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SUMMARY

This treatise provides recorder performers and teachers with a guide to understanding the unconventional notation symbols encountered in *Music for a Bird* by Hans-Martin Linde and *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte* by Markus Zahnhausen. Given the context of the overall history of notation, it argues that the idiosyncrasies of the unconventional notation symbols encountered in the recorder repertoire of contemporary composers such as Linde and Zahnhausen are by no means an anomaly. Throughout history, notated scores have functioned merely as incomplete guides to the reconstruction and the realization of musical works. Along with the decoding of these instructions, a host of acculturated meanings have always been taken for granted on the part of the writers of such guidelines. In the light of the modernist crisis and the resultant exacerbation of the gulf between composers and their audience, however, it would seem that the need for such acculturated intervention is greater then ever before. This treatise serves to bridge the gulf between the works of Linde and Zahnhausen on the one hand, and the average performer and teacher of the recorder on the other, by offering an analysis both of the meaning of the unconventional symbols these works contain as well as of the method according to which they should be executed on the recorder.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THIS STUDY

1. AIM
The aim of this research is to provide recorder performers and teachers with a guide to understanding the unconventional notation symbols encountered in *Music for a Bird* by Hans-Martin Linde and *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte* by Markus Zahnhausen, by offering an analysis both of their meaning as well as of the method according to which they should be executed on the recorder.

2. CONTEXT AND RATIONALE
The general inaccessibility of its modern repertoire to musical practitioners within the field is not unique in recorder circles. Although it may be argued that this inaccessibility has something to do with the so-called “crisis of modernism”, wherein we see a growing isolation of many 20th-century composers, it may also be argued, on the other hand, that, throughout its history, notation has never been a complete, fixed and immutable system of communication between musicians. In the history of Western music problems of decoding occur as much in early music (Parrish 1978) and in the music of the so-called “Common Practice Period” (Houle 1999) as they do in 20th-century music. Stanley Boorman thus reminds us about the limitations of notation in any given historical context:

 [...] the notation itself is allusive. It is not the piece of music, it is not even a complete guide to reconstructing that piece. Instead it is an allusive guide, offering the performer hints alongside the instructions, and therefore depending on the musician’s ability to understand these hints and allusions (Boorman 1999:411).

In its broadest sense, notation may be defined as encompassing “all formalized systems of signaling between musicians” (Williams 2001: 73), which we may understand here to include all oral systems (such as performance and listening experiences), all verbal systems (such as the playing instructions contained in the prefixes to the printed editions of Linde’s *Music for a
Bird and Zahnhausen’s *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte*, as well as the more conventional time and character words contained in the scores themselves, and all non-verbal symbolic systems of signaling (such as both the conventional and the unconventional notation symbols in the scores of these two works). This treatise will consider each of these three options in turn, and will show that, on their own, none of them would appear to be an entirely satisfactory means of signaling between musicians in the case of *Music for a Bird* and *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte*. Instead it will be argued that the greatest gain lies in the combination of all three.

The rationale for this research is therefore to present to the reader a performance of these works (Appendix F) along with an analysis of the unconventional symbols contained in their musical scores (Appendix B and C), a verbal explanation of the meaning of such symbols and the method by which the novel effects they suggest may best be achieved on the recorder.

The two works in question are representative of an exciting growth in the repertoire for the recorder that occurred in the 20th century. They are works of exceptional quality that deserve to be heard and performed more often than they currently are. In presenting this treatise I hope to contribute in some way to demystifying their unconventional symbols and thus to grow the number of recorder practitioners who have the “ability to understand these hints and allusions” (Boorman 1999: 411).

### 3. THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING, METHODS AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The theoretical underpinning for this research is qualitative rather than quantitative in nature. In the qualitative paradigm, researchers “attempt always to study human action from the perspective of the social actors themselves [also referred to by anthropologists as the “emic perspective”]” (Babbie and Mouton 2001: 270).

