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Introduction

Luciano Berio’s Sequenza VI for viola, composed in 1967, analyses from a composer’s point of view, with the aim of drawing practical compositional inferences based on theoretical documentation. This approach is adopted on purpose intentionally to understand the manner by which all compositional elements were formed, combined and interacted by themselves in producing the final aesthetic result. It is supposed that this Analysis could speculate the most probable compositional scenario which might have occupied Berio’s mind in composing the piece. Assuming Sequenza VI could be exalted as a compositional model of the time due to its principles and virtues, an analytical approach from a composer’s point of view attracts both interest and curiosity as well.

The Analysis focuses on three main research fields. The first field refers to notation and form, the second to structure and the third to interpretation. Especially, the first field explores the topics of the lack of barlines, rhythmic clarification, proliferation, notational evaluation and form classification. The second field concerns the division into sections, density and tension, texture, melodic-harmonic description and harmonic evaluation. In the third field, the topics of performance and theatricality are examined.

Before any special reference is made, a short review of the main music styles which emerged during the 20th century constitutes essential knowledge in understanding the subject in question. In fact, since 1900 musical creativity has been constantly and intensively developing an enormous stylistic diversity: impressionism, neoclassicism,
expressionism, chance music and new tonality brought about revolutionary changes in the fields of pitch, rhythm, melody, harmony and sound vocabulary, while a great variety of unprecedented notational practices came to the fore in order to accommodate these new tendencies. In particular, after the end of the 2nd World War, human thought called for radical changes and daring innovations. As Bryan Simms (1986) observes, ‘the decade after 2nd World War was indeed a period of dramatic and far reaching innovations in style which pushed neoclassicism far from the center of attention’. Simms states that ‘for many artists the legacy of the 2nd World War was a cynical view of the human condition and psyche that called for a clean slate’. That period was marked by a recurrence of serial composition which had a great expansion. By the early 1950s integral serialism was personalized by the composers. At the same time an innovation of the opposite sort - indeterminacy- captured composers’ interest. (Simms, 1986, pp. 331, 332, 344). Composers on both sides of the Atlantic experimented differently this tendency, with the remark that Europeans never abandoned entirely their inherited tradition in contrast with their American counterparts. Richard Taruskin (2010) states that ‘the Europeans, with their sense of inherited tradition... could never reconcile themselves to the randomly generated sounds...’ (Taruskin, 2010, p. 65). Robert Morgan (1991) remarks that the 1960s ‘became a time of extraordinary experimentation in music and other arts’ and its

---

1 Bryan Simms refers to Elliot Carter’s remark that ‘his conversion from neoclassicism was provoked by his realization that violence was an unavoidable part of human nature’. (Simms (1986, p. 331).
pluralism ‘mirrored the changing social and political conditions of the time’. (Morgan, 1991, p. 408).

For Italian Composer Luciano Berio, the end of the 2nd World War became the starting point of his formidable creativity. For him the sixties, in which Sequenza VI was composed, was accepted as one of his most productive periods. Berio embarked upon a rapid and seminal series of discoveries, without breaking the bonds of tradition. From an early age in 1945, he developed a great creativity and proved to be one of the most prolific composers of the late 20th century. Although in the late 1950s great compositions were composed, Berio began to concentrate on works for smaller groupings.

Sequenza VI for solo viola, on which the present analysis is focused, is the 6th of fourteen virtuoso pieces for different solo instruments or voice written between 1958 and 2000 which almost span the whole of Berio’s composing years. Luciano Berio being interviewed by Rossana Dalmonte explained that the title Sequenza was meant to underline that ‘almost all the Sequenzas were built from a sequence of harmonic fields’ (Berio, 1985, p. 97).

Berio composed Sequenza VI in 1967, when he was living in Hoboken, New Jersey, USA and teaching at Juilliard School of Music. The piece has dedicated to the viola player Serge Collot but it was premiered that same year in New York by the violist Walter Trampler. (Osmond-__________

---


3 For (female) voice only one Sequenza was composed, the 3rd (1966), famous for its theatricality and acrobatic vocalisms.

4 ‘Sequenza’ means ‘sequence’ in Italian.

5 Munich, Germany, 1915 - Port Joli, Canada, 1997
Smith, 2001, p. 351). *Sequenza VI* was transcribed for solo cello by the cellist Rohan de Saram and first performed by him in London in 1981.\(^6\) Furthermore, *Sequenza VI* was the core from which four orchestral pieces sprung, under the title *Chemins:*\(^7\) *Chemins II on Sequenza VI* for viola and 9 instruments (1967), *Chemins III on Chemins II* for viola, nine instruments (as for *Chemins II*) and orchestra (1968), *Chemins IIb* for orchestra (1969) and *Chemins IIc* (as *Chemins IIb*) plus solo bass clarinet (1972). This specific compositional cycle occupied Berio’s mind for six years (1967 - 1972) and this creativity occurred in the middle of the time of his compositional activity. Eventually, half the *Sequenzas* (7) were extended into *Chemins.*\(^8\) (Berio, 1985, pp. 179 - 181).

*Sequenza VI* was characterized by David Osmond-Smith as ‘one of the most powerful pieces that Berio had written during the sixties and one of the finest of the whole series’. Its amazing transformations into four *Chemins* unfold a broader compositional process that ‘was in turn to shape a good deal of Berio’s work during the seventies and beyond.’ (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 42).

---

\(^6\) See: Robert Kinzinger’s description in:

\(^7\) The word "Chemins" means "path" in French.

PART I. Notation

CHAPTER I

The lack of barlines

When considering the score of *Sequenza VI*, the reader stands in front of six large pages filled with irregular, detailed and fine-crafted melodic/harmonic accumulations which are shaped mainly by a series of dense and constantly transforming textures. The score consists of fifty three systems (staff-lines), ten small and great optional insertions and one alternative version to which conventional notation is applied. It is important to emphasise that a homophonic type of writing is employed and this entire scene takes place under the condition of lack of barlines.

The score, on which all references are made, is the only one edited by the Universal Edition, Ltd., London, © 1970, (UE 13726 Mi) under the title *Luciano Berio, Sequenza VI per viola sola* (1967). References to the score are made by page number, followed by the number system. (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 44).

Basically, the *non barline* writing was used by Berio to the majority of his Sequenzas. This practice concerns eight pieces which were written conventionally on one staff-line, the *Sequenzas VI* for viola, *VII* for Oboe, *VIII* for violin, *IX* for clarinet, *X* for trumpet, *XI* for guitar, *XII* for bassoon, *XIV* for cello, as well as *Sequenza VIII* for accordion to which a two staff writing was applied. On the other hand *Sequenzas II* for harp (1963) and
IV for the piano (1965), to which two staff systems were employed, have been barred normally.

Historically, it can be said that for centuries, western music survived with unbarred notational systems. Barlines were used when it was dictated as ‘a necessity’, under specific circumstances. (Cope, 1997, p. 89). In every case bars were set up, as a necessity, in order to define the rhythmic periodicity.

In the case of Sequenza VI, it is supposed that the almost complete lack of conventional phrases and metrical multiplicity could explain the unbarred practice. This assumption comes in accordance with Nancy Uscher’s reference to Berio’s remark that ‘there is no phrasing of a conventional nature’ (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 286) and John MacKay’s opinion that ‘the music is probably unphrased’. (MacKay, 1988, p. 226). Nancy Uscher agrees with the unbarred policy, which was applied to Sequenza VI, but she doesn’t miss the opportunity to report that the violist Walter Trampler9 was ‘not happy with the absence of barlines…’ because according to him ‘visually the phrasing isn’t as apparent.’ (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 287).

Although Walter Trampler brings into question the absence of barlines, he admits the phrasing mistiness. Furthermore it is supposed that if barlines had been inserted, their existence would have relieved the performer from identifying the plethora of short and different time signatures, which are interchanged rapidly and irregularly. On the other hand the bars would have flooded the text and made the reading difficult. The multiple fragmentations, which would have been imposed

9 He gave to Sequenza VI its first performance in 1967. (p. 7)
to long and short melodic figurations, could constrain the performer to focus his attention on every single rhythmic shape. At the same time the player might find some difficulty in clearly comprehending the outline of such irregular rhythmic figurations. Ultimately, the existence of barlines would adversely influence the performance result. On this matter David Cope (1997) argues that ‘music need not necessarily be restricted to measures or rely on beats’ because ‘such reliance can rob composers of the potentials of rhythmic exploration and freedom’. (Cope, 1997, p. 89).

Generally it is assumed that the lack of barlines must be related to the lack of regular and periodic rhythmic pulses. Barlines can be applied to every kind of metrical formation if they can be prolonged, as long as it takes in order to be sufficiently perceived.\textsuperscript{10} Finally, for \textit{Sequenza VI} the lack of barlines doesn’t seem to have been judged harshly up to the present time.

\textsuperscript{10} See examples 1-9, pp. 15-16 and 19-30, pp. 69-72.
Rhythmic clarification

By taking into account the discussion which was presented in the previous unity on the subject of the lack of barlines, the notational practice of *Sequenza VI* calls for complete rhythmic exploration and acquaintance. In fact, the rhythmic complexity calls for special attention and the admission that the rhythmic matter could be exalted to fundamental factor in shaping the form of the piece doesn’t seem to be far from reality.

For the reasons which have been explained above, the music text of *Sequenza VI* calls for close attention to explore the method and philosophy by which it was rhythmically calculated. Given that *Sequenza VI* was transcribed in order to become the core of a series of subsequent orchestral works (*Chemins II, III, llb, llc*), the barred score of *Chemins II* for solo viola and nine instruments, should be used as a guide. It is worth mentioning that the score of *Chemins II* contains 161 metrical changes, as is presented in the following unity. In understanding Berio’s notational practice, the comparison of the two scores could authentically reveal the possible rules of barring. In this way the small and numerous rhythmic formations will be easily demarcated into their individual components in order to be retraced and sufficiently comprehended.

It is assumed that the rhythmic calculation is fulfilled by beat cycles of both quavers and semiquavers. The metrical specification depends mainly on the beaming by which the note values are grouped. In fact, with this carefully designed beaming, time signatures are implied and stressed points are indicated.
The following examples depict representative excerpts collected from the score of Sequenza VI. The time signatures, which are marked on the extracts below, correspond exactly to those of the barred score of Chemins II.

Long-time spaces are easily calculated because they are subdivided into identical note values which are performed without interruption. In Example 1 (p. 1/1) the time signature of $3/8$ is probably implied.\(^{12}\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{3}{8} \\
\end{array}
\]

\hspace{2cm}

Example 1

A solitary dotted quaver forms the time signature of $3/16$. The calculation of the remaining material depends on the surrounding note values: (Example 2, p. 1/3).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{2}{8} & \frac{3}{16} & \frac{3}{8} \\
\end{array}
\]

\hspace{2cm}

Example 2

---

\(^{11}\) Permission to reprint short excerpts has been granted by the Universal Edition.

\(^{12}\) The numbers indicate the page and system (staff-line) respectively.
Three beamed semiquavers, when they appear as a group by themselves, can form their own time signature or participate in a longer metrical formation of semiquavers. In every case, the first of each is normally accentuated: (Example 3, p. 2/3).

![Example 3](image)

*This kind of passage is out of time (see below)*

The same practice occurs in the following case, even though the accent marks, which are applied at off-beats, are related to the technique of *broken tremolo*. (Example 4, p. 4/1).

![Example 4](image)

Beamed arpeggiated figurations of four hemidemisemiquavers which are directed to be played ‘as fast as possible’, are found at non-stressed positions, probably because from this upbeat direction they can better serve as resolute preparations for the next stressed chords. The
time signatures seem to be defined by this concept, a fact that happens in most of the cases: (Example 5, p. 1/5).

Example 5

The beamed note groups are considered to be autonomous rhythmic formations so they shape their own time signatures, something that happens frequently: (Example 6, p. 2/6).

Example 6

Arpeggiated figurations of demisemiquavers and hemidemisemiquavers are equal to two and one quavers respectively. In the second case hemidemisemiquavers are depicted by small heads and stems: (Example 7, p. 5/3).

Example 7
Figurations, containing from 1 to 9 slashed quavers, depicted by small heads, are viewed as passages out of measured time. At points (a) and (b) two pauses of semiquaver are noted on the score of *Chemins II*, a fact that attests that these passages, like others of the same category, are thought to be out of measured time. Despite the fact that in the second case the total rhythmic values falls short of a demisemiquaver, the same measure appears fully completed on the score of *Chemins II*. (Example 8, p. 3/1 - 2).

![Example 8](image)

Grace chords of 2, 3, or 4 pitches which are depicted by small slashed quavers are considered to be passages out of measured time: (Example 9, p. 3/4).

![Example 9](image)
It is important to note that the three-part rhythmic formations dominate throughout the score. This kind of rhythm emerges from both, the unification of the complex note configurations and the dotted quavers and semiquavers. The two kinds of time signatures refer to those of quavers and semiquavers, as they are marked in examples 1-9, pp. 13-16. The above descriptions mainly indicate Berio’s practice, on the understanding that some of them cannot be viewed as inviolable rules.

Considering the score from its functional and aesthetic side, special mention should be made to two additional elements: The broken tremolo and the small-head notes. The broken tremolo is depicted by an additional upward stem on which five small horizontal lines are set up. Obviously, with these five small lines, the ‘as fast as possible’ tremolo is depicted in semihemidemisemiquavers, while the note values are indicated by the downward stems. The small-note heads represent the pitch repetitions, tied or untied. This is an important visual facilitation and practical indication for the performer while holding the same fingering position for the recurrent small-head notes, moves to the next position by focusing his attention on the large-head notes only. (See examples 3, 5, 6 on pp. 14, 15 above). The filigree appearance of the previously mentioned notational elements not only indicates an aestheticism itself, but also contributes to a more comfortable reading. These extra depictions, which were invented to serve the specific texture, can undoubtedly be ranked among Berio’s notational innovations.
Proliferation

As has been already mentioned, *Sequenza VI* became the source of imaginative subsequent works. In fact *Sequenza VI* is considered to be a typical example of the widespread Berio principle of reworking a piece by adding extra layers. The piece served as a nucleus from which a series of four orchestral pieces were produced: *Chemins II, III, IIb, IIc*. Comprehensive descriptions of this matter stray from the objectives of the present analysis. On the contrary, the comparison of the following two representative excerpts from *Sequenza VI* to their equivalents found in the solo viola part of *Chemins II*, brings out, once again, the barring potential and the availability of the material for a much wide commentary.

In the examples given below, two excerpts from the score of *Sequenza VI* are set against the same extracts from *Chemins II*: (Examples 10, 11 and 12, 13).

---

13 Berio’s orchestral work, *Sinfonia* (1968 - 1969) is a great typical example.

14 *Chemins III* (1968, 1973 of 37 instruments) was shaped by adding a considerable number of instruments to *Chemins II*. In *Chemins IIb* (1970 of 38 instruments) the solo viola part was removed from the orchestral scene and in *Chemins IIc* (1972) a solo bass clarinet was added to the previous version.

15 Permission to reprint short excerpts has been granted by the *Universal Edition*. 
It is worth noting that the bar lines found on the score of Chemins II demarcate various time signatures of quavers and semiquavers which are interchanged 161 times.

