bar 8), harmonic concerns aside. Two points can be made further to

¹⁵ Thus Simpson's claims towards D minor inferences in his melodic line cannot be taken as implications of harmonic *function* on the small scale, but as referential constituents of a broader dialectic. Lionel Pike tackles this issue on a larger scale in an unpublished study of all six quartets. What is more striking viewed with hindsight, is Simpson's claim to reflect Beethoven's final movement contrast between mode and tonality, if only because Simpson's harmony is possibly closer to modality due to its textural and inflection – (as opposed to direction) based constitution.

this: firstly, that Simpson's spatial placing of the octave C's in section 1, divided by a temporally central F points towards his reading of definite ambiguity caused by the assertiveness of the dominant over the tonic in Beethoven's first phrase. Secondly, as discussed, Simpson's climax cannot be considered a purely harmonic goal, and will be from a perceptual viewpoint, somewhat less satisfying as a conclusion of a non-triadic motivic process (not even beginning to take into account the tonal affects of the final three chords or their continuation). A correlation can then be perceived with the only significant reduction in either registral span or textural density in the Beethoven, between the chords of bars 18 & 19 - this the only indication in terms of this analysis of incompleteness in the climax of Beethoven's cadential unfolding, which invites expectation as to subsequent events.

It should be clear from this analysis then, that the carrying forward of empirical formulas for the subsequent interpretation of other harmonic re-modelling is not feasible. Contemporary tonality such as Simpson's is entirely axiomatically contextual in both its organic coherence and *dynamic* function. However, the opposition of climactic technique, manifest through Simpson's reduction in complexity and Beethoven's tension building harmonic complications is certainly worth exploring at least within Simpson's oeuvre as a compositional technique. Any more detailed abstraction than this must however, fall outside the boundaries of this current study and within those of structural totalities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DAHLHAUS, Carl, 1980 *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century*, trans. Mary Whittall, (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- DUNSBY, Jonathan & STOPFORD, John, 1981 "The Case for a Schenkerian Semiotic", *Music Theory Spectrum* 3.
- HATTEN, Robert S, 1994 *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation and Interpretation*, (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press).
- MACDONALD, Malcolm "Simpson's Rasumovskys: Three discussions on the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth String Quartets – Part 1: String Quartet no. 4 – Robert Simpson in conversation with Malcolm MacDonald", *Tonic* 1/4:11-16.
- MEYER, Leonard B, 1956 *Emotion and Meaning in Music*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- NATTIEZ, Jean-Jacques, 1982 "Varese's 'Density 21.5': A Study in Semiological Analysis", *Music Analysis* 1/3.
- PICKARD, John, 1994 "Simpson's Third Symphony – an Analysis", *Tonic* 6:3-27.
- PIKE, Lionel, 1984 "Simpson's Rasumovsky Quartets – An Introduction", *Tonic* 1/4:8-10.
- _____,
Unpublished study of Beethoven Op. 59, 1-3 & Simpson, String Quartets 4-6.
- PUFFETT, Derek, 1986 "Tippett's Second Quartet", *Music Analysis* 5:2-3.
- SALZER, Felix, 1962 *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*, (New York: Dover).
- SIMPSON, Robert, 1967 Introduction to *The Symphony: Elgar to the Present Day*, ed. Simpson, Robert, (Penguin).