Qualitative research is closely linked with phenomenological or interpretivist traditions, in so far as:

- The research takes place within the natural surroundings of the “social actors”
- Its goal is to provide understanding (Verstehen) rather than explanation
- The interpretivist researcher views people as “conscious, self-directing, symbolic human beings” rather than regarding them as scientific objects.
Phenomenologists place emphasis on the fact that people are “engaged in the process of making sense of their (life) worlds” (Babbie and Mouton 2001: 28) in the sense that they constantly strive to “interpret, create, and give meaning, to define, justify and rationalize” their actions (Babbie and Mouton 2001: 270). A metatheory that is related to phenomenology is hermeneutics; due to the fact that it also places emphasis on the “subjective understanding or interpretation (Verstehen) of human action” (Babbie and Mouton 2001: 30). For the qualitative researcher hermeneutics is important because, in the same way that we understand the meaning of any given text by interpreting it; “we should aim in a similar fashion, to interpret ideas, purposes, and other mental states expressed in the world of human action” (Babbie and Mouton, 2001:31).

What this implies is that meaning should be explored in both a textual and a contextual sense. In the case of the history of musical notation, or the unconventional symbols used by 20th-century composers for the recorder such as Hans-Martin Linde and Markus Zahnhausen, we therefore need to explore performance practice in two ways. First, we need to come to an understanding of texts such as those written on the history of notation (with specific reference to the idiosyncrasies in 20th-century notation), those dealing with the composers themselves, as well as those that present the actual musical texts or compositions. Second, we need to engage with those contexts that will allow us to ‘fill in the gaps’ as far as the lack of written evidence and the contingency of human involvement are concerned. These contexts may include traditions of musical practice in the case of the recorder, which have tended to emphasise its role in Baroque and pre-Baroque music, or which have tended to limit it to its social role as instrument exclusively suitable for elementary musical instruction. Another context may be found in the tendency amongst performers and teachers of music to learn by example rather than from books.

Two research methods will therefore be employed in this study. First, existing texts will be interpreted by means of a critical analysis of sources. Second, an attempt will be made to fill in

---

1 See Boorman 1999: 414, where the author stresses that the first step in the decoding of the musical message is to come to terms with the “original musical text (the concept of the composer)”, after which comes our engagement with “the notated text”.

(Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 28; 270).
the gaps as far as the lack of written and musically practiced evidence and the contingency of human involvement are concerned by the following means:

- I have been fortunate to have established e-mail contact with composer Markus Zahnhausen and will, through such correspondence, engage directly with him on questions pertaining to this treatise
- I shall put three questions to two practitioners in the field of recorder performance and teaching, in order to gain some understanding of the general levels of perceived accessibility of works such as Linde’s *Music for a Bird* and Zahnhausen’s *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte*
- I shall provide an analysis of the unconventional notation symbols in the scores of Linde’s *Music for a Bird* and Zahnhausen’s *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte* along with detailed instructions on how these may be performed, and I shall demonstrate these instructions with reference to the recordings of these works contained on the accompanying CD, Appendix F.

### 4. DELIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY AND OUTLAY OF CHAPTERS

This study is not about testing the truths of what has been written on contemporary recorder performance practice. In the qualitative paradigm the question of truth based on empirical evidence or scientific experiment is an irrelevant one. Rather it is research done to learn from all of the above sources, to provide an “emic perspective” from the point of view of all the musicians and musicologists cited, who collectively perform their role as “social actors” (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 270) in shaping our present understanding of performance practice in the case of Linde’s *Music for a Bird* and Zahnhausen’s *Sieben Stücke Für Altblockflöte*.