Chemins II, for solo viola and nine instruments (flute, clarinet in B♭, trombone, electric organ, harp, marimba / tam-tam, vibraphone, viola and cello), was composed in 1967, the same year as Sequenza VI. The original score of Sequenza VI was barred and transported, much the same as solo viola and became the core of the new piece. In the solo viola part of Chemins II more pauses and minor scale rhythmic and pitch modifications are observed in relation to the original score of Sequenza VI. One can logically assume that these changes were dictated by metrical reasons. Furthermore, they obviously facilitate and relieve the performer who is playing a very demanding piece. In fact, the performer needs to invent unconventional techniques in manipulating the almost constant bowing tremolo which requires physical endurance. Any relaxation, which is allowed to the solo viola part, has no impact in slowing the intensive rhythmic pulse because it is replaced by commensurate activity which is assigned to the surrounding instruments. On this issue Nancy Uscher (1982-1983) reports Walter Trampler’s opinion that noted that ‘the solo version is more taxing’. (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 287).

Two records are cited here to describe the way by which the previously mentioned Chemins II were created: David Osmond-Smith explains Berio’s method mentioned before according to which ‘a Sequenza was to serve as a nucleus around which further works were produced by adding extra layers to its pre-established structure’.
(Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 42). Paul Griffiths (1995) reports Berio’s statement that Sequenza VI, Chemins II and Chemins III are relayed to each other ‘like the layers of an onion’ and observes that ‘there is a two way flow of musical thought, outwards from the original solo to the orchestra, and inwards to the centre’. (Griffiths, 1995, p. 193).

It is worth noting that only Sequenza VI had such a great proliferation, although half of the Sequenzas were extended into Chemins. These derivative series of orchestral works are, in essence, adaptations of their antecedents, a fact that leads to the assumption that the initial solo structure was considerably amenable to a wider commentary. Paul Griffiths marks that ‘Sequenza VI was proved to be a particular fruitful source of proliferating avenues’. The principle of commentary provide these works with an exemplary fascination and Griffiths implies an explanation when he says that ‘composers of Berio’s generation had learned that the ideal of the immediate post-war years, that of starting music again from scratch, could not so easily be accomplished’. Referring to the experience of the 1960s he remarks that ‘composition was not pure invention; it was adaptation’. (Griffiths, 1995, pp. 193 - 194) Berio himself commenting on the edition of Chemins II explains that this derivative work constitutes analysis, commentary and extension of the original and by this amplification the hidden and compressed musical processes are brought out to the surface and developed.\footnote{Retrieved from: http://www.universaledition.com/composers-and-works/composer/54/work/1562 - [Accessed on 27/4/2014].}

\footnotetext[16]{See the Introduction}
By inference, the barring potential along with the harmonic density, sound intensity and textural variety make *Sequenza VI* suitable for sufficient commentary in producing derivative orchestral works.
Chapter II

Notational Evaluation

The conventional notation, which was applied to *Sequenza VI*, proved to be the most convenient in depicting not only the piece in question but also other similar works, as is discussed later. In fact, the scores of the antecedent *Sequenzas I* and *IV* and the subsequent *Sequenza VII* were re-notated on the model of *Sequenza VI*, after a long exploration of the subject. It is assumed that the re-notated scores became more easily and clearly comprehended by the performers than the original scores. The importance of this choice and its consequences can be properly evaluated by examining the notational model which was finally applied to *Sequenza* per flauto solo (*Sequenza I* for flute, revised in 1992), *Sequenza IV* for the piano and *Sequenza VII* for oboe.

*Sequenza* per flauto solo was edited in 1958 in proportional notation. This work was transcribed according to the conventional model of *Sequenza VI* and edited long after in 1998, under the title *Sequenza I* per flauto solo.

Folio and Brinkman (2008) make reference to Heinz Stolba’s report that *Sequenza I* was originally composed in standard notation and barred in $\frac{3}{4}$ but Berio decided to use the proportional notation because he felt that the original one was ‘too awkward’. After a few years Berio became ‘increasingly disappointed with how flute players approached this notation’. Finally the piece was transcribed by Berio’s assistant Paul 18 from the editorial house for the *Universal Edition*.
Roberts to conventional notation and was published in 1992, thirty four years after the original edition had been released. (Folio and Brinkman, 2008, p. 15).

The following example, 14, represents a sample from the last page of the score of *Sequenza I*.\(^\text{19}\)

*Sequenza I (1958)*\(^\text{20}\)

![Example 14](image)

The pitches are depicted by quavers only. The note values depend on their spatial position in a confined staff space, which is controlled by specific metronomic indications. The duration of the beamed quavers is approximately calculated according to their spatial distance. The duration of fermatas is entirely left to the performer’s own preference.\(^\text{21}\)

*Sequenza I* was categorized by Umberto Eco as ‘Open Work’. Eco (1989) started developing his theory by making reference to three modern music works: Luciano Berio’s *Sequenza* per flauto solo, Karlheinz Stockhausen’s *Klavierstücke XI* and Pierre Boulez’s *Third Sonata* for

---

\(^{19}\) Permission to reprint this excerpt has been granted by the *Edizioni Suvini Zerboni*.


\(^{21}\) See initial directions found on the score.
piano. He assumed that these pieces were representative samples of ‘Open Work’ because, due to their nature, they have left ‘considerable autonomy to the performer in the way he chooses to play the work’. Specifically, Berio’s Sequenza was assumed by Eco to be ‘Open’ because the text ‘predetermines the sequence and intensity of the sound to be played…but the performer is free to choose ‘how long to hold a note inside the fixed framework...’ (Eco, 1989, p. 1).

According to Eco’s theory, the compositional project contains a number of possibilities ‘rationally organized, oriented, and endowed with specifications for proper development’. As a consequence the possibility of numerous different personal interventions is an oriented and discriminated participation on the part of the performer. (Eco, 1989, p. 19). It is worth noting Eco’s general aesthetic approach, according to which ‘a work of art...is a complete and closed form...while at the same time constituting an ‘open’ product...to countless different interpretations which do not impinge on its unadulterable specificity’. Eco refers to Henri Pousseur’s observation that ‘the poetics of the “open” work tends to encourage acts of conscious freedom on the part of the performer...’ and argues that even though a work is completely finished it ‘demands a free, inventive response...’ Eco, 1989, p 4).

---

22 According to Eco, ‘the notion of possibility’ in contemporary science tends to discard intellectual authorities in favour of personal decisions, choices and social contexts. (Eco, 1989, p.14).

23 Although a performance can offer a satisfying version of a work, it seems to be ‘incomplete’ because it is unable to give simultaneously all the ‘artistic solutions’ which the work may admit. (Eco, 1989, p. 15).
Edward Venn brings into question Eco’s classification that *Sequenza I* can be put into the same category as ‘Open Work’ with the two other works, those of Stockhausen and Boulez because the performance directions, found on the score, cannot justify the freedom of maintain a note, which Eco granted to the performer. Venn argues that Berio’s practice and Eco’s theory don’t seem to be related and by no means, is ‘openness’ equated with ‘freedom in performance’.24 (Venn, p. 171).

Cynthia Folio and Alexander R. Brinkman (2008) consider that ‘the translation of the spaces’ between the ‘hash marks’ (in the 1958 edition) to crotchets (in 1992) ‘is far from precise’ and ‘the differences in notes, register, dynamics and articulation are minor compared to the profound differences in rhythm and rhythmic grouping.’ (Folio and Brinkman, 2008, pp. 15 - 16). In fact, every attempt to transport the original version into conventional notation brings out a different version which is assumed to be ‘just one interpretation of the original’. (Folio and Brinkman, 2008, pp. 18 - 19).

Considering the above statements it can be deduced that, the spatial notation of *Sequenza I* can be re-notated but, in every case, similar but non-identical versions are possible. The comparison between the first phrase of the 1992 edition and Berio’s 1966 handwritten version really attests to this fact. (See Folio and Brinkman, 2008, p. 17, examples 1.2 and 1.3). At the same time it cannot be ignored that by the

24 Edward Venn assumes that Umberto Eco labelled *Sequenza* per flauto solo as a ‘work in movement’ because ‘he eventually misunderstood its spatial notation’, given Berio’s statement that the piece in question ‘will automatically bring a feeling of instability, an openness...’ (Venn, pp. 171 - 172).
transcription both negative and positive consequences were inevitably caused. The first case is reported by Folio and Brinkman who make reference to Benedict Weisser’s ascertainment according to which although many things were ‘lost in translation’, Berio preferred to have a ‘proper result’ rather than ‘the possibility of a richer amount and variety of relationships’. (Folio and Brinkman, 2008, p. 34). The second case is related to John Rink’s (2006) general statement that ‘rescoring the music can sometimes mitigate the original notation’s inadequacies by shedding light on properties obscured by or absent from the score itself’.  

Reginald Smith Brindle (1987) notes that although Sequeenza I was arranged in proportional notation, conventional signs were used as a means of indicating approximate durations. Smith Brindle clarifies that ‘it is easy to play and represent the Composer’s requirements precisely (perhaps too precisely where real time indeterminacy is aimed at’. (Smith Brindle pp. 1987, 63 - 64). It could be assumed that Smith Brindle, in 1975, intuited Berio’s intention for a considerable rhythmic control, a fact that was proved much later, in 1992. As a matter of fact, Berio himself expressed his disappointment in the performance approaches early in the 1960s. It means that, without doubt, performers variously cognized and interpreted the proportional score of Sequeenza I, far from Berio’s expectations. It is worth noting that after questioning the performers’ opinions the foregoing researchers Folio and Brinkman (2008) ended up with the conclusion that the majority of them were in favour of the original version for various reasons such as flexibility,

---

25 For instance, ‘an alternative metrical scheme latent in the original might be revealed by rewriting the music...re-barring as necessary to shift otherwise hidden downbeats and associated patterns of emphasis’. (Rink, 2006, p. 53).
phrasing and rhythmic vitality. (Folio and Brinkman, 2008, p. 19). Finally, *Sequenza I* acquired a full rhythmic control in 1992 by being transcribed into the same unbarred conventional notation which was applied to *Sequenza VI*.

Examples 15 and 16 depict the 1st phrase of *Sequenza I* in proportional and conventional notation. They refer to the 1958 and 1992 versions respectively.\(^{26}\)

*Sequenza per flauto solo*\(^{27}\) (1958)

![Example 15](image)

*Sequenza I per flauto solo*\(^{28}\) (1992)

![Example 16](image)

---

\(^{26}\) Permission to reprint these excerpts has been granted by the *Edizioni Suvini Zerboni*.

\(^{27}\) Edizioni Suvini Zerboni, S.p.A., Milano, 1958, (S. 5531 Z.)

\(^{28}\) Universal Edition 19957, 1992
Sequenza IV, for the piano was composed in 1965\(^{29}\). The piece was revised by Berio himself long after and published in 1993. Philip Thomas (2007) notes that in the new version grace notes were precisely notated, odd-numbered groups were substituted by even-numbered pitch groups, bars were extended by beat rests, pauses were added, tempos and time signatures were altered and actual pitches were changed. Furthermore Thomas guesses that Berio’s ‘dissatisfaction with past performances’ led the composer to revise the piece. He arguably believes that the additional rests and pauses ‘suggests the composer favoured a more expansive interpretation... and the revisions seem to reflect momentary preferences rather than changes in the compositional scheme...’ (Thomas, 2007, pp. 190 - 191).

Having in mind the previously mentioned Thomas’ references and suggestions, it is understood that in the new version minor-scale momentary reformations were made, more and adequate breathing spaces were created and certain technical difficulties were smoothed out, without compromising the identity of the work. In fact, one can logically assume that the revised version displays more rhythmic consistency and makes the text more readable, aiming at better prospective performance results.

Sequenza VII, for oboe was composed in 1969. The original score was supplemented by the oboist Jacqueline Leclair, and re-published as Sequenza VIIa, in 2000\(^{30}\). The original score of 1969 consists of a high

\[^{29}\text{Universal Edition, nr. 13727 mi., 1967}\]

\[^{30}\text{Universal Edition, No 31263}\]
proportion of traditional, “strict” rhythmic writing and spatial notation as well. Leclair notes that by this discrimination ‘two different time worlds’ coexisted: the first sounds strict and the second somewhat improvised. She advocates that the revision was a necessity because the ‘time / notation’ system applied to Sequenza VII seemed to her to be overly elusive. The supplementary edition was written in ‘normal rhythmic notation’ and ‘offers the oboist the opportunity to learn the timings / rhythms with great accuracy’ making clear that the revised version corresponds exactly with the ‘timings’ of the original. Referring to the timeframes, Leclair suggests the revised version in learning the piece ‘with great accuracy’. Afterwards, when the timeframes ‘are absorbed so that they are intuitively memorized’ the performer can ‘return to the original score and learn to express the two different time «feels» in the performance’. For Leclair, rhythmic orientation is presupposed for the phrasing, dynamics and gestures to be brought out confidently.\(^3\)

Leclair took it upon herself to revise the piece, apparently because she realized that the precise rhythmic calculation constitutes the safest way in consciously understanding the music text. After this cognitive procedure, the performer can interpret phrasing, dynamics and gestures confidently and develop the virtuosic character of the piece in the line of his / her unique artistic personality. In the two letters that Jacqueline Leclair sent to the writer,\(^3\) she narrated the events which had taken place from 1994 in which she started to re-notate the piece to 2000 when her version was published officially by the Universal Edition. In

\(^3\) Leclair, J, Sequenza VIIa [online]. http://www.beriooboesequenza.com/

\(^3\) April 7\(^{th}\) and 13\(^{th}\) 2014
fact, it was difficult for her to be convinced of the necessity of her supplementary edition and more difficult to obtain a meeting with Berio himself. Finally, the whole matter was worked out successfully when Jacqueline Leclair succeeded in meeting Berio in 1997. During this meeting she justified her revision by making references to Berio’s statements on *Sequenza* per flauto solo and the necessity which led him to re-notate this piece. At the same time she emphasized the difficulties which the performers could face in understanding the notation of *Sequenza VII*. Leclair sums up in a few words the result of their meeting by saying that ‘Berio simply admired’ her manuscript and decided to send this to his publisher immediately.

Indeed, in the following two years Leclair’s manuscript took its final shape in collaboration with Berio and his assistant. *Sequenza VIII* was published, in 2000. Leclair ascertained in her letter to the writer that ‘the temporal proportions which were transcribed in conventional notation’ were ‘very important’. Furthermore she stated that ‘rhythm is always the most important element of good music making, irrespective of the style of rhythm involved’ and ‘the style of music...would benefit from very precise, sure rhythmic structure’. It is worth quoting Jacqueline Leclair saying that:

> What inspired me was the expectation, that learning *VII* from a metered version would help oboists not only find the piece more understandable but also assist them in performing the music better.33

---

33 Letter sent to the writer on April 7th 2014
The following examples, 17 and 18, depict an excerpt taken from the 11th staff-line of the original version of Sequenza VII for oboe (1969), against its equivalent from the revised version (2000). These examples display the way in which the spatial notation was transcribed into conventional notation by the oboist Jackeline Leclair. In parts of spatial notation, the stemless notes, which are divided at right angles with a small line, were instructed by Berio to be played ‘as fast as possible’. These notes were calculated by J. Leclair as a detached (staccato) semiquaver.