TONIC 1980-2003

- John Brooks, The Beginnings of the Robert Simpson Society (1/1, 1980, 2-3)
- Robert Dearing, Composer of Our Time (1/1, 1980, 4-9)
- Angela Musgrave, List of Robert Simpson's Works (1/1, 1980, 10-12)
- Brian Duke, Two Early Piano Works (1/1, 1980, 13-15)
- Hans Keller, The Man and the Music. With a discussion of some matters by Brian Duke and Hans Keller (1/2, 1981, 7-11, 1/3, 1981, 11-13 & 16-17 and 1/4, 1982, 23-24)
- Harold Truscott, The Origin of the First Symphony (1/2, 1981, 11 & 14-16 and 1/3, 1981, 25-26)
- A Birthday Hansel, by Lennox Berkeley, Adrian Boult, Derek Bourgeois, Peter Racine Fricker, Vagn Holmboe, John McCabe, Goffredo Petrassi, Edmund Rubbra, Humphrey Searle, Ronald Stevenson, and Michael Tippett (1/2, 1981, 12-13)
- Bayan Northcott, 1980: A Year of Simpson (reprint from *Tempo*) (1/2, 1981, 16-19)
- Complete Discography (1/2, 1981, 20-21)
- J. David Gillett, 60th Birthday Celebration: a Report (1/3, 1981, 3-4)
- Robert Simpson/Michael Oliver, 60th Birthday Radio Interview (1/3, 1981, 6-11)
- Lionel Pike, The Canon in Robert Simpson's Sixth Quartet (1/3, 1981, 17-18)
- John Underwood, Working with Simpson (1/3, 1981, 18-21)
- A. H. Mason, Recordings held in the British Institute of Recorded Sound [now National Sound Archive in The British Library] (1/3, 1981, 22-25)
- The Constitution of the Robert Simpson Society (1/4, 1982, 7-8)
- Lionel Pike, Simpson's Rasumovsky Quartets. An Introduction (1/4, 1982, 8-10)
- Malcolm MacDonald/Robert Simpson, Simpson's Rasumovskys. Three discussions on the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth String Quartets (1/4, 1982, 11-16, 2/1, 1984, 15, 3/1, 1987, 18-25 and 3/4, 1990, 21-27)
- Forum: Essence of Bruckner (1/4, 1982, 17)
- Robert Matthew-Walker, The Proms and Natural Justice. A comment, with a response by Robert Simpson (1/4, 1982, 18-21)
- Robert Simpson, Symphony No. 5. Programme note (2/1, 1984, 4-5)
- Robert Simpson, Friends and Mentors (2/1, 1984, 6-7)
- The Robert Simpson Society Study Archive (2/1, 1984, 8)
- Gordon Roland-Adams, [How Do You Compose?] With a reply by Robert Simpson (2/1, 1984, 9)
- Robert Simpson/Michael Oliver, The Genesis of the Eighth Symphony. A radio discussion (2/1, 1984, 10-14)
- David Cairns, String Quartet No. 9. A review (reprint from *The Sunday Times*) (2/1, 1984, 16-17)
- Robert Simpson, Comment or Perception? A sentient artist's reply to unjust criticism (2/1, 1984, 18-20)
- Lionel Pike, Robert Simpson - Foreground and Background (2/2, 1985, 3-17)
- Paul Rapoport, Tonality and the Symphony. With a response by Robert Simpson (2/2, 1985, 18-20)
- John Brooks, Professor David Gillett [†] (3/1, 1987, 3-4)
- Robert Simpson, Two Friends 'Gone'. [Edmund Rubbra and Hans Keller†] (3/1, 1987, 4-5)
- Robert Simpson, The Ninth Symphony. Programme note (3/1, 1987, 6-7)
- Paul Pellay, The Fifth Symphony. An Analytical Commentary (3/1, 1987, 8-12)
- Kevin Norbury, *The Four Temperaments* (3/1, 1987, 13-16)