Following this introductory chapter, the treatise will be set out as follows. In the forthcoming chapter I shall provide an overview of the history of notation that emphasises the contingency of human engagement in this field. In chapter 3 I shall provide the reader with some information on the two composers themselves, which must serve as background to chapter 4,

---

1 Despite my best efforts to do so, I have been unable to establish similar contact with Hans-Martin Linde.
wherein I consider the challenge posed by the unconventional notation symbols encountered specifically in Linde's *Music for a Bird* and Zahnhausen’s *Sieben Stücke Für Altbölkflöte* and wherein I ultimately propose a means by which these challenges can be met. Chapter 5 presents a summary and conclusion to this study as a whole.
CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORY AND SCOPE OF MUSICAL NOTATION

1. INTRODUCTION

Notation, according to the New Grove, “is a visual analogue of musical sound, either as a record of sound heard or imagined, or as a set of visual instructions for performers” (Williams 2001:73). Notation is not the only form of communication between a player and a composer. Aside from written transmission, various forms of oral transmission have existed since time immemorial, and today of course audio technology also fulfills a communicative role. Nevertheless, of all of these, it may be argued that written forms of musical notation – and Western forms of notation in particular – are certainly the most pervasive and extensive. More recently, in postmodern musicological terms, the status of the notated score has become a subject of great debate, especially in the light of the Barthesian idea of ‘text’ (Barthes 1978). Stanley Boorman states that many questions could be asked as to whether a musical text needs to be written, or whether a recording could be constituted as a musical text. He says that musical notation should never be considered definitive of the music itself. Instead it should be regarded as an object of mistrust, because that which you perceive on paper is on most occasions not what is suggested in sound (Boorman 1999). Boorman is therefore suggesting that appropriate interpretations in musical performance rely on a great deal besides the written score. The aim of this chapter is to engage with ideas such as those of Boorman, ultimately to provide a backdrop for my interpretation of the unconventional notation symbols encountered in the works of Hans–Martin Linde and Markus Zahnhausen in the forthcoming chapters of this study. Before doing so, however, this chapter will begin by sketching a brief history of notation, from ancient times to the present, in order to better understand its implicit limitations within any given historical context.
2. THE HISTORY OF NOTATION

In the broadest sense, musical notation is a concept that embraces “all formalized systems of signaling between musicians” (Williams 2001: 73). Notation therefore includes those systems of memorizing and teaching music, with spoken syllables, words or phrases, which are also sometimes called oral notations. These oral, non-literate musical communication systems are in fact where the origins of written notation lie.

2.1 The History of Notation in Ancient Cultures and Non-Western Music

Looking back, one comes across notation in many different forms as well as cultures. However, some ethnic groups are more notation prose than others, usually a corollary of other general levels of literacy: written notation was and is a phenomenon of the literate social classes.

African people do not have a long history of the use of written notation. Traditionally, speech in the form of syllables, word patterns, names of strings, number of xylophone keys, as well as other technical vocabulary was seen as their “notations”. In occidental cultures, written notations were much more of the norm, but strangely enough could not have been too much of the norm because in Europe in the 11th century, instrumental artists used no notation and church musicians communicated mainly through hand signs and syllables rather than the reading of a score in a rehearsal or performance. Oriental cultures such as China, Japan and Korea, as well as the ancient cultures of the Middle East and surrounding areas, accumulated a large number of notational systems to serve their different purposes.

Notation and the use thereof generally takes its form from the social and cultural context in which it is placed and developed. It is interesting to note that written notation in Greece, Mesopotamia and Egypt was first written for instrumental music and in the Western European countries written notation was first written for vocal music. From this the cultures of instrumental and vocal notations developed into a script of language that was used as part of notation. Chant notation was also introduced in Byzantium, Eastern Europe, Tibet, Mongolia and Japan. Non-linguistic symbols used in scripts were required only for the texts that were
These ancient notations were generally designed to give only what was considered necessary information. The remaining information was withheld either because it was already learnt (so that the written instructions served merely as memory aids) or because there was a desire to keep such information a secret. (Boorman 1999) In other words these are two motivations behind the use of notation, the first being the memory aid and secondly the need to communicate.