1969

Example 17

2000

Example 18

55 Permission to reprint these excerpts has been granted by the Universal Edition.
By inference, the supplementary edition of *Sequenza VII* was fully approved by Berio. This fact attests that Berio was interested in bringing out the time frames exactly. Generally, it is assumed that Berio was in favour of every well-documented suggestion in smoothing the overburdened rhythmic complexities or solving the reading difficulties and misunderstandings.

Beyond doubt, Berio drew the note values in spatial notation as accurately as possible. Although this manner, of itself, doesn’t guarantee the absolute rhythmic depiction, Berio’s well-designed scores don’t leave any doubt about his desire to achieve a consistent rhythmic performance. On the other hand the notational history of the above mentioned *Sequenzas I, IV and VII* attests that Berio didn’t hesitate to reconsider his practices when they might be charged with unsatisfactory performances. Berio preferred to minimize deviations and, perhaps, further interesting performance approaches, by going back to the conventional and time-tested notational practices. He preferred not to risk reading difficulties, misunderstandings, arbitrary interferences and adaptations. For Berio himself, the accurate and consistent rhythmic depiction seems to be among the most important preconditions for good performance results.

The above mentioned notational approaches of *Sequenzas I, IV* and *VII* attest to Berio’s awareness that the notational system seriously affects the way in which the performer perceives the music and conveys its meaning to the listener. The way by which the music is notated directly affects the way the performer comprehends the score and interprets the music. Berio admitted a return to a traditional method of
writing by making the score more attractive and easy to comprehend. Ultimately because the rhythmic matter is considered to be of crucial importance in shaping the style of the piece, Berio by no means made any compromise.

*Sequenzas I, IV and VII,* were reviewed long after they had their 1st edition, when the need for revision came up as a necessity and prevailed over every other reason. The rhythmic clarification of *Sequenza VI* was undertaken by taking into account the previously mentioned thoughts despite the fact that the score was notated in a conventional and precise manner.36

Berio’s spatial choices can be viewed as attempts to explore new notational methods and possibilities in order to serve his stylistic pursuits. Normally, conventional writing is related to past music forms which consist of classical types of phrases, regular sequences of distinct pulses and consistent metrical and harmonic patterns. The spatial choices in question can be seen as escapes from traditional practices in depicting new and extremely difficult forms referring to the fields of pitch, rhythm, and sound vocabulary. Jacqueline Leclair states that the graphic scores of Earle Brown and Christian Wolff constitute movements aiming to free the performer from the ‘perceived "tyranny" of extremely specific notation’. According to her, Berio’s *Sequenza VII* was part of this general tendency which took place during the period from the late 1950s through the 1960s and 1970s, in which ‘many composers were experimenting extensively with notation’.37

36 See pages 13-16.
In fact, the years around the sixties were characterized as a period of extraordinary experimentation in form, harmony, and morphology. At the same time the graphic notation had a great expansion. The Sequenzas which were composed between the late 1950’s and the 1960s were affected more or less by this widespread tendency. On the contrary, in the coming years Berio adopted the opposite tendency by re-evaluating past practices, towards to a more consistent and conservative approach.

The notational history of the Sequenzas from 1967, when Sequenza VI was composed, until 2002, when the last Sequenza XIV was published, reveals that all nine pieces were depicted in standard notation under the condition of a lack of barlines. For the pieces in question, with the exception of Sequenza VII, no notational objections seem to have arisen on the part of both Berio and the performers. Sequenza VII (1969) was fully reviewed in standard notation in 2000, although it was originally composed, in 1969, with parts both in conventional and spatial notation.

By inference, Berio managed to depict extremely difficult and irregular textures in conventional notation and under the status of the lack of barlines.

Another dimension which shouldn’t escape one’s attention has to do with the consequences which followed Berio’s pursuit for precise rhythmic depiction. Although the music of Sequenza VI sounds indeterminate, due to its textural features, it was notated conventionally, a fact that brings out a great deal of tension. Arnold Whittall (1999) argues that ‘this sense of tension may explain the
evident exasperation of Berio’s remark, in 1996, that ‘classicism is nowadays like an empty box than can be filled with whatever we want’. Whittall assumes that this tension ‘is surely an essential aspect of Berio’s creative personality’ and ‘the source of his most individual and memorable achievements’. Given Berio’s recognition of the ‘fascinating, fluctuating divide between classicism and modernism’, Whittall suggests that Berio, like many twentieth-century composers, was concerned with preserving ‘an appropriate balance between ‘spontaneity and control, imaginativeness and integration’. (Whittall, 1999, pp. 300 - 301). In fact, the performer is asked to accommodate and balance the tension which is produced by the striking discrepancy between the indeterminate texture and its full rhythmic control. This tension and its conscious manipulation can play a crucial role in producing reliable interpretations. This tension provokes performer’s technical and artistic alertness, inventiveness and versatility.

As a general conclusion on the notational matter it can be said that, for the composer, the main concern is to choose the most convenient notation by which his music could be reliably depicted and satisfactorily interpreted. For the performer, the score needs to be attractive, readable, and comprehensible and to encourage possibilities for creative contribution. Without ignoring the composer’s will, the performer’s personal contribution in understanding and interpreting a music piece might reveal hidden aspects, far from the composer’s expectations, as is discussed in chapter V.
Form classification

Up to the present point, the discussion has been pivoted on the notational issue and its effectiveness in serving the irregular textures. Given this textural irregularity, the issue of sound indeterminacy, which is perceived, lends itself to discussion. This point of view challenges the writer’s curiosity to select and quote relevant information in relation to the topic. His ultimate purpose is to demonstrate if this label of indeterminacy can characterize the music of *Sequenza VI* and, if yes, how much and under which conditions it could be really admitted.

The topic in question can be better understood if it is considered under the prism of the advancements after the end of the 2nd World War. In the Introduction, points have been made about the expansion of serial composition -integral serialism- and subsequently about indeterminacy which captured composers’ interest. In fact, after the time at which serial thought was extended to its furthest points, the coming trends of indeterminacy were assumed as an inexorable necessity. According to Reginald Smith Brindle (1987) integral serialism, ‘while creating a new musical language during the fifties, contained within itself the seeds of self-destruction’. (Smith Brindle, 1987, p. 60). On this issue, George Rochberg (1984) is questioned ‘how can a total serial approach to composition, so rigorously systematized, result in indeterminacy’. It can be assumed that the transition from the total organization to the furthest limits of indeterminacy is something which
happened naturally. Rochberg argues that this phenomenon must be related to the ‘physical concept of entropy’.\textsuperscript{38} (Rochberg, 1984, pp. 5, 6).

According to Brian Simms (1986), indeterminacy gave a great perspective to a wide range of variety, extensive application of chance and experimentation upon numerous indeterminate methods. Indeterminacy in Europe, known as ‘aleatoricism’ by the Europeans, had a limited application and it has to be distinguished from the more extensive applications of \textit{chance}, which were applied by American Composers such as Cage, Feldman, Brown, Wolff. Furthermore, Simms assumes that ‘the influence of indeterminacy there was moderated by a strong commitment to serialism and a more traditional view of the composer’s role’.\textsuperscript{39} (Simms, 1986, pp. 368, 369).

On this issue Robert Morgan (1991) remarks that ‘despite Stockhausen’s radical evolution during the 1960s, most other European composers maintained a relatively cautious attitude toward indeterminacy, using it mainly to achieve certain kinds of calculated musical effects’. Especially, Luciano Berio, Hans Werner Henze, Henri Pousseur and Witold Lutoslawski ‘made at least some use of indeterminacy’. (Morgan, 199, pp. 374 - 375).

\textsuperscript{38} Rochberg remarks that ‘all closed systems in the universe, tend naturally to deteriorate and lose their distinctiveness by moving...from a state of organization...to a state of chaos and sameness’. This description derives from Norbert Wiener’s physical concept of \textit{Entropy}. (See: Rochberg, 1984, pp. 5 - 6 and Simms, 1986, p. 369).

\textsuperscript{39} Bryan Simms reports that Werner Meyer-Eppler, in his article ‘\textit{Statistic and Psychologic Problems of Sound}’ defined the term ‘aleatory’ by the words: ‘A process is said to be aleatoric if its course is determined in general but depends on chance in detail.’\textsuperscript{39} (Simms, 1986, p. 369).
According to Reginald Smith Brindle (1987) indeterminacy can be both partial and total. Furthermore he arranges indeterminacy in time, pitch, form, expression (dynamics, timbre, nuances) and space. (Smith Brindle, 1987, pp. 60 - 80). Brian Simms (1987) discriminates indeterminacy in composition and in performance. Simms reports that ‘by the late 1950s Berio -like Stockhausen and Boulez- ... admitted limited mobility of form and indeterminacy of performance which relied upon graphic notation’. (Simms, 1987, pp. 357, 377).

If the music of Sequenza VI could be characterized as indeterminate, it falls into the category of indeterminacy in composition. But there can’t have been any written description that could absolutely fit the case. A close description is given by David Cope (1997). In his 2\textsuperscript{nd} category of indeterminacy Cope refers to ‘music composed indeterminately but notated traditionally’, (Cope, 1997, p. 162), but below he exemplifies an indeterminate process which involves the five parameters (pitch, dynamic, articulation, duration and register), each of which must be determined by five tosses of the dice. (Cope, 1997, p. 164).

In the case of Sequenza VI, the textures couldn’t have been collected by chance, so the piece pertains to an individual type of indeterminacy. It concerns indeterminacy in composition according to which the textural material is designed intentionally and notated traditionally by aiming to produce a sense of indeterminacy.

After the previous discussion, an overall description should be made on the basic textural features of Sequenza VI in which a sense of indeterminacy is perceived. The melodic lines consist of patterns which
are unconventional and irregular in length. The rhythmic complexity and irregularity creates numerous short-term time signatures. It is worth noting that the score of *Chemins II*, to which *Sequenza VI* was barred and transported, contains 161 metrical changes. As a result, there is no possibility for any metrical order to be established and perceived at a minimum level. As a consequence, linear pitch groups cannot be seen as self-existent musical ideas, which could be especially spotlighted. The tempo differentiates ten times. In the central part of the piece, in section No 3 which maintains the minimum level of density, eight short tempo changes generate erratic strains and relaxations while many opposite dynamic changes occur momentarily and contradict one another. The harmony is, in many cases, saturated by the extreme use of chromaticism, embellishment tones, dissonances, dynamics and bowing techniques.

In conclusion, the texture of *Sequenza VI* seems to have been intentionally formed in order to produce an indeterminate sound impression, especially when the listener remains unaware of the compositional processes. This listener’s unawareness could lead him to suppose that the music might not have been pre-established and strictly notated but to a certain extent improvised. Finally the case of *Sequenza VI* doesn’t seem to be far from David Cope’s general statement that since only traditional notation appears in a score ‘nothing even suggests indeterminacy except perhaps the sound’. (Cope, 1997, p. 164).

---

40 See p. 20 above
41 See figures 6 and 7 on pages 52 and 53 accordingly.
Part II. Structure

CHAPTER III

Sectional division

In the previous chapters, on the occasion of notation, general references were made to the textural features. In this chapter a detailed structural analysis will take place but before any approach on the subject, the division into sections comes up as a necessity. As a matter of fact, due to the textural distinctiveness, any attempt to divide Sequenza VI into sections, by observing the score and following conventional methods, will prove to be both, arid and critical.

The texture of Sequenza VI consists of irregular and constantly transforming figurations while conventional phrases and rhythmic uniformities are not observed. On page 10 above, references were made to the fact that ‘there is no phrasing of a conventional nature’ (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 286) and ‘the music is probably unphrased’ (MacKay, 1988, p. 226). Due to this phenomenon if one attempts to divide the piece by considering the score, this could lead to problematic results given that the numerous different textural shapes have no any sufficient rhythmic consistency and comparable affinity. On this matter Amanda Bayley (2008) makes reference to Stephen Morris’ sleeve note in the recording by the violist Walter Trampler. According to Morris’s evaluation Sequenza VI develops a ‘kind of polyphony of different textures’. (Bayley, 2008, p. 240). Also the harmonic factor cannot be taken into account in dividing the piece because the textural ‘polyphony’, mentioned above, doesn’t seem to be related to a
methodical organization of the harmonic rhythm. Instead, a practical idea for the division into sections through a careful listening will be sufficiently effective. As a consequence, the criterion of sectional division should concern the aural sound impressions before any score consideration. Afterwards, the borders of sections and subsections should be located on the score for further commentary.

Considering the previously mentioned thoughts the present Analysis takes into account the aural experiment which was carried out, in 1990, by Irene Deliège and Abdessadek El Ahmadi under the title *Mechanisms of Cue Extraction in Musical Groupings: A study of Perception on Sequenza VI for Viola Solo by Luciano Berio*. (Deliège and El Ahmadi, 1990, pp. 18-44).

According to this experiment eighteen musicians and an equal number of non-musicians were invited to listen to Walter Trampler’s performance and to ‘indicate perceived segmentations’, by identifying cues, with the aim of understanding the plan of the piece. The segmentations resulted in identifying ‘the beginning and the end of major compositioned units’. (Deliège and El Ahmadi, 1990, p. 18). As a result, six sections were identified and defined in terms of perceived volume of sound.

---

42 Trampler’s 1967 performance was the only one available before 1990 when the experiment in question was published. (VINYL RCA, SPA. ROME. ITALY. LSC 3168, (AKBY 17916-17). Obviously, Cellist Rohan de Saram’s 1981 performance hadn’t been taken into account. (See pp. 7, 8)

43 Generally, a cue was considered to be ‘a rather brief marker whose impact is very clear in sound and rhythm’... (Deliège and El Ahmadi, 1990, pp. 18, 19, 29).

44 The segmentations were in general agreement with a reference analysis provided by two composers. (Deliège and El Ahmadi, 1990, p. 18).
The following figure, No 1, extracted from I. Deliège and A. El Ahmadi’s perception study indicates the perceived volume of sound depicted by the shaded columns ‘as proposed by a non-musician subject’. (Deliège and El Ahmadi, 1990, p. 25).

**Figure No 1: I. Deliège and A. El Ahmadi’s plan of Sequenza VI**

![Diagram showing sectional plan of Sequenza VI](image)

This sectional plan is adopted by the present Analysis as the most appropriate structural framework. It is not absolutely undeniable that the same result would have been extracted if the specific experiment had been conducted on another subsequent performance of Walter Trampler after 1967. Without doubt the experiment in question seems to give great potential for further research.

Amanda Bayley (2008) adapted Deliège and A. El Ahmadi’s plan of Sequenza VI, and ‘for clarity and comparison’ added ‘the timings corresponding to the different sections’ of 1967 Walter Trampler and 1998 Christoph Desjardins’ recordings. (Bayley, 2008, pp. 239-241). It is important to emphasize that in Bayley’s plan, sections with individual subsections were specified, so the structural framework is illustrated in a more analytical manner. (Bayley, 2008, p. 241).