Robert Simpson, The Sixth Symphony (1977). Programme note	(3/2, 1988, 4-5)
Robert Simpson, The Seventh Symphony (1977). Programme note	(3/2, 1988, 5)
Lionel Pike, The Ninth Symphony	(3/2, 1988, 7-13)
Stephen Johnson, An Expression of Energy	(3/2, 1988, 14-16)
Eric Wilson, New Simpson Masterwork. [<i>Introduction and Allegro on a Bass by Max Reger</i>]	(3/2, 1988, 17-19)
Robert Simpson, John Brooks[†]	(3/3, 1989, 2)
Malcolm MacDonald, Simpson's Symphonic Appetite	(3/3, 1989, 3-6)
Stephen Johnson, The Ninth Symphony (reprint from <i>The Musical Times</i>)	(3/3, 1989, 7-13)
Robert Simpson, The Twelfth Quartet (1987). Programme note	(3/3, 1989, 14)
Lionel Pike, The Eighth Quartet - RS's 'New Way' (reprint from <i>Tempo</i>)	(3/3, 1989, 15-29)
Lionel Pike, The Sixth Symphony	(3/4, 1990, 2-12)
Matthew Taylor, The Seventh Symphony. A conductor's perspective	(3/4, 1990, 13-15)
Robert Simpson/Gillian White, Ninth Symphony. A radio discussion	(3/4, 1990, 16-20)
Robert Simpson, Symphony No. 2. Programme note	(4/1, 1991, 3)
Lionel Pike, Simpson's Second Symphony: The view from the archives	(4/1, 1991, 4-13)
John Pickard, Robert Simpson's 2nd Symphony - an analysis	(4/1, 1991, 15-25)
Robert Simpson, On Conducting Oneself in Public (reprint from <i>The Listener</i>)	(4/1, 1991, 26-27)
Lionel Pike, An Astronomical Quartet [No. 7]: a lesson from Robert Simpson	(4/2, 1992, 2-17)
Philip Maund, Robert Simpson at 70	(4/2, 1992, 19-21)
Brian Duke, AGM talk	(4/2, 1992, 22-24)
John McCabe, Robert Simpson: an appreciation	(4/2, 1992, 25-26)
Robin Holloway, Robert Simpson	(4/2, 1992, 26)
J. David Gillett, How I Came to Meet Bob	(5, 1993, 2-4)
Lionel Pike, The Ferocious Anti-Pessimist (reprint from <i>The Times Higher Education Supplement</i>)	(5, 1993, 5-7)
Hugh Ottaway, Clues and Keys (reprint from <i>The Listener</i>)	(5, 1993, 8-10)
Robert Simpson, Against Lipsius (reprint from <i>The Listener</i>)	(5, 1993, 11-14)
John Pickard, Simpson's Third Symphony - An Analysis	(6, 1994, 3-27)
Lionel Pike, Towards a Study of Musical Motion: Robert Simpson's <i>Variations and Finale on a Theme of Haydn</i> (reprint from <i>The Music Review</i>)	(7, 1995, 3-12)
Lionel Pike, Simpson's String Quartet No. 1 - An Analysis	(7, 1995, 13-27)
Lionel Pike, A Study in Cosmic Motion: Robert Simpson's <i>Eppur si Muove</i>	(8, 1997, 3-6)
Simon Phillippo, Robert Simpson's String Quartets Nos. 4, 5, & 6 and their Relationship to Beethoven's Opus 59 'Rasumovsky' Quartets	(8, 1997, 7-23)
Robert Simpson/Julian Budden, The Composer Speaks. Radio conversation	(9, 1998, 3-31)
Greg Laybourne, Robert Simpson and Post-Structuralism. Analytical perspectives	(10, 1999, 5-27)
Simon Phillippo, Circles, Mirrors, and Structural Momentum in Robert Simpson's Second Symphony	(10, 1999, 29-38)
Robert Simpson, 20th century music on record	(11, 2001, 3-6)
Robert Simpson/Deryck Cooke/Bernard Keffe/Denis Matthews, Musicians Talking. Symphonic thinking, avant-garde and romanticism	(11, 2001, 7-24)
Robert Simpson, Haydn the Symphonist	(12, 2002, 2-48)
Greg Laybourn, Robert Simpson's Dynamic Analogy: Techniques of Structural Re-Modelling	(13, 2003, 2-34)

THE ROBERT SIMPSON SOCIETY

President:

Vernon Handley

Vice Presidents:

Phil Lesh
Angela Simpson
Ronald Smith
Ronald Stevenson
Matthew Taylor

Committee:

Martin Anderson
Pamela Bacon (Vice-Chairman)
Terence Hazell (Chairman & Acting Secretary)
Robert Hill (Editor, *Leading Notes* & Acting Membership Secretary)
Rosemary Hill
Andrew Jackson (Website Manager)
David Jones
Donald Macauley
Graham Melville-Mason
Lionel Pike
Peter Ross (Honorary Treasurer)
Jürgen Schaarwächter (Editor, *Tonic*)

Editor Jürgen Schaarwächter, Amthausstrasse 16, D-76227 Karlsruhe, Germany, e-mail j.schaarwaechter@t-online.de · *Printing* Waterprint Ltd., Unit H8, Hays Bridge Business Centre, Brickhouse Lane, Godstone, Surrey RH9 8JW, e-mail waterprint@fsbdial.co.uk.

The authors of the articles printed in this journal have asserted their rights to be so identified in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

General communications to the Society and enquiries about membership, subscriptions etc. should be addressed to Terence Hazell, 5 Sispara Gardens, Southfields, London SW18 1LG, e-mail stokes hazell@hotmail.com, or Robert Hill, 20 Warren Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0BS, e-mail hrobert535@aol.com.