These basic functions of musical notation have never changed. To this day we use notation for exactly these reasons. As a memory aid notation enables the performed to encompass a far larger repertoire that he or she could otherwise have realized. It assists a performer’s memory in music that is basically already known but not necessarily remembered perfectly. From this, a framework can be provided for improvisation or it may improve sightreading. Written notation provides the means to draft and sketch musical ideas during the process of composing. As a means of communication it preserves music over long periods, and facilitates performance without the need for direct communication with the composer. It helps the conductor by leaving him or her with a set of special symbols by which to obtain responses during a performance. It also presents a musical text for study and analysis. It offers the student or performer a sort of excitement or bringing of the music to life in his or her own mind when no performance is possible. It also provides the theorist with a medium by which to present or demonstrate musical or acoustical laws (Williams 2001: 74).

To understand the history of notation sorted into some kind of chronological order is a daunting task, bearing in mind its very broad scope. One should start by looking at the first surviving elements. The earliest recognized form of written notation in any civilization was the system used by the Mesopotamians as well as the Assyrians, Babylonians and Sumerians. The origins of this practice date back to the middle of the 4th millennium BC. It is a syllabic- logographic cuneiform system into the Hellenistic period and down to the 1st century AD. The ancient writing of the Egyptians, namely hieroglyphics, is a mixture of pictures that represented objects as well as phonetic symbols. These hieroglyphics and other syllabic graphics, as well as the carvings on the walls of temples and tombs, are our connection to the first evidence of musical sounds that survived from the Pharaonic period. There is even evidence of scenes of music making that shows a kind of arm, hand and finger movement
representing signs or instructor signals giving details of melody and rhythm to performers (Hickmann 1956: 1). Some of the hieroglyphics (dating from the old kingdom of 2668 to 2181 BC, and the new kingdom of 1567 to 1085 BC) have since been interpreted as specific written musical instructions. Amongst the Jews, cheironomy may have also existed from the 2nd millennium EC. In this it is probable that some of these signs were from within the system of biblical accents developed by the masonic scholars of the Tiberians during the 9th and early 10th centuries BC, which were originally based on the hand signs used in assisting singers while chanting. The use of these accents was for the cantor of the texts, which is also called ekphonic notation. It comprised a system of nine accents indicated by the placing and grouping of dots. This system was developed to a high degree of sophistication in the ensuing centuries. The liturgical monophonic repertoires of the Syrian, Armenian and Byzantine churches also made use of the ekphonic system. (Williams 2001:74)

The earliest known alphabet system of notation is that of the Ugarit, prescribed on clay tablets that represent 30 letters and which appear to have evolved from the cuneiform syllables of the mid-second millennium BC in Syria-Palestine. The Greek and Hebrew alphabets developed in part from the Ugarit. The first musical notation known to harness this alphabet was of Greek letters as well as other symbols that represented a continuous diatonic series of notes over three octaves. Each letter or sign also appears rotated onto its side as well as in mirror image to represent the diatonic note raised by a quarter tone and semi-tone respectively. Scholars believe that this instrumental notation must have come into existence sometime before 500 BC, and that vocal notation using the Ionic alphabet probably even before the 5th century BC (Williams 2001: 74-75).

In China an ideographic system of writing existed by the early second millennium BC. Each character of the script stood for mono-syllables that represented musical pitches dating from the fourth century BC. The first detailed discussion of these shows five monosyllables – gong, shang, jue, zhi and yu – denoting the notes of the Chinese pentatonic scale. The monosyllables are in effect solemnization syllables in that they designate the five points on the pentatonic scale matching each fixed pitch. However, in the third century BC the earliest

---

1 Cuneiform is an early style of writing, consisting of wedge-shaped symbols inscribed on clay or stone.
surviving script was given to a fixed pitch system of the 12 Lü¹, - each of these having its own pitch name. The starting pitch of this 12-tone system was Huang-zhong or yellow bell, the fifth above it Linzhong or forest bell, the fifth above that Taicou or great frame, and so on. Each of these pitches was then represented in script by a pair of characters. (Williams 2001: 74-75).