By keeping Amanda Bayley’s above plan in mind, the next step attempts to allocate the points on the score which coincide with Walter

---

**Permission has been granted by the SAGE Publications.**
Trampler’s performance timings. In this way the most likely framework will be created by demarcating sections and subsections on the score. Hereupon the manner by which the compositional elements, which refer to melody, harmony, tempo, texture and sound morphology, were arranged into the structural framework is revealed. At the same time interactions and relationships of the various elements logically result in practical conclusions.

It is assumed that this purpose can be effectively realized by considering the score and listening to Walter Trampler’s 1967 performance. In this way the most reliable starting points of the sections and subsections and the timings are demarcated on the score as following.

The foregoing figure, No 1, is graphed in figure No 2:

Figure No 2: The sectional division and timing plan of Sequenza VI

![Chart showing the sectional division and timing plan of Sequenza VI](chart.png)

---

46 VINYL RCA, SPA. ROME. ITALY. LSC 3168, (AKBY 17916-17)

47 The timings which come about are slightly differentiated from the timings suggested by Amanda Bayley. (See Bayley, 2008, p. 241).
The start points of sections and subsections, found on the score, could be established as they are described in the following figure, No. 3.

**Figure No 3: The start points of sections and subsections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Start Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the piece is assumed to be of five sections, the 6th section might therefore be considered the final ‘cadence’, because it lies solitary on the lowest volume of sound, figure No 4 reveals a proportional structuralism from the point of view of volume.

Figure No 4: The proportional Structuralism of Sequenza VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Volume of sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outermost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to the centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The column arrangement presented in figure No 2 and its more abstractive depiction displayed in figure No 4 demonstrates a wide quantitative framework which was planned proportionally, although sections and subsections don’t seem to be symmetrical in length. In particular, figure No 4 displays a well-proportioned structural design at three volumes of sound which might be related to Berio’s previous serial experience, although he sheered away early from an absolute and predetermined music organization. (Bayley, 2008, p. 237). In fact, after the 1950’s, as John MacKay (1988) states, compositional trends and practices moved ‘from the micro-structural level (instantaneous dynamic, durational, pitch and timbral quantities)’ of the integral serialism ‘to global structurings, in duration and succession of textural

---

48 The three volumes of sound coincide with the three levels of density the components of which are examined below.
qualities’. Serial thought was relaxed and ‘the number of discrete levels was reduced from twelve to three (such as maximum, medium, and minimum) or four’. (MacKay, 1988, pp. 223 - 224).
Density and Tension

The term *perceived volume of sound*, in I. Deliège and A. El Ahmadi’s study, indicated in figure No 1, p. 43 above, concerns sound levels, that is to say *levels of density*, according to Berio’s terminology. Generally, Berio used the terms *density* and *tension* to describe the sound status and the special methods by which the sound result is finally achieved. Focusing on Berio’s definitions, the term *density* is used to describe the melodic and harmonic developmental status. The term *tension* refers to the dynamic, temporal, pitch and morphological dimensions by which density is obtained. Berio’s expression *morphological dimension* refers to the techniques of playing. Ultimately, although the density concerns the melodic and harmonic concentration, (thickness or thinness), it is controlled by the tensional dimensions (dynamic, temporal, pitch and sound morphology) which as a whole, attach special expression and quality to the primary material. (Berio, 1985, pp. 97 - 99).

As a matter of fact, the previously presented sectional division arose by discriminating the sound impressions into three levels of density: minimum, medium and maximum. It is assumed that this division reveals a wide plan and directly calls to mind Osmond-Smith’s remark, that ‘Sequenza VI is typical of Berio’s large-scale structural thought’. (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 47).

Before making any comment on the textural features, it is important to consider the dynamic, temporal, pitch and morphological dimensions and evaluate their contribution in shaping the three levels of density.

---

49 See also: Shove and Repp, pp. 55 - 57
density. For this purpose the sectional division will be used as a model. The correlation of the tensional dimensions with the sectional division is attempted because there are strong indications that Berio’s large-scale structural thought concerns the former as much as the later. This fact seems to coincide with Berio’s words when talking about his Sequenza per flauto solo, but implying more or less all the Sequenza series, he stated that the dynamic, temporal, pitch and morphological dimensions were characterized by ‘maximum, medium and minimum levels of tension’. (Berio, 1985, pp. 97 - 98).

The Dynamic dimension of Sequenza VI in its whole gamut seems to occur in accordance with the levels of density. In the following figure, No 5, the graph refers to dynamics in Sequenza VI and has been extracted from Amanda Baley’s figure 13.2. (Bayley, 2008, pp. 243). This graph has been set up against the plan of the sectional division, presented in figure No 3, p. 45 above.

---

50 Permission to reprint this graph has been granted by the Ashgate, Gower & Lund Humphries Publishing.
The course of dynamics starts with ***fff*** and ends up with **pppp**. In the sections of maximum level of density the ***fff*** dominates throughout section No 1 while in the corresponding Section No 4 the *f* dynamic level tries to be carried.

In Sections No 2 and No 4, which maintain the medium level of density, mainly the *f* and secondly the *mf* dominate while sporadic and momentary parts are dedicated to *pp*, *p* and ***ff*** dynamic levels. Specifically section No 4 starts with *mf* but before it reaches to *ff*, the dynamics *mp*, *p* and *pp* are alternated for short periods of time. It can be assumed that these short-term lower dynamics have their origins in the previous section No 3 which maintains a great number of low and short dynamic changes.

In Section No 3, those of the low level of density, dynamics in a wide gamut are interchanged rapidly. It is supposed that using this
practice Berio tried to obtain the minimum level of density given that the high dynamics are immediately retracted by dropping to an opposite level. At the same time the music interest is retained. The lowest dynamic indications are found in the last section No 6. Almost from the beginning of section No 6 which is marked by the term *con sord.*, the *f* dynamic level performs a dramatic descendant to *p*. Hereupon, the *p* continues its descendant course until it reaches its lowest level (*pppp*), despite the two fleeting and sporadic attempts at ascent which occur in the meantime.

Referring to the *f* level, it cannot escape one’s attention that from the middle of section No 2 until section No. 5, the *f* level tries to be carried. Especially in section No 3, despite its great mobility in the dynamic field, the *f* level seems to be used as an index marker on both sides on which the dynamics fluctuate. Generally, the *f* level is trying to be carried. The contrast between *fff* and *ppp* found in the outmost sections, No 1 and No 6, is noticeable.51

Considering the diagram of dynamics, three dynamic levels are identified. The 1\(^{st}\) dynamic level is specified by the terms *mf, f, ff, fff, sf, sff*. It occurs in sections 1, 2, 4 and 5 those of maximum and medium level of density. The 2\(^{nd}\) dynamic level is determined by the terms *p* and *pp* and is found in sections No 3 and almost entirely in section No 6 which maintains the minimum level of density. The 3\(^{rd}\) dynamic level refers to the lowest dynamic area (*ppp* and *pppp*) and occurs at the end of section No 6. It is assumed that this classification in three dynamic levels comes in accordance with Berio’s large-scale structural thought.

51 See examples 19 and 30 on pp. 69 and 73 respectively.
This thought is also observed in the fields of pitch, harmony, tempo, texture and sound morphology.

In figure No 6 the three dynamic levels are marked on the graph of dynamics.

**Figure No 6: The three dynamic levels of Sequenza VI**

Especially in section No 3 the whole dynamic gamut occurs, except the *fff* indication. In spite of this fact, this section must be classified in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} dynamic level. This classification can be justified because of the thin texture and the great number of frequent and sudden dynamic alternations. In fact, the graph of dynamics reveals that in the larger part of this section, No3, the *p* dynamic level is used as the lowest point of reference while the dynamics exceeds momentarily the *f* level to *ff*, *sf*, and *sff*. In the remaining part of section No 3, the lowest dynamic level reaches the *pp*, but no dynamic exceeds over the *f* level which has been marked as a point of reference. Given the frequent and sudden dynamic alternations mentioned above, the dynamics in question (*p*, *pp*) retracts every attempt undertaken by the upper dynamics to impose and firmly establish their presence. Without doubt, the above graph indicates a careful design.
The *Temporal* dimension refers to the eleven *tempo* indications which are observed throughout the score. The tempo starts with \( \textbf{♩} = 62 \), and follows the course \( \textbf{♩} = 72 \) (p. 3, 2), \( \textbf{♩} = 96 \) (p. 3, 7), \( \textbf{♩} = 90 \) \(^{52}\) (p. 4, 1), \( \textbf{♩} = 96 \) (p. 4, 1), \( \textbf{♩} = 72 \) (p. 4, 7), \( \textbf{♩} = 144 \) \(^{53}\) (p. 5, 1), \( \textbf{♩} = 120 \) (p. 5, 2), \( \textbf{♩} = 144 \) (p. 5, 4), \( \textbf{♩} = 60 \) (p. 5, 4) and \( \textbf{♩} = 50 \) (p. 6, 10).

In figure No 7 shown below the course of tempo changes, extracted from Amanda Baley’s figure 13.3 \(^{54}\), (Bayley, 2008, p. 245), is graphed on the column arrangement which represents the levels of density.

Figure No 7: The density levels and tempo changes in Sequenza VI

The main tempos of \( \textbf{♩} = 62 \) and 60 predominate the whole score and cover its major part. Especially, the tempo \( \textbf{♩} = 62 \) covers section No

\(^{52}\) It is indicated on the score as \( \textbf{♩} = 60 \)

\(^{53}\) It is indicated on the score as \( \textbf{♩} = 96 \)

\(^{54}\) Permission to reprint this graph has been granted by the *Ashgate, Gower & Lund Humphries Publishing*. 
1 and the major part of section No 2 (until page 3 / 2), while the tempo $\text{♩} = 60$ covers sections 4, 5 and the half part of section No 6. In the above mentioned areas the tempo barely differentiates and it could be said that the differences seem to be insignificant. During the 2nd half of section No 2 (p. 3, 2) the tempo escalates twice at p. 3 / 2 ($\text{♩} = 72$) and p. 3 / 7 ($\text{♩} = 96$). In the next section, No 3, (from p. 3 / 9 to 5 / 5) eight changes of higher tempos occur ($\text{♩} = 96, 90 [\text{♩} = 60], 96, 72, 144 [\text{♩} = 96], 120, 144$ and 60).

The comparison between the course of density levels and tempo changes reveals that higher, shorter and more frequent tempos occur in section No 3 which maintains the minimum level of density. In approaching section No 3 the course of tempos is being gradually prepared ($\text{♩} = 62, 72, 96$) but before the end of this section the tempo is reduced suddenly from $\text{♩} = 144$ to $\text{♩} = 60$.

The tempos can be demarcated in the following three levels, in line with Berio’s large-scale structural thought. In the next figure, No 8, the tempo levels are indicated:

Figure No 8: The tempo levels of Sequenza VI
In figure No 9 the dynamic and tempo graphs are presented one against the other and their courses are outlined. These graphs have been extracted from Amanda Baley’s figures 13.2 and 13.3 which refer to dynamics and tempo changes in Sequenza VI respectively. (Bayley, 2008, pp. 243, 254).

Figure No 9: Dynamic and tempo graphs in Sequenza VI
The progress of these graphs attests that both dynamics and tempos move in the opposite direction and occur at almost the same time. Section No 3 especially is the only area with the most frequent succession and variety of tempos and dynamics in relation to the other sections. In fact, eight different tempos and 125 short-term and sudden dynamic changes are found throughout this section which maintains the minimum level of density. Also, section No 3 is the only one to which the entire dynamic gamut, from ff to pppp, is employed. Because in most cases the dynamic changes occur frequently and momentarily, the minimum density level is by no means affected. For all that, if a logical assumption should be attempted to explain the philosophy of this phenomenon observed in section No 3, it must be related to the generation of both tension due to the sudden dynamic alternations and motion due to the frequent and high tempo changes. As a result, the musical interest is continues at all times and it never becomes monotonous despite being within such a calm area of low density.

By inference, it is assumed that the course of dynamics and tempos throughout Sequenza VI wouldn’t have occurred by chance. On the contrary it indicates Berio’s large-scale structural thought. The general rule could be summed up in a few words as following: the higher the dynamics the fewer tempo indications and vice versa.

A more analytical approach especially on tempo graph reveals another aspect of Berio’s compositional process. In figure No 10 below the tempo graph is depicted. The remainder between the two initial and final tempo indications is the same number which is ten. For the rest indications, the remainder from one tempo indication to the next is always a multiple of the number of six.
In the figure No 11 below, tempo graph is depicted more simply. In the ascending course from 72 to 144, the remainder between two adjacent tempo indications always comes up to twenty four.
The *Pitch* dimension generally concerns the pitch material. In *Sequenza VI*, the gamut of viola was used in its entirety, from the lowest C\(^3\) to the highest F\(^#6\). Basic sources of the pitch material became the main tonalities G, D, and A, which refer to the three open strings of the instrument, the extended chordal formations, the widely used tritones and dissonances and the extensive chromaticism.\(^{55}\)

Undoubtedly a great deal of density is created by the intensive harmonic activity, the ‘polyphonic writing’ to a certain extent, the extensive chromaticism and the dissonances along with the wide melodic lines and intervallic leaps. Referring to the role of dissonances Wallace Berry (1987) assumes that dissonance is a crucial factor of creating density, so the relation of density to dissonance is fully concerned. Furthermore, he states that the proximities and the particular distribution, by which components are separated in vertical alignment, directly affect the degree of density.\(^{56}\) (Berry, 1987, pp. 209 - 210). Special mention on the nature of the melodic and harmonic material is given in chapter III below. The previously mentioned handful of primary sources of pitch material is assumed to occur in line with Berio’s large-scale structural thought.

\(^{55}\) The matter is discussed in chapter IV, p. 75.

\(^{56}\) For instance, superimposed 2\(^{nds}\) make up a very dense ‘textural complex’, while ‘the sonority and coloration suggest further aspects of density’. (Berry, 1987, pp. 209 - 210).
The *Morphological* dimension refers to various techniques of playing. The *broken tremolo* is assumed to be the main morphological feature of *Sequenza VI*. It constitutes the basic instrumental technique by which this piece is identified.

In the following figure, No 12, the columns indicate the percentage of the total values which refers to the *broken tremolo*, remaining techniques of playing and rests accordingly.

Figure No 12: the total values of the broken tremolo, the remaining techniques of playing and the rests of Sequenza VI.

The previous overall arrangement doesn’t seem to allow the reader to draw a touchstone inference. On the contrary, the next figure, No 13, indicates the note values of the *broken tremolo*, section by section.
The *broken tremolo* is widely found in sections of maximum density while in sections of minimum density its use is drastically reduced. In fact, in low levels of density which are represented in sections No 3 and 6, there is a very rare or almost non-existent *broken tremolo*. Even if it doesn’t appear, its impression is always waiting to be heard.

In calculating the note values indicated by *broken tremolo*, the rapid prefixed arpeggiated figurations, the grace notes and the other embellishments haven’t been taken into account although they comprise a block by themselves. This phenomenon dominates throughout the piece but it is more understandable in sections No 1, 2 and 3 (examples 5 and 6, p. 15).

Figure 14 illustrates the percentage of the remaining techniques of playing.
The sectional percentage of the other techniques of playing corresponds to the density levels. The most extreme difference is found in sections 5 and 6. In the following figure, No 15, the graphs of the previous two figures are combined. The graphic course of these two categories of playing reveals their consistent motion to the opposite direction step by step.
Figure No 15: the *broken tremolo* and the remaining techniques of playing in Sequenza VI

Although the *broken tremolo* covers a large part of the piece, it would be interesting to graph the ordinary bowing which displays the normal timbre of the viola. On the assumption that the selected notes for calculation are perceived to be a minimum, figure No 16 below indicates the total note values up to semiquavers section by section.
The absence of ordinary playing in sections of maximum density is obvious. The ordinary playing does not exist in sections No 1 and 5. The short portions of ordinary bowing found in sections No 2 and 4, those of the medium level of density, seem to sound like a merciful oasis of calm, among such harsh sound impressions. Almost fifty percent of ordinary playing is found in section No 3 that of minimum level of density, while in the final section, No 6, which maintains the very lowest density, normal playing dominates.

Apart from the broken tremolo a very small amount of *fingering tremolo* is also found on the score. It is observed very rarely, as is illustrated in figure No 17 below.
Figure No 17: the percentage of *fingering tremolo* in Sequenza VI

The rests cover a small part of each section. In the following figure, No 18, the percentage of the rest values is presented section by section.

Figure No 18: the percentage of rests in Sequenza VI
The way, by which the rests are spread, come up to give small breathing spaces before the sudden downward powerful attack or before the upward rapid prefixed arpeggiated figurations by which the formers are prepared. Generally by the rests, smaller or larger arcs, motives and solitary notes are marked but in the most cases, rests don’t seem to leave sufficient time for relaxation. Even though ample time is left, this eloquent silence presages powerful bowing barrages.

The overall depiction of the previously mentioned elements is presented in figure No 19 below:

Figure No 19: the overall graph of the note values in Sequenza VI
A number of other instrumental techniques are listed along with the broken and fingering tremolos discussed above: The playing of on the bridge\textsuperscript{57} is sporadically found in sections No 2 and 3 but it is met more systematically in sections No 4 and 5. It is mainly used to treat the out of time slashed arpeggiated figurations of quavers. (See example 6, p. 15 and pp. No 5 and 6 of the score). The sudden and frequent alternations from arco to pizz. and col legno techniques are found in section No 4. (See example 27, p. 71 and p. No 5 of the score). The glissando passages are frequently found in the highest registers of section No 5 and are repeatedly performed by random and minimal slide fingering: (See score, p. No 6 and examples 23 and 24, p. 70). The harmonics are found towards the end of the section No 5 and form two long passages:\textsuperscript{58} In the 1\textsuperscript{st} passage they are played by glissandi randomly and with a wide sliding of the fingers. In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} passage the harmonics alternate with the ordinary position of the fingers. (See score, p. No 6/5-6 - 7 - 8).

The previously mentioned morphological factors, which are related to the instrumental techniques, aim to amplify the density. Without doubt the main factor in creating density is the widely used broken tremolo and the way in which it is instructed to be played. According to the directions found on the score, it should be performed by ‘fff sempre’, ‘as fast as possible’, ‘towards the frog’ and ‘far from any prolonged pattern or regular articulation’. In most of the cases the broken tremolo exists as the fastest and most powerful distributional

\textsuperscript{57}This term is marked on the score as ‘Pont.’ in Italian.

\textsuperscript{58}The six harmonics which are found in solitary pitches in sections No 3 and 4 seem to have a minor impact.
tremolo of three/four stops. Furthermore the broken tremolo must be played unconventionally, so the performer is called upon to invent unconventional manners of playing in order to efficiently serve the demanding textures of Sequenza VI. These techniques, to which more details are presented in chapter V below, can be is listed in the revolutionary instrumental techniques (such as the unconventional bowing pressures), which had their peaks in the mid-1960s.\textsuperscript{59}

Considering the previous remarks, high velocity, density, and extremely rough dynamics are intended to be produced, by the broken tremolo. This phenomenon is always observed even when it occurs on long chords of immobile harmony. (Example 19, p. 69). Although high dynamic and speed levels are efficiently treated by this kind of tremolo, it loses no opportunity to be brilliantly perceptible even on points of lower density and thinner texture. (Example 27, p. 71).

The remaining techniques of playing are also considered to be important means of density as has been mentioned above. The frequent alternations from \textit{arco} to \textit{pizz.} and \textit{col legno}, which are found in section No 4, (example 27, p. 71 and page No 5 of the score) and the \textit{glissando} passages found in section No 5 (score, p. No 6) are used in line with the textural transformations and retain the high density similar to the broken tremolo.

\textsuperscript{59} See more details in chapter No V below.
Texture

As has been said in the previous unity, the texture and its thickness or thinness, known as pitch concentration, constitutes the primary reason in shaping the desired levels of density. Also, the role of the tensional dimensions (dynamic, temporal, pitch and sound morphology) in controlling density is emphasized. On this matter David Cope (1997) argues that the components of texture (pitch, timbre and duration) are certainly combined; in other words, texture ‘is generally measured in terms of density’. (Cope, 1997, p. 99). On the same matter Wallace Berry (1987) suggests that ‘density as the number of sounding components is the density-number; density as the ratio of the number of sound components to a given space is the density-compression.’ (Berry, 1987, p. 209).

Representative examples of the three levels of density collected from the score are commented on below:

From the **maximum** level of density:

The extended four-pitch chord, which occurs in the sonorous middle area played by broken tremolo, ***fff sempre***, ‘as fast as possible’ and ‘towards the frog’, reaches the highest level of density and dynamic. Strong intervallic tension is produced by the dissonant minor 2\textsuperscript{nd} G♯-A: (Example 19, p. 1 / 1).
Arpeggiated groups of demisemiquavers decisively prepare for the next powerful chordal formations: (Example 20, p.1 / 6).

By reaching the culmination point $E_b^6$, three almost identical chordal interpolations momentarily and repeatedly appear three times between rests. These repetitions tend to reduce the density: (Example 22, p. 2 / 1, b).
Thickness, insistency, constant fast tremolos and sporadic glissandos, found in section No 5, retain the density despite the high registers. The two initial staffs are covered by a three pitch chordal intense action on p. 6 / 1 - 2: (Example 23). The same mobility is intensively continued by four pitch chordal sequences on p. 6 / 3 - 4 - 5: (Example 24).

From the *medium* level of density:

Sporadic solitary notes, played by either broken tremolos or ordinary playing, gently bring a soothing timbre: (Example 25, p. 2/3).
Delicate sound impressions are produced within soft passages, seconded by fingered tremolos: (Example 26, p. 3 / 1).

Example 26

The frequent changes in techniques of playing such as *arco*, *pizzicato* and *col legno*, which are applied to quadruple stop chords and occur between rests, retain the density at the proper level: (Example 27, p. 5 / 7 - 8).

Example 27

From the **minimum** level of density:

Passages of long duration solitary notes widely dissociated from each other and performed more by ordinary playing than broken tremolo, are set up between rests. The opposite dynamic changes cannot affect the minimum level of density because they occur momentarily and contradict each other: (Example 28, p. 3/10).

Example 28
The near absence of chords, the scarce use of tremolos and the delicate passages retain the minimum level of density: (Example 29, p. 4 / 5).

Example 29

The fall of velocity (♩ = 50) and dynamic, the narrower leaps, the long note values and the near absence of tremolos which occur in the two final staffs of section No 6, reach the lowest level of density: (Example 30, p. 6/9).

Example 30

These two final staffs could be considered the final ‘cadence’.

Despite the lowest density and dynamic this area displays rich harmonic mobility because with every note change a new chord appears. The whole chordal sequence seems to have been properly designed in order

---

See figures No 3 and 4 on pp. 45 and 46 respectively.
to create harmonic motion in spite of the lowest dynamic and rhythmic mobility, a fact which is illustrated in the following chapter.⁶¹

After the previous discussion it is assumed that the textural shapes, which have similar features in volume of sound and density, can be arranged in three wide groups which correspond with the three levels of density. At the same time specific instrumental techniques were employed according to their ability to obtain the intended purpose. The comparison of the textures with the dynamics and tempos reveals that the textures outline a similar course to those of dynamics in contrast with the tempos which move conversely. This is illustrated in figure, No 9, p. 55. This contradiction has been recognized by Berio himself. (Bayley, 2008, p. 242).

Attempting a logical explanation for this seemingly incomprehensible practice, the writer hypothesises that Berio deliberately created this antithesis between the course of tempos and dynamics as well as between the course of tempos and textures. He assumes that this contradiction constitutes an additional means aiming to reinforce the dramatic character of Sequenza VI. Amanda Bayley (2008) suggests another similar case by quoting composer George Flynn’s observation who remarks that the ‘dramatic vitality’ of Sequenza VI ‘derives not from the mere presence of alternating textures but rather from the ways in which the textures are prolonged and related to one another’. (Bayley, 2008, p. 242).

⁶¹ See example No 41, p. 92.
In conclusion it can be deduced that the density in *Sequenza VI* is produced not only due to the nature of such an idiomorphic texture but also because it is properly activated by the specific tensional means and instrumental techniques. To quote Wallace Berry, (1987) ‘musical textures are often activated by dynamic, articulative, rhythmic, coloristic, and other means’ on which ‘many techniques of textural activations are applicable’... It is worth mentioning that by these techniques ‘relatively simple, fixed textures’ can be importantly vitalised.\(^{62}\) (Berry, 1987, p. 222).

---

\(^{62}\) Wallace Berry (1987) states that in works of Stravinsky numerus examples of ‘simpler’ and ‘inert’ textures are set in motion by many types of activation. (Berry, 1987, p. 222).
CHAPTER IV
Melodic and Harmonic Description

The melodic and harmonic description of *Sequenza VI* has challenged other previous researchers’ interest such as David Osmond-Smith and John Mackay, who illustrated the main melodic and harmonic features of the score.

David Osmond-Smith (1992) records the basic and ancillary material and outlines the pitch structure by discriminating the top line and those of the lower pitch formations which have an enduring presence. Melodic progressions, wider arcs, passages of a particular pitch group and areas with ‘strong tritonal content’ were depicted on an abstract figure. (Osmond-Smith, 1992, pp. 44 - 46). John MacKay (1988) outlines the uppermost tones of harmonic aggregates, occurrence and recurrence of aggregates, arguing that they ‘gain relatively specific functional significance through their integration into ascending and descending chromatic lines’. (MacKay, 1988, pp. 234, 235). Basically, both researchers’ interest focuses mainly on drawing the important pitch progressions, frames, occurrences and recurrences. Harmonically, David Osmond-Smith (1992) mainly emphasizes the crucial role of the tritones, which, ‘even at first glance... is evident’, and ‘the polarity between A and E♭’ which dominates ‘the first four pages’. (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 42). Linking both *Sequenzas IV* (for the piano) and *VI* (for viola) MacKay observes ‘aspects of tonal organization’ (MacKay 1988, p. 223) and assumes that the ‘tonal form’ of the latter is ‘more closely integrated’ than that of the former which had been composed two years
before. (Mackay, 1988, p. 236). Furthermore he advocates that the ‘tonal form’ of Sequenza VI ‘manifests many of the abstract organizational procedures which are commonly associated with the concept of a "tonality"’. (MacKay, 1988, p. 236).

The above mentioned hints at tonal organization encourage an analysis of the harmonic issue from the tonal point of view. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that tonal formations can be observed at the borders of sections and subsections and, sporadically, at certain points throughout the score. The harmonic framework, which is shaped by the chordal formations found at the borders of sections and subsections, seems to have been planned under an overall tonal concept. It could be hypothesised that this harmonic framework displays Berio’s large-scale structural thought, along with the division into sections, the density and the tensional dimensions formerly discussed in chapter II.

The proper practice in exploring the harmonic matter will be chosen by considering the way in which the harmonic material was arrayed. For this reason, it is worth quoting the following relevant comments: David Osmond-Smith (2001) argues that ‘fixed pitch resources...are each explored for their melodic and harmonic potential in turn’. (Osmond-Smith, 2001, p. 354). He discriminates that not only the top line which ‘provides an anchor for the ear’ but also the inner parts create ‘a succession of harmonic variants beneath each successive pitch of the upper part’s ascent’. (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 43). On this issue John MacKay (1988) remarks that ‘because of the close linear organization of the harmonic aggregates, the identity is dominated by the upper pitch’ and that ‘different chords occur beneath the same
upper pitch but these can be regarded as variants of the same chord…’ (MacKay, 1988, p. 239, n. 12).

The above mentioned observations imply a homophonic type of writing. In the following figure, No 22, the most likely upper melodic line (real or imaginable) is drawn independent of any interruption and accompanied by its vertical harmonic support. In accommodating the melodic-harmonic description, the sectional division as it appears in figure No 2, p. 44, is employed. It must be discriminated here that, this melodic-harmonic description takes place in the line with the sectional division, presented above, for reasons of continuity and consistency. The sectional division is used, in essence, to place the material into a framework in order to obstruct it from being loosened. At the same time it is supposed that in this way the possible melodic-harmonic process will be more clearly distinguished. A similar analytical approach was suggested by Wallace Berry (1987) who assumed that ‘typically the melody outlines the primary notes of the tonality’. In three examples, among others, extracted from Coreli, *Concerto Grosso* in F minor, op. 6, No 3 (3rd movement), Couperin, *La Bondissante* (from order 21) and Krënek’s, *Eight Piano Pieces*, No 4, Berry marks essential pitches, of superior harmonic projection, and attaches them to the underline beam. (Berry, 1987, pp. 118,119 and 120).

For the reasons mentioned above, the melodic-harmonic course is considered independently of the note values. Both, rhythmic and harmonic matters are examined individually from each other. What really concerns the present analysis is the theoretical identification of the chords found at the borders of sections and subsections. Because the relationship between rhythm and harmony seems to be loose and
rather indefinable, the harmonic description considers these chords as directional harmonic points only. In fact, in certain cases, the appearance of the chords of the harmonic framework is rhythmically fleeting.\textsuperscript{63}

In figure No 20 below, the melodic-harmonic description is displayed in detail. The beginning and end of sections and subsections are harmonically defined but the inner formations are marked only when they can be arguably identified. The pitches are considered by their harmonic significance only, without reference to their rhythmic value. The pitches which form the upper imaginable line are depicted by blank, upward beamed notes, while the pitches which represent the rest of the harmonic material are indicated by smaller black downward beamed notes.