By the early 6th and 8th centuries CE instrumental tablature came to be, the first being a set of elaborate Chinese examples with technical instructions for the Qin², providing directions for the playing of the piece called Youlan on the Chinese Zither. This system, known as Wenzi pu, was in existence until the 10th century. In Japan a tablature was noted for the Japanese lute, called Biwa, which dates back from 768 BC and was derived from the Chinese court tradition (Williams 2001: 74-76).

The first traces of alphabetical notation for Arabic theory, although never used in musical practice, dates from the 13th century. In Byzantine and Russian sources in the 16th century, Balinese Solemnization syllables for gamelan compositions in the Pelog system came to be written down in Balinese script notation. Only at the end of the 19th century did the Nut Anaha or the “ladder notation” of central Java, used in the Yogyakarta Kraton manuscripts, came into use. This was a grid system almost like guitar tablature with dots. Another system known as “chain notation”, which uses six horizontal lines to represent pitches and which is connected with chains, came into use only a few years before. At the same time the number notation for pitches known as Nut Angka or Kepatihan was introduced (Williams 2001: 74-76).

2.2 The History of Notation in Western Culture

In Western music the earliest-known attempts at notating music are found in the use of neumes. These symbols were used in the Christian Church for the singing of plainchant. Chanting is the means to speak a word again and again, in this case involving the repetition of biblical words and phrases.

¹ The Lü was constructed for tuning purposes. To establish the pitches, 12 bamboo pipes, closed at one end, were cut into graduated lengths. When blown across their open ends, they produced the 12 Lü, or the fundamental pitches of that octave. ² A gin is a conductor.
The earliest surviving chant manuscripts that contain musical notation date from the 9th and 10th centuries, from a monastery in St Gall in Switzerland. The particular style of neumes written on these manuscripts is known as Sangallian. Other geographical areas had different notational techniques, such as the Norman, Beneventan, Aquitanian and French. Some of these notation systems may outdate the Sangallian but to date no older manuscripts have survived. In *The New Grove Dictionary*, Sadie stresses the importance of the fact that, since its inception, musical notation was never a fixed and unitary affair. Thus, discovering new forms of ancient notation “is clearly of great historical importance, for it stands at the beginning of the development that led to the notational forms we use today” (Williams 2001:76). At first neumes were placed either above or below an imaginary line in order to provide a clear indication of pitch. In time they became increasingly concrete in their instruction. Eventually, this imaginary line gained a clef to show its pitch, and it became drawn in rather than being imaginary. From this the four-lined staff developed, still used for notating chant today.

Scholars of early forms of notation have been able to show that Western forms of neumatic notation in the 9th and 10th centuries did not arise without influences from contemporary non-Western or non-Christian forms of notation. As earlier described, for example, this was also the time of Byzantine ekphonetic notation. It was not long after this that neumatic notation also came into use in Tibet for the singing of the Buddhist chant, possibly the result of the influence of the ekphonetic notation system of the Syrian Church transmitted by the Nestorians. In the earliest surviving documents of Western polyphony, we encounter a peculiar set of notational signs, which were similar to that of the Greek instrumental notation known as dasian notation. This was also called the parallel and free organum of *musica enchriadi* (http://en.wikipedia.org/ekphonetic notation.)