\textsuperscript{63} See examples 32, 33, 36, 39, on pp. 87-90.
Figure 20: The Melodic - Harmonic Depiction of Sequenza VI

Chords:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-A*</th>
<th>1-B</th>
<th>2-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D+    A+    D
(I)    (V)    (I)

E+    A+
(V/V) (V)

D(I) A-
(A)    (I)

2-A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A-
(V/I)

3.3  3.4  3.5  3.6

(C)      D+
(V)

* The numbers and letters refer to the Sections and Subsections
* * The numbers refer to the Pages and Systems of the Score accordingly. (UE No 13726, Mi 1970, London)
The above figure, No 20, is described in words as follows:

In section No1, the 1\textsuperscript{st} subsection starts with lively activity which occurs on and beneath the A string of the instrument, while the tonic D and the dominant A are respectively observed at the beginning of the two initial staffs (p. 1/1-2). The 1\textsuperscript{st} subsection is finished at G\#\textsuperscript{(5)} (p. 1/9), to which the dominant E is applied. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} subsection starts from the next tonic A and the melody, by upward chromatic motion, reaches to E\flat\textsuperscript{(6)}, the culmination point, by quick repetitions of the B\flat, A\flat and E\flat\textsuperscript{(6)} chords. At the same time two chordal interpolations on p. 2/1 (a) are insistently inserted three times an octave lower. They shape the tonic D and seem to form a two direction (D - F) cadence preparation to the E\textsuperscript{(6)} (tonic A) from which the next section starts. (p. 2, (a)).

In section No 2, the 1\textsuperscript{st} subsection starts from the tonic A (pitch E\textsuperscript{(6)}) and goes through the dominant D (p. 3/6 end) finishing at the tonic G, on the G (open) string (p. 3/7). The 2\textsuperscript{nd} subsection starts with the dominant D (pitch F\#), and goes through the G tonality ending up at dominant E (pitch G\#), (p. 3/9). From this point forward the thick texture is dramatically reduced and the start of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} section, that of the minimum level of density, is clearly distinguished. Already a gradual change to a different textural process can be seen at the beginning of page 3.

In section No 3, the 1\textsuperscript{st} subsection starts with E\textsuperscript{(5)} (p. 3/9), where the tonic A is applied, and reaches the end of page 4, which is marked by the F / E\flat alternation. Initially, the activity pivots around the A string of the instrument. On p. 4/5 an ascending process leads to D\textsuperscript{(6)} (p. 4/6 end). From this point until the end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} subsection, any melodic-harmonic formation is derived from the six-pitch dominant D: [D - F (N,
♯) - A (♭, N) - C - E♭, plus the added 6th B (♭/ N)]. Throughout the 2nd subsection, the A (5) marks the highest imaginable line. On p. 5/5, the added 6th which was presented earlier as B♭, turns into a characteristic B (N) as a foretaste of the top line of the next section.

Section No 4 starts and finishes with the tonic G. Initially, (p. 5/6-7) the upper line is imaginatively confined by the B (N) (4). Afterwards, (p. 5/8 - 10), the melodic mobility, which starts with the tritone A - E♭, is confined between the two pitch points, E♭ (5) (up) and B♭ (3) (down).

Section No 5 (p. 6/1-8) seems to be based on the previously mentioned six-pitch dominant D. The tritone A (5) - E♭ (6) seems to define the area around which large-scale activities take place. In the 1st subsection, chordal formations of three and four pitches perform glissando passages which move up and down by minor 3rds, perfect 4ths, perfect and augmented 5ths. In the 2nd Subsection (p. 6/5-8) intensive harmonic micro-mobility occurs in high registers by close successive four pitch chords.

Section No 6 is based on the A string of the viola. The A tonality dominates throughout the section. It is introduced (p. 6/8 end) by the initial chordal group, the upper pitches of which shape the G♯ (dim.) chord. The aesthetically unique and delicate impression of the final section mainly consists of a 26 tritone chordal sequence, which shapes a complete tonal cycle, on the observation that one pitch of every tritone is laid on one of the open strings A - D - G of the viola. The A - D - E - B chords are respectively ranked as T7 - S7 - D9 - D / D7. A pause of a crotchet separates the section into two subsections (p. 6/10). The 2nd

64 See examples 23 and 24, p. 70 and p. 6/1 - 2 - 3 - 4 of the score.

65 Score, p. 6/5 - 6 - 7 - 8.
subsection consists of a twelve tritone chordal sequence which shapes a complete tonal harmonic cycle of its own.\textsuperscript{66} Tempo and dynamics have been further reduced.

Figure No 21 below indicates the compendious melodic-harmonic description of Sequenza VI based on the previous figure, No 20.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{66} See example 41 below.
\end{footnotesize}
Figure No 21: The compendious melodic-harmonic description of Sequenza VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Subsections</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td>Chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A⁴</td>
<td>D⁺⁻ (Tonic)... A⁺⁻ (Dominant)- D⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A⁵</td>
<td>A⁺⁻ (Dominant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E⁵⁻ A⁻ (Dominant / Tonic )</td>
<td>F⁵⁻ ... ... ... G³⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G³⁻ G⁻ (Tonic)</td>
<td>G⁵⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E⁵⁻ A⁺⁻ (Tonic)</td>
<td>F / E♭⁵⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F⁵⁻ D⁻ (Dominant)</td>
<td>F♯⁵⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D⁴⁻ G⁺⁻ (Tonic)</td>
<td>F⁴⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D/B♭⁵⁻ D⁻ (Dominant)</td>
<td>F⁴⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E-E♭⁶⁻ D⁻ (Dominant)</td>
<td>D⁶⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D⁶⁻ G⁺ dim. to A (Tonic)</td>
<td>G♯⁴⁻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G³⁻ A⁷⁻ (Tonic)</td>
<td>G³⁻ C♯³⁻</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following figure, No 22, the large-scale harmonic framework is outlined by focusing on the initial and final chords, found at the borders of sections and subsections.

Figure No 22: The harmonic framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chords</td>
<td>D...E A...D A...D G...E A...D D...G G...E D...D D...D A...E A...A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abstractive harmonic plan is presented in figure No 23. It outlines the main tonalities that confine wider sectional spaces.

Figure No 23: The abstractive harmonic plan of Sequenza VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonalities</td>
<td>D - A - D</td>
<td>A - D - G - A</td>
<td>A - D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative samples, collected from the score, are laid out below in order to be harmonically identified.

Chordal sequences form tonal cycles and cadences:

Example 31 (pp. 1/1-2, 2) illustrates the start of the two initial staffs. The Tonic D (added tone: G♯), the dominant A (added tone D), and the tonic D (added tone G♯) form a complete tonal cycle. At (*) the
C♯ and B♭ pitches seem to approach the pitches D and A by moving contrarily.

Example 31

Example 32 (section No 1, p. 1/8) illustrates the end of the 1st and the start of the 2nd Subsection. The E⁷ chord is considered to be the secondary or applied Dominant to the A Dominant (added tone: G♯).

Example 32

Example 33 (section No 2, p. 3/6-7) illustrates the transition from the 1st to the 2nd subsection. Both A♭ and F♯ pitches seem to form a French Augmented Sixth over D Dominant. They are clearly distinguishable as leading tones and move, by semitone, to their solution on G♯

Example 33
Example 34 (p. 3/9) illustrates the transition from section No 2 to section No 3. The A tonality, which is approached by its dominant $E^7$, is strongly implied.

![Example 34](image)

Example 35 (pp. 5/10 and 6/1) illustrates the end of section No 4 and the start of section No 5. The two sections seem to be connected by the chords G and D (added 6\textsuperscript{th}: B\textsubscript{♭}) respectively.

![Example 35](image)

At some points a micro-harmonic structure is clearly distinguished, as is illustrated in the two following examples:
In example No 36 (p. 2, 3) a complete tonal cycle is formed by the chordal sequence A - B - E - A.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
I & II' (V/V) & V & V^7 \\
\end{array}
\]

Example 36

In example No 37 (p. 2/4) the upper melodic line and the presence of the D - G♯ tritone indicate the A tonality.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
V^7 & - & I \\
\end{array}
\]

Example 37

The D Dominant chord exclusively shapes long and short passages. This extended chord contains ten pitches as is illustrated in figure No 24:

Figure No 24: the D extended chord
Example 38 (p. 5/2) illustrates a short passage which fully contains the extended D dominant in question. (Section No 3).

Example 39 (p. 5/5-6) illustrates the end of section No 3 and the start of section No 4. The two sections are connected by the extended D Dominant towards the G tonic.

In section No 3, (2\textsuperscript{nd} subsection) long passages are covered by the extended D dominant. Example 40 (p. 5/4-5) illustrates the two final staffs of section No 3, in which long passages are obviously dominated by the same recently mentioned D chord.
Generally it can be said that in almost every case the chords contain added / non-harmonic tones. In certain cases the non-harmonic tones are produced by the open strings of the viola but this is far from being an inviolable rule. Long passages seem to be formed by an extended chordal formation only. (Example 40 above). Furthermore micro-harmonic structures are sporadically observed. (Examples 36 and 37, on p. 89). Usually, chords which are recognized as ‘tonics’ form four-pitch chords (I<sup>7</sup>), while ‘dominants’ are considered to be of five-pitch chords (V<sup>9</sup>). In the second case, (V<sup>9</sup>), an added 6<sup>th</sup> is frequently observed. Tritones can be implied as part of a dominant if the next harmonic step justifies such a point of view. The transitions from one chordal formation to the next usually occur by chromatic steps and shifts by semitones, perfect 4<sup>th</sup>s and 5<sup>th</sup>s.

---

67 ‘Added’ tones are usually assumed to be those which are placed a 2<sup>nd</sup> above or below the harmonic tones but in the present case the term refers to all ‘non harmonic’ tones.

68 See examples 39, 40: added pitch B♭.

69 See examples 32, 33, 34, 36 and 39 on pp. 87-90.
The end of the piece displays a noticeable harmonic interest. It concerns the second subsection of section No 6. In this endmost area, an array of twelve tritones is observed each of which pertains to a $6_5$ dominant chord. Example 41 illustrates this twelve tritone sequence. The chordal roots, which are shown at the bottom of the example shape a harmonic course of dominants pivoted on the A tonality. The two $F^5$ coincide with the 9th of the E chord.

Example 41

It is worth mentioning that the upper pitch of each tritone is assigned to an open string of the viola (G, D or A). In other words, each tritone is formed beneath an open string. In No 1, one can hypothesise that the open G string coincides with the upper pitch of a tritone, so beneath it the hidden C♯ will be implied. This hypothesis arises because, with this implied tritone, a sequence of twelve tritones is completed. This fact is marked due to the number of twelve, and wondering if its occurrence might have happened by chance or not. In all respects, any explanation can be viewed more as a hypothesis than as an undisputed certainty.
The lower sharpened pitches of the tritones are considered to be leading tones of the implied dominants which are connected in sequence by chromatic steps or they occur in wide leaps. Under these conditions they cannot move and have their solutions towards a tonal centre. These observations can lead one to hypothesize that the lower sharpened pitches cannot be tuned by the performer as leading tones but they should be tuned in relation to their upper pitches, which coincide with the open strings of the viola.

A question might arise if the two G pitches, found at points 4 and 12 in the previous example 41, could be considered as neutral or not because the action of the previous sharpened pitch hasn’t been recalled. Normally, it is assumed that these two pitches must have been formed under the same pattern as the others, so their neutrality cannot be brought into question. By looking at the barred score of Chemins II the previous assumption is witnessed. In fact in Chemins II, these pitches are demarcated by bars so they cannot be affected by the previous, of the same name, sharpened pitches. Finally, the manner in which these tritones were formed, indicates their relation to the physiology of the instrument. In example 41, mainly the A and D tonalities and secondarily the G tonality were employed because of their co-identity with the open strings of the viola.

---

70 Example 41, numbers 6 - 7 and 11 - 12.
Harmonic evaluation

All references to the harmonic matter tend to conclude that the harmony in *Sequenza VI* has its origins in the open strings of the viola. In example 41, commented on above, the crucial role of the open strings in shaping the twelve tritones is indicated. All the chords of this complete harmonic sequence are exclusively formed under the open strings G, D and A.

On the occasion of this characteristic example, a discussion needs to arise about the role of the open strings of the viola with reference to the harmonic background of the piece. After the detailed harmonic description, presented in figure No 20, (pp. 79-81), the chords, found at the borders of sections and subsections, are displayed in figure No 21, p. 83. In the subsequent figure No 22, p. 86, the main tonalities, by section, are outlined more abstractedly. Finally, it is indicated that the chords and tonalities coincide absolutely with the open strings of the viola. Generally, the open strings are widely used as points of departure and relief and as steady ground in forming long passages.\(^{71}\) In the last case the detailed harmonic development, which occur at a microstructural level, indicates that it is fully related to the fingering positions. The above ascertainment comes to infer that the harmonic material of *Sequenza VI* depends on the properties and technical possibilities of the viola.

In conclusion, the origins of the harmony must be searched in accordance with the nature of the instrument itself. On this issue, Paul Roberts (2008) suggests that *Sequenza VI* ‘deliberately concentrates on

---

\(^{71}\) Such indications are found in examples 33 and 39 on pp. 87 and 90 accordingly.
types of harmony exclusively connected to the viola in its positioning and calculated use of the open strings’ (Roberts, 2008, p. 122). In fact, the open strings of the viola were taken into account as index markers, on which the choice of main tonalities (G - D - A) was exclusively based. In particular, the A string is absolutely linked to the A and D tonalities. Additionally, its memorable abilities (timbre, loudness, openness and outside position) without doubt gave Berio the strong potential to use it widely.

After the detailed discussion on the harmony in relation to the properties of the viola, the very role of harmony, along with the other compositional elements, needs to be specified and commented on.

It is assumed that the harmonic substance of Sequenza VI became the primary material on which the whole textural variety was based, adapted and developed as well. This hypothesis doesn’t seem to be far from the reality. Luciano Berio being interviewed by Rossana Dalmonte explained that the title Sequenza ‘was meant to underline that ‘almost all the Sequenzas were built from a sequence of harmonic fields’. (Berio, 1985, p. 97). On this matter, David Osmond-Smith (1992) generally observes that ‘the use of large-scale harmonic process, to give shape to a work, became increasingly important to Berio from the late sixties on...’\(^{72}\) (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 34).

As it has been shown previously, the harmonic framework of Sequenza VI consists of definable harmonic formations which are observed at the borders of sections and subsections. On the other hand,

\(^{72}\) Osmond-Smith, (1992, p. 34), presumes that ‘a forecast of this approach was provided by Sequenza V for trombone, (1966)’.
the intermediate spaces display an in-depth sophisticated harmonic elaboration that harmony can be undoubtedly identified in certain cases, but in many other cases it remains absolutely controversial. These assumptions come to meet Paul Griffiths’ (1995) opinion, who characterizes the harmonic statements and processes in Berio’s music as ‘unambiguous only on the largest scale’. Besides he states that ‘at any moment they may be surrounded by alternatives which nudge at the music’s basic principles, and keep it in the world of questions rather than answers.’ (Griffiths, 1995, p. 194).