Along with his development of solemnization, which was to form the basis for the tonic-solfa notation system widely used to this day, Guido of Arezzo (995 – 1050) is credited with standardizing some of the changes to neumatic notation. His purposes were pedagogical – he was having difficulty teaching chanting to young choristers and therefore felt that notation needed to provide clearer instructions (Williams 2001: 75).
In the centuries that followed, Western notation continued to undergo fundamental changes, for example, with the formation of square notation as well as the development of rhythmic modes and the evolution of the mensural system with its highly complex rhythmic possibilities. During the 15th and 16th centuries the first Western instrumental tablatures developed, the earliest being for keyboard instruments and lutes. The 16th century also saw a breakdown of the proportional mensural system. This system’s historical development is found in the works of Franco of Cologne (c.1250-1280), Philippe de Vitry (1290-1361) and Petrus de Cruce (c.1270-1300). Franco, in his *Ars Cantus Mensurabilis*, was the first to describe the relations between *maxima*, *lunga* and *brevis* in terms that were independent of the fixed patterns of earlier modal notation. He also refined the use of semibreves. Franco described the subdivision of the *brevis* as fundamentally triplex or perfect. Thus although the *brevis* could be divided into either three equal or two unequal semibreves, triplet rhythmic micro patterns were preferred. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/mesural-notation](http://en.wikipedia.org/mesural-notation))

The introduction of further subdivisions of the *brevis* is credited to the work of Petrus de Cruce (c.1270-1300). However he did not notate these as the separate smaller durations of the *minima* and *semiminima*, but simply as variable numbers of semibreves. The exact rhythmical interpretation of these groups is partly uncertain. The notating of these complex groups of short notes by sequences of semibreves was later used more systematically in the notation of Italian *Trecento* music ([http://en.wikipedia.org/mesural-notation](http://en.wikipedia.org/mesural-notation)).

The decisive refinements that made notation even of extremely complex rhythmic patterns on multiple hierarchical metrical levels possible were introduced in France during the time of the *Ars Nova* (1300), with Philippe de Vitry (1290-1361) as the most important theoretician. The *Ars Nova* introduced shorted note values below the semibreves, it systematized the relationship of perfection across all levels down to the minima, and it introduced the devices of proportions and coloration (Ulrich&Pisk.1963: 81-82).

During this time of the Franco-Flemish or Dutch school in Renaissance music, the use of the French notational system gradually spread throughout Europe. This period brought on the replacement of white notation with black notation, due to the fact that white paper was used more often than vellum for music. It also brought a further slowing down of the duration of the
larger note values while introducing more small ones. Towards the end of this period, the use of ligatures and the original rules of perfection and imperfection became gradually obsolete, together with the use of these longer note values themselves. During the 17th century, the system of mensuration signs and proportion gradually developed into the modern time signatures, and new notation devices for time measurements, such as bar lines and ties, were introduced, thus ultimately leading towards the modern notational system. (Ulrich & Pisk. 1963: 133-143).

In the 18th and 19th centuries Western notation saw a formalization of the orchestral score as well as an increasing use of non-Italian verbal indications as auxiliary signs to staff notation. This developed a more detailed specification of all parameters of sound in an attempt to highlight all angles of performance.

The 20th century saw many changes in art music. War and technology were major influences on composers. The world wars had composers and other artists questioning the values and beliefs of society. Some felt that anything that happened before that time had led to the war, and rejected compositional practices from the eras before. Others felt that composing their music by strict mathematical formulas and methods could control the chaos in the post-war world. In particular the highly emotional style of the Romantic era fell out of style. Some composers now sought to pare their music down to only the essentials – John Cage took this theory to the extreme when he wrote a piece that is several minutes of silence. Many aspects of the performance could be left up to the performer. Obviously some of these new techniques and ideas changed the way music was notated.

In its wake came various 20th–century proposals for the reformation of notation, two in particular being the klavarskribo and the equitone. Compositional indeterminacy imposed new angles on staff notation that at first was looked upon as space-time notation, but was later replaced with specially designed systems. The writing of microtonal music placed strain on the notation system inherited by Western composers in the 20th century, with its rigid pitch representations of staff notation, and this caused the introduction of new notational signs, including new accidentals for quartetone and sixth-tone microtonal inflections (Williams 2001: 76).
The 20th century also saw an increased interest in ethnomusicology and with it came notational challenges. The above innovations were therefore also needed for the transcription of non-Western music that had strained the capacity of ‘traditional’ Western staff notation. There was a need to find ways to represent music that was written in a different notational system or to notate music never before notated at all. It demanded that the notational system be descriptive rather than prescriptive. Two innovative approaches developed out of the work of 20th-century ethnomusicologists. The first of these was the melograph that was invented by Charles Seeger, designed to trace music in the form of a pitch-time graph. The second system was that of Karl Dahlback, who produced two similar graphs by using a device called a cathode ray tube (Williams 2001: 76).