Apart from any theoretical approach to identifying the harmonic shapes by considering the score, a clear aural harmonic perception is in question almost in its entirety. In fact at many points, harmony can hardly be aurally distinguished and the reasons are assumed to be both, technical and aesthetic. The technical reasons are related to the lack of classical bass lines, the extensive chromaticism and the plethora of harmonic variants in combination with the rapidity by which one chordal aggregate comes after the other. The added / non-harmonic tones obscure the chordal sound and the rapid pitch distortion inevitably destroys the harmonic impression. The sporadic tritones, especially in chromatic passages, sound primarily neutral and become more ambiguous and veiled. For this reason there is no need for classical solutions\(^73\). At the same time, the near identical tritone sequences deter any tonal stability.\(^74\) David Osmond-Smith (1992) refers to Berio’s ‘relatively weak’ and ‘complex harmonic context’ the components of which (semitonal side-steps and nuances of relative dissonance or


\(^{74}\) See example 41, p. 92
consonance) ‘rapidly lose their differentiating power…’ (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 36). The aesthetic reasons basically have to do with the extraordinary ways of playing and the harsh dynamics and Berio’s demand for the chordal pitches to be homogeneously and equally emphasized.\textsuperscript{75}

Without doubt, the role of harmony in \textit{Sequenza VI} is seriously downgraded in favour of other stylistic and aesthetic parameters which come aggressively to the fore. Amanda Bayley (2008) doesn’t assume that pitch parameter has ‘immediate significance to the listener’ and as a consequence the large-scale structure of \textit{Sequenza VI} ‘is generated from the allocation of specific roles to dynamics, tempo, timbre, texture and rhythm...’ (Bayley, 2008, p. 238).

In the introduction reference was made to the fact that Berio embarked upon a rapid and seminal series of discoveries without breaking the bonds of tradition. Berio’s respect for the continuity of harmonic legacy cannot be ignored. Despite the saturation of common-practice tonality, tonal associations were never abandoned.

The harmony of \textit{Sequenza VI} displays a tonal organization and course to a certain extent. On this matter Paul Griffith (1995) talks about Berio’s harmonic sensitiveness and ‘his own inclination to deal with history, not write it off...’...‘in seeking a greater harmonic continuity than had been characteristic of music in the 1950s and 1960s’. (Griffiths, 1995, p. 194). David Osmond-Smith (2001) attests that Berio himself had a permanent concern for ‘reclaiming the fundamental role of the harmony in musical structure’ and it was pursued after the success of such works as \textit{Sinfonia} (1968 - 1969). Initially, Berio started by using a

\textsuperscript{75} See initial directions found on the score.

By inference the harmony of *Sequenza VI* maintains its quantum of functional significance in a workplace within which all the parameters are, more or less, interpenetrated, influenced, spoiled or overlapped by themselves. In spite of its strong tonal roots, *Sequenza VI* sounds atonal in most of its entirety and the reason is strongly related to the textural distinctiveness. In fact, the different and irregular textures display avant-garde rhythmic features to which regular harmonic rhythms cannot be established. As a consequence the harmony occurs in ways which have been already described.\(^7^6\)

\(^{76}\) See also Bayley, 2008, p. 240, 242
Part III. Interpretation

Chapter V

Up to this point, the analysis on Luciano Berio’s *Sequenza VI* for viola has worked on both notational and structural matters. The present part III on interpretation includes topics on both performance and theatricality and comes to complete the foregoing two parts. By taking into account that *Sequenza VI* was intentionally notated by the specific model, aiming for the best possible performance results, part III comes to explore the subject and mark the main factors to ensure a reliable interpretation.

Performance

In approaching the performance matter, general information on the topic should be brought into question by selecting and quoting deductions and practices. It is supposed that in this way, the special performance issues of *Sequenza VI* will be better understood and basic inferences will be drawn as well.

Referring to the importance of the score analysis on the part of the performer, John Rink and Glenn Gould are in favour of a theoretical approach of the music text before the performer attempts to realise the score in sound. John Rink suggests that performers ‘need to be able to employ a more sophisticated vocabulary...and to understand more fully ways in which music might be organized’. John Rink (2006) lists the means by which the specific knowledge could be obtained: Identifying formal divisions and the basic tonal plan, graphing tempo, graphing
dynamics, analysing melodic shapes and constituent motifs / ideas, preparing a rhythmic reduction and re-notating the music. (Rink, 2006, p. 41). The Pianist Glenn Gould, used to structurally ‘analyse’ and creatively ‘interpret’ the works he performed ‘from virginalists to serialists’. For him, a performance should be founded on ‘analytical’ rather than ‘tactile’ (that is, instrumental) considerations. (Bazzana, 1997, p. 87).

On this issue Roger Heaton (2001) wonders whether the sound result could be really affected by a theoretical analysis and queries whether the ‘soundless analytical processes’ of a work can actually be realized ‘in sound’ because, in reality ‘a performer’s musical “instinct” kicks in’. (Heaton, 2012, pp. 100 - 101). Heaton’s queries cannot be underestimated, given that the performance of a work is surely influenced by the performer’s individual technical, aesthetic and cognitive context. On the other hand, analytical approaches on a series of issues, such as structural plan, notation, phrasing, harmony, tempos, dynamics, articulations and instrumental techniques, enrich the performer’s existing cognitive background and contribute to a better comprehension of the score. It is assumed that these factors could affect, to some degree, the performer’s established musical habits, provided that he/she is interested in theoretically conceiving the relevant technical and aesthetic demands and try to realise them.

As a matter of fact, the previous discussion has to do with how the performer understands and interprets the score. Daniel Leech-Wilkinson (2012) argues that the way in which a score is evaluated directly affects the comprehension of the music style. He remarks that ‘how the score is
played makes a very great difference to what it means\textsuperscript{77} so ‘performance can change the character, even the nature, of a score to a much greater extent than we allow’... (Leech-Wilkinson, 2012, p. 4). Consequently, for a performer the influence of the other players can affect the way by which he cognizes the style of music. Furthermore, the personal background knowledge and the individual performance skills should also be admeasured in evaluating the final performance result. Again, Daniel Leech - Wilkinson states that ‘the main reason to suppose that a score suggests its performance is the broad agreement among most performers as to how it (broadly) should go.’ (Leech-Wilkinson, 2012, p. 7). Especially for pieces of modern style, every attempt at interpretation creates many queries in the way of searching for authentic solutions. Charles Rosen (1998) assumes that ‘the performer’s understanding of any radically new style is somewhat uncertain, and he is often unsure...how the work is supposed to sound’. (Rosen, 1998, p. 69). On this issue Roger Scruton (1997) states that ‘understanding music is, in part, a cognitive activity’. He explains that the performer’s understanding reflects the way of hearing what he plays and, by extension, his performance communicates his own way of hearing to the listener. (Scruton, 1997, pp. 211 - 212). In fact, musical comprehension is a multiplex procedure so the performer’s role is crucial in materializing the score in sound.

On the premise that ‘the history of music is a history of performers continuously transcending what were thought to be limits’,

\textsuperscript{77} ‘As a result, the character of the music will be more authentically expressed and transferred to the listener, while undesirable traditional or emotional implications will be avoided.’ (Leech-Wilkinson, 2012, p. 4).
Paul Griffiths (1995) argues that the extreme, unprecedented and challenging scores of the 1960s ‘were enough to encourage a new race of modern virtuosos, who detected in post-war music an invitation to extend the possibilities of performance’. Furthermore, due to both ‘the rapid turnover in compositional technique and the rapid extensions of what could be expected from instruments, instrumentalists began to feel that... virtuosity had its best display as improvisation’. (Griffiths, 1995, p. 191).

Luciano Berio himself used to ask for ‘a high level of technical and intellectual virtuosity...the virtuosity of knowledge’. The term ‘virtuosity of knowledge’ was laid down by Berio himself as a precondition for the contemporary performer. It refers not only to a skilful musician but also to an accomplished and intellectual personality too. Berio explained that when he wrote the Sequenza series he didn’t have an interpreter with extraordinary techniques and stereotype instrumental gestures in mind but an accomplished musical personality. By having a high level of technical and intellectual virtuosity, he can really ‘shake up the history of the music, moving within a broad historical perspective and of resolving the tension between the creativity of yesterday and today’. (Berio, 1985, p. 91). According to David Osmond-Smith (2001) Berio required a virtuosity of ‘sensibility and intelligence’ that often entails a thorough understanding of the history of the instrument. (Osmond-Smith, 2001, p. 254).

The virtuosic character of Sequenza VI, like all the other pieces of the series, is obvious. Already ‘Berio's fascination with virtuosity and challenging complexity’ had become explicit in 1958, with his 1st Sequenza per flauto solo (Osmond-Smith, 2001, p. 254). Apparently,
Sequenza VI requires performers with high technical and intellectual knowledge and creative imagination. Because of this reason, the considerable freedom they need to manage the piece cannot be questioned. It can be assumed that this fact is not unexploited by the performer who might not hesitate to take advantage of it and offer his/her personal contribution to a series of minor, but at the same time challenging issues. 

For the performer himself, a discussion on freedom in performance could comprise matter of great interest, because it has to do with the essence of the music work. Outlining the freedom which could be taken up by the performer, the pianist Glenn Gould generally advocates that the profile of the music which refers to contrapuntal balances, rhythmic nuances, dynamic levels, articulation, tone colour, instrumentation – even where specified by the composer – is all subject to the performer’s will, without compromising the identity or status of the work. (Bazzana, 1997, p. 36).

Referring to the freedom in performance of twentieth century music, the pianist Charles Rosen (1998) argues that to flout the author’s indications which refer to dynamics and articulations is ‘immoral deliberately’. Rosen admits that strict adherence to the authentic text ‘creates numerous problems’ but he remarks that the performer can understand ‘how and why the dogma arose’. Rosen disapproves of absolute freedom and reports that to treat rhythm as ‘slightly less fundamental’ and demote tempo (among other parameters) ‘almost to the level of merely helpful suggestions by the composer who may have misjudged its effectiveness…it is often felt’. (Rosen, 1998, p. 66). Here Rosen stresses the importance of rhythm and tempo and presupposes
that these parameters should be consciously treated by the performer, otherwise there is a danger of the style of the music work being spoiled or disfeatured.

In the case of Sequenza VI, the amount of rhythmic freedom which is allowed to the performer is a question of great importance. Its detailed rhythmic depiction seems to prejudice the performer about the importance Berio gives to rhythmic accuracy. The three long fermatas and the phrase ‘for about 10’’, which refers to the passage found at the end of the 5th section (page 6, 8) are the only written indications in which rhythmic freedom is reported. It is assumed that Berio’s demand for the performer to ‘do exactly what is written on the page’ (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 286) concerns, to a great extent, the rhythmic accuracy. Berio was opposed to a performance which could drift in an unlimited and unjustifiable rhythmic freedom. Perpetrating arbitrary adaptations or interferences in rhythm and pitch duration were far from Berio’s intentions. Berio merely intended ‘to allow a margin of flexibility in order that the player might have the freedom -psychological rather than musical- to adapt the piece here and there to his technical stature’. (Berio, 1985, p. 99). Berio called to attention the playing ‘with freedom; don’t play mechanically’, (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 286) and this comment might refer to a series of factors such as the predominant tremolo, the rare breathing points, the irregular phrasing and unconventional playing, the inherent technical difficulties and the high tempos which could impose upon the performer to play ‘mechanically’. Furthermore, Berio’s assurance that there is ‘no phrasing’ of a conventional nature (Uscher, 1982-1983, p. 286), and MacKay’s remarks on the ‘unphrased’ score, on ‘the relatively sporadic grouping structure’ and on the ‘intermediate
syntactic structure’, many of the ‘subtleties’ of which are left ‘entirely up to the performer’, (MacKay, 1988, p. 226), advocate a certain deal of rhythmic freedom.

Charles Rosen (1988) refers to another aspect of the subject by reporting that ‘the composer often demands a certain freedom that shapes the work in ways that he could not have expected but this freedom may not be explicit in the text’. (Rosen, 1988, p. 69). On this statement it can be said that the more the music is adequately notated the more it becomes amenable in revealing the points and margins of freedom.

According to all indications, Sequenza VI was invested with accurate and understandable notation which is accredited to acceptable performances. This happened in the majority of the Sequenzas series. Special references have been made to Sequenzas I, IV and VII discussed in chapter No II above. The transcription of Sequenza I ‘in rhythmic notation’ on the model of Sequenza VI, took place because ‘maybe it will be less ‘open’ and more authoritarian but at least it will be reliable’ (Berio, 1985, p. 99). The revised scores of Sequenzas IV and VII were brought about as a necessity for rhythmic accuracy and consistency.

Aside from the rhythmic matter of Sequenza VI, the rest parameters which refer to dynamics, articulations, phrasing and tone colours might leave a greater deal of freedom in performance, than the rhythmic parameter provided that they don’t adversely influence the status of the piece, as has been mentioned before. It is assumed that, despite the highest technical and aesthetic demands, Berio didn’t compromise the consistent rhythmic performance, where the character and the form of the piece could be questioned. For Berio himself,
rhythmic consistency seems to be the most important factor in establishing the style of the work.

On the rhythmic issue of *Sequenza VI*, it is important for the performer to comprehend the philosophy of the notational system and of how the stressed points can be easily recognized in the line of the accomplished beat cycles. The importance performers give to stressed points undoubtedly varies, and depends on their personal evaluation. Rhythmic accentuation is not an independent and absolute value but it is affected by the phrasing which rarely coincides with the first and last impulse of a measure. Accents do not end in themselves but their functional significance depends on how the performer approaches a specific passage, far from any mathematical calculation. According to Wallace Berry, (1987) ‘the question of meter is the question of accent... the metric and phraseological ordering... are in opposition to internal ordering of grouping as to linear functions’. (Berry, 1987, pp. 317, 323).

In addition, special estimations on the notational matter and suggestions on certain technical and aesthetic matters are pointed out below: Apparently, the *broken tremolo* predominates throughout the piece, and it should be performed ‘as fast as possible’, ‘towards the frog’, and ‘far from any prolonged pattern or regular articulation’, according to the initial performance directions found on the score. Because this continuous tremolo calls for a great effort and endurance, Nansy Uscher (1982-1983) states that ‘the bow technique... must incorporate an unconventional approach’. According to her, Walter Trampler suggests a bow grip ‘with thumb placed under the frog’ and another way to hold the bow according to which ‘one could even put a piece of wood on the frog with which to hold the bow’. For Trampler, a
‘completely flat bow hair’ is required in ponticello (on the bridge) passages. Sol Greitzer, who performed Chemins II in 1977, suggests alternation of ‘the first bow hold with the normal grip’, ‘some hair’ in col legno passages and the 1, 2, and 3 fingers almost always in passages high up in position. (Uscher, 1982-1983, pp. 287, 288 - 289).

On the occasion of the above mentioned broken tremolo, which must be approached in an unconventional manner, reference should be made to the period of the sixties during which composers were encouraged by performers to write compositions and to exploit unconventional performance techniques. Aside from Berio, the composers George Crumb, Roger Ericsson and Mauricio Kagel are counted among those who specialized in such works. Reference should be made to the musicians Heinz Holliger (oboe), Vinko Globokar and Stuart Dempster (trombone) and William O. Smith (clarinet), who composed similar works. In the first half of the 20th century unconventional techniques can be seen as ‘departures’ within a traditional context’ but later these techniques replaced the ‘normal’ modes of performance. (Morgan, 1991, p. 391). The second case characterizes Sequenza VI to which the unconventional technique, which requires the broken tremolo, was widely applied. Indeed, Walter Trampler’s suggestion on how to play the broken tremolo comprises sufficient proof.

Walter Trampler emphasizes sharp dynamic contrasts between fast ‘wild screaming’ sections and ‘lyrical’ ones. Sol Greitzer proclaims ‘dynamics and articulation’ as factors of high contrast. He distinguishes the major and forte part of the piece with the piano passages and non-tremolo notes which ‘are made long in contrast to the predominant
tremolo’. (Uscher, 1982-1983, p 288). In fact, the non-tremolo notes, which are found in periods of low density and dynamic, seem to sound long in contrast with the predominant tremolo. During these periods the performer can take advantage of the content and exercise a certain amount of rhythmic freedom in contrast to the high dynamic periods in which rhythmic accuracy is required. Nancy Usher (1982-1983) reports that Trampler finds that saltando passages are ‘a relief to the arm’, (Uscher, 1982-1983) and looks for breaks in the music wherever possible, as a relief to the ongoing intensity. (Uscher, pp. 287, 288).

Generally the performer should take into account the two basic features by which the dramatic character of the piece is defined: contrast and tension. Contrast can be brought out by clearly differentiating aggressive and contemplative periods, powerful homophonic and calm monophonic passages. Tension calls for a great deal of physical endurance and technical skill in order to retain the proper level for long time periods and enhance it more.

Sequenza VI, like Sequenza II for harp (1963), was endowed with an unusual ferocity and as a consequence the nature of the viola was challenged by unprecedented technical demands which were imposed aggressively. The capabilities of the instrument were extraordinarily used in a unique and, in many cases, unconventional manner. As a consequence, the performer is forced to overcome the inherent performance difficulties and the gravity of the technical problems in searching for effective solutions. Despite this, it can be said that the properties of the instrument were taken into account, as was mentioned in chapter No 3 above.
By inference, Berio had a great respect for what instruments gained in the fields of transformations and techniques across the centuries and this fact couldn’t be questioned. Berio when being interviewed said that he ‘never tried to alter the nature of the instrument’ or to use it ‘against’ its ‘own nature’. (Berio, 1985. p. 92). On the contrary, he took full advantage of the skills and properties of the instrument and demonstrated a thorough understanding of the particular technical demands and acoustic qualities.

*Sequenza VI* develops a range of performance timings, occurring over a long period of time, which is differentiated noticeably. It must be clarified that by no means does timing differentiations constitute a criterion for any qualitative evaluation. In accordance with this point of view, Roger Heaton (2012) generally doesn’t assume that the first or the subsequent performances, even when approved by the composer, can be considered authentic statements. (Heaton, 2012, p 100). Obviously, the performances of *Sequenza VI* reveal a wide range of time approaches of the work which noticeably differentiate over a long period of time. The timings given by six celebrated performers from 1967 to 2010 are indicated in figure No 25:
The 1st performance of the piece, given in 1971 by Walter Trampler, is the shortest (10.01) in comparison to subsequent performances. Trampler performed only the main part of the piece. He chose to perform the (b) alternative version (found on page 2 of the score) but avoided performing anything else from the ten optional insertions. Steven Dann, in 2002, obtained the longest duration (14.53). In fact, Dann performed the entire music text including the (a) alternative version (on page 2 of the score), and the ten optional insertions. Because the two performances occurred 31 years apart, various reasons have arisen to explain these two different approaches.

The Naxos Album reviewer D. Moore assumes that such a 15 minutes ‘monster’ (and ‘boring’ piece, according to Times reviewer) drops the performers into troubles at a time when they are striving to keep the high pitches stable. He argues that Walter Trampler, in his performance

---

‘comes closer than anyone else to taming this monster and manages to make it sound organized if not totally idiomatic’. Moore recognizes that Trampler managed to play difficult double and triple stops in a high register in tremolo ‘without falling apart’. This observation indicates, among other factors, the inherent performance difficulties and the gravity of the technical problems on which the performer is called upon effective solutions.

In conclusion, all the above references on performance stress the high technical skills and the special knowledge which are required. Furthermore, given the virtuosic character of the piece, the freedom in performance is a matter of great importance. The degree of rhythmic freedom particularly needs to be consciously managed by the performer as long as the form of the piece is by no means compromised. Besides, performers should develop their own artistic personality towards the most reliable interpretation by using knowledge, experience and creative imagination. A reliable and conscious performance approach of Sequenza VI might coincide with Charles Rosen’s (1998) remark according to which ‘the most successful performances of contemporary works are those that only give the illusion of remaining faithful to the text while they hide a genuine and deeply rooted freedom of interpretation.’ (Rosen, 1998, p. 73).
Theatricality

This unity on theatricality comes naturally to supplement the previous unity on performance. The theatrical dimension plays a fundamental role in Berio’s creativity. The principle of theatricality is more or less found in all of the Sequenza series. (Halfyard, 2008, p. 99). Obviously, Sequenza III (for Voice, 1965) and V (for trombone, 1966) are the most theatrical.

Although Sequenza VI isn’t cited as being among the most theatrical of Berio’s works, its theatricality seems to constitute an inherent dimension of the performance activity. In certain cases, it is noticeably visible and causes considerable visual impressions. For this reason the theatrical dimension of the piece is examined first. Thereupon both, the bodily contribution and the gestural vocabulary evoke reasonable interest for consideration. Janet Halfyard (2008) describes the performance of Sequenza VI is an ‘arresting aural and visual drama… a feat of physical stamina…’ (Halfyard, 2008, p. 111). Indeed, the audience perceives a provocative and aggressive attitude which emerges from the performer’s great effort to overcome his physical limits of endurance in order to perform difficult parts and dangerous acrobatic passages. At the same time the sudden changes in texture, dynamic, rhythm and timbre convey shock and anxiety which grabs the listener’s attention in a state of constant alertness.

As a matter of fact, theatricality requires bodily motion which as a mediator, contributes to transferring the meaning of the music to the audience. For musicians, a major part of musical competence involves bodily coordination with the musical flow which basically refers to breathing, preparation, attack, escalation and de-escalation of tension and phrasing. Rhythm, timing, and meter pulse can truly activate the digital action, only if it comes from the inner bodily motion. Jane Davidson (2006) suggests that ‘finding the right mental and physical intention and allowing that to be freely communicated through the body seems essential in the production of a fluent and meaningful performance.’ Going ahead, Jane Davidson argues that because ‘music contains a strong emotional content it can inspire a happy and contemplative feeling or make a listener move in response’. (Davidson, 2006, pp. 145, 146, 147).

The embodied musical meaning of Sequenza VI refers to patterns which have notable visual, kinaesthetic and tactile impacts. In the case of a visual attendance being impossible, listeners tend to mentally shape the gestural processes that represent the embodied music cognition. To quote Eric Clarke (2006) ‘the ebb and flow of apparent movement and tension / relaxation that listeners experience in music come in part from the identification with the physical means of musical production’. (Clarke, 2006, p. 66). Jane Davidson (2006) refers to Ray Jackendoff’s suggestions that ‘the experience of motion we often give to music...may either have an actual bodily origin or be associated with sounds or sights that convey a sense of bodily movement’. (Davidson, 2006, pp. 145 - 146).
The gestural vocabulary consists of comparable theatrical elements. Janet Halfyard (2008) suggests that Sequenza VI, ‘in terms of narrative, character and action displays theatrical ‘elements’...and enacts ‘comparable rituals’, starting out from a ‘static’ and ‘restricted’ chord. This opening gesture’... becomes the ‘musical equivalent’... to the word, but this is the first note, in essence, from which ‘all the others are introduced and woven into Berio’s musical narratives’. (Halfyard, 2008, pp. 112 - 113).

In fact, the predominant broken tremolo constitutes the most important gestural element. The initial -and lengthier- broken tremolo chord lasts about 20 sec according to Steven Dann’s performance, (2002).  

80 Extreme effects of sound are produced when the bow, while performing the broken tremolo and ‘towards the frog’, momentarily scrambles up to on the bridge (Pont).  

81 Another impressive lively scene is revealed in section No 5 where long passages of chordal sequences, which are found in higher positions, shape noticeable fingering patterns by moving rapidly from upwards to downwards and vice versa.  

82 Similar patterns occur and call for ‘random and minimal sliding of fingers’, ‘random and wide sliding of fingers’ and ‘alternating quick ordinary and “harmonic” position of fingers’. This is an attractive prospect for a performer who plays in the highest registers with great strength and skilful handling, while he is striving to keep the high pitches as stable as

80 See example 19 on page 69.  
81 See pages 2/4 and 6, 3/7 and 8, 4/1 and 2, 5/9 and 10 and 6/1, 3 and 4 of the score.  
82 See page 6/5, 6, 7 and 8 of the score  
83 See page 6/5, 6, 7 and 8 of the score
possible.\textsuperscript{84} Paul Griffiths (1995) states that in Berio’s music, such techniques cannot be considered as ‘embellishments’ but substantial compositional matter, so their ‘showiness is not an extra’. In particular he assumes that ‘the frenetic tremolo chords of \textit{Sequenza VI} are the substance of the piece’: it ‘seems to arise in a very direct manner from the instrument, the physical exercise of playing and from the history and repertory it has’.\textsuperscript{85} (Griffiths, 1995, pp.191 - 192).

Generally, the textural characteristics and the extraordinary and unconventional ways of playing were conceived as essential compositional elements and adopted, among other reasons, because of their inherent and noticeable theatricality. This assumption comes in accordance to David Osmond-Smiths’ (1992) observation who, focusing on Berio’s solo works, presumes that a ‘wide range of timbre, texture and attack’ is deployed ‘almost exclusively in the service of making the individual gesture more vivid...’ (Osmond-Smith, 1992, p. 40).

By inference, theatricality in \textit{Sequenza VI} is more abstract in comparison to other pieces of the same category, but it is substantial, noticeably vivid and highly dramatic.

\textsuperscript{84} See previous unity, p 110.

\textsuperscript{85} Griffiths’ observation that ‘\textit{Sequenza III} for female voice (1965 - 6) is not a song with new vocal techniques but new vocal techniques that make a song’, (Griffiths, 1995, pp. 191 - 192), exactly describes this Berio’s compositional achievement.
Conclusion

The present analysis on Luciano Berio’s *Sequenza VI* for viola (1967) was carried out in three parts which concern the fields of notation and form, structure and interpretation respectively.

The texture became the point of reference on which the whole analysis was based. In fact, the texture because of its extraordinary features gave cause for reflection.

In Part I of the analysis the notational matter was explored. The rhythmic calculation was brought out as a necessity because the specific texture, although it was notated conventionally, was laid out on unbarred staff-lines. The rhythmic philosophy, the barring potential and the notational innovations were evaluated. Afterwards, an explanation was given on the discrepancy which was observed by the fact that the texture, although it seems to sound like indeterminate was notated conventionally.

In Part II the structural matter was discussed. Because of the idiomorphic texture, the division into sections took place in terms of levels of density. In further analysing the tensional dimensions (dynamic, tempo, pitch and sound morphology), by which the levels of density were obtained, the research ended up by inferring that all the tensional dimensions occurred in accordance with Berio’s large-scale structural thought. At the microstructural level, a consistent, detailed and crafted elaboration was attested in the fields of dynamic, pitch, rhythm, tempo, timbre and harmony. The tonal aspects of harmony were marked and commented on. In addition, the general role of harmony, among the other compositional parameters, was evaluated. It was shown that the
harmonic substance, which exalts its origins to the properties of the viola, became the source of pitch material, on which the textures were formed.

In Part III which refers to interpretation, apart from the special knowledge and the demanding performance skills, the degree of freedom which is allowed to the performer, was considered to be the main factor for a reliable interpretation. In particular, the rhythmic factor was assumed to be a crucial parameter in forming the style of the piece. Finally the theatrical dimension and the gestural elements were evaluated.

By inference, the texture succeeded in being depicted in unbarred conventional notation. Due to its features, the texture occasioned the study on notation, structure and tensional dimensions, while the harmonic matter and the definition of freedom in performance came naturally to complete the Analysis. The consistent, multi-layered and fine-crafted compositional process can explain the great proliferation of Sequenza VI into four Chemins and the rave notices the piece has received.

In forthcoming research, it is assumed that textural matter should be brought to the foreground again, aiming exclusively to define the textural transformations and mark the start points. Specifically, the manner by which textural shapes are prepared, developed and finished should be further analysed, supposing that a somewhat consistent plan will be revealed. Given that the second and smaller parts of the sections (noted as 2nd subsections) were considered to be gradual preparations for an even transition from one level of density to the next, it is
supposed that the same process could have occurred in shaping the various textural appearances. Although *Sequenza VI* constitutes a typical example of Berio’s large-scale structural thought, the consistency which was observed in forming the tensional dimensions advocates that a somewhat respective process might penetrate the individual textures. Of course, an attempt to define and structurally analyse the textures exactly or indisputably is difficult to a certain extent, given their dissimilarities.

A more detailed analysis on the textural matter should be undertaken. With this knowledge the great proliferation of derivative works that succeeded *Sequenza VI*, will be better understood. In fact, on the occasion of the study of the notational matter and the barring potential of *Sequenza VI*, general references were made to the widespread Berio’s principle of reworking a piece by adding extra layers to a pre-established structure. In the bibliography, mentions are found to explain the manner by which *Sequenza VI* was extended into four *Chemins*. It is assumed that these subsequent works constitute in essence an analysis and further commentary on the original, the hidden aspects of which are also revealing and amplifying. The further study on textural transformations was suggested, supposing that the potentiality of the solo structure to be integrated and commented on into an orchestra depends on its specific features which should be defined. The final result and its importance cannot be guessed, allowing that the texture gives rise to a sense of indeterminacy, but researchers and composers might be interested in experiencing Berio’s ideas and practices on this matter.
Further study on notation and harmony is suggested by considering their course throughout the fourteen Sequenzas which virtually spanned the whole of Berio’s composing life. In fact, a notational analysis needs to be extended to the other Sequenzas given that in the present analysis, the notational matter was verified as a crucial factor towards an authentic cognition and interpretation.

In the field of harmony, a further research should consider Berio’s harmonic choices throughout the Sequenza series. Berio himself clarified that the title *Sequenza* ‘was meant to underline that ‘almost all the Sequenzas were built from a sequence of harmonic fields’. (Berio, 1985, p. 97). Berio started by using twelve-tone material to build his first *Sequenza per flauto solo*, composed in 1958, but afterwards he returned to more traditional choices. In *Sequenza VI*, the harmony, which exalts its origins to the properties of the viola, became the source of pitch material, a practice that should be also investigated for the rest of the Sequenzas. In every case, the harmonic identity should be considered on the premise that it wasn’t chosen independently of the properties and abilities of the instrument.

In addition, the study on the course of polyphonic writing through the fourteen Sequenzas should be undertaken, on the understanding that from his first *Sequenza per flauto solo* (1958), Berio started seeking for a polyphonic type of writing to be applied to a monophonic instrument. This writing seems to be pivoted on two axes. The first axis has to do with the pitch material and the second with a wide range of instrumental techniques. Both the pitch material and instrumental techniques are combined in producing a polyphonic sound variety. It is worth mentioning that instrumental techniques were used by Berio in an
extraordinary manner and many times they overlapped the pitch and harmonic clarity. This approach of Berio indicates a contemporary type of polyphonic writing. It is supposed that the suggested research will reveal interesting aspects of Berio’s evolitional polyphonic process in relation to the whole of the Sequenza series which was his major cause of concern during the years between 1958 and 2000.
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