Electronic music was also a 20th-century feature. Both technical and representational notations have also been devised for electronic music. Some compositions featured pre-taped electronic sounds or made use of electronic instruments. Modifications of traditional instruments were used in some pieces. Harry Partch modified instruments and invented his own for his compositions. He believed that notation should be individualized to each instrument for performance as well as having a common denominator notation used for analysis. Experimental notations that he used include numbers and altered note heads (www.slais.ucb.ca/courses).

David Cope points out that in the 20th century “there has been nothing short of an onslaught on new systems, approaches and most markedly an individualistic attitude toward new music notation” (www.slais.ucb.ca/courses). This onslaught has in many ways posed new challenges for musical performers. In the absence of a uniform and universal system of notation, 20th-century Western music demands from performers that they respond to notated scores with new levels of tacit knowledge. This is the challenge that has motivated this study, and that will be specifically addressed in the recorder repertoire of Hans-Martin Linde and Markus Zahnhausen in the forthcoming chapters. Before doing so, however, we need to consider the extent to which it is possible to claim that the problem of tacit knowledge is not unique to the 20th century alone.
3. THE SCOPE OF MUSICAL NOTATION

In mapping the brief history of notation given above, it was noted early on that different forms of musical notation and the use thereof generally take their form from the social and cultural contexts in which they are placed and developed. For performers of today to render such works with any degree of historical accuracy, therefore, this fact inevitably requires that they engage with some historical research into the contexts in question.

There is a generally held notion that in Western music, notation and performance practice were relatively standardized up to the end of the 19th century, and that problems with notational idiosyncrasies from one composer to the next are mostly found in 20th-century music. However, the historical background provided in this chapter has shown that pre-20th-century notation in Western music history is anything but fixed and immutable.

In the case of medieval music, for example, Carl Parrish notes the following:

The study of notation will also reveal the fact that there remain problems in every aspect of early music that are yet unsolved (some perhaps unsolvable), so that in many cases a transcription is merely a personal interpretation, and other interpretations may also be possible, at least in the light of our present knowledge. An understanding of the evolution of notation can often aid in forming a reasonable presumption on which to work, pending a final solution (Parrish 1978: xvii).

Some may argue that the problems of interpreting medieval notation symbols is somewhat of an anomaly in the Western music notation tradition, one that persists simply because these interpretations need to be based on social and cultural contexts so far removed in time from the present day. These same people may argue that, once we are dealing with the music of the so-called Common Practice Period, from 1600 – 1900, then these problems no longer exist and we all know exactly what the social and cultural contexts are against which notation symbols should be understood and interpreted. However, as George Houle notes, this is not the case.

The notation of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music is often a puzzle to performers. The symbols of notation appear tantalizingly similar to modern ones, but their meanings are not, a fact that can lead to bewilderment and misinterpretation. Yet when the original notes are translated

---

1 See page 7 of this treatise
into their equivalents in modern notation, as in any phonetic pronunciation scheme, something vital is lost. By learning to read the original notation correctly, one can enter more closely into the composer’s thought and his performers’ traditions (Houle 1999: 64-67).

Seen in this light, it is clear that the many ‘unconventional’ symbols in 20th-century Western music notation do not present problems that are not already encountered in some guise or other throughout the history of notation. As Eleanor Selfridge-Field notes, despite its aim of “prescribing consistency of practice”, paradoxically the very longevity of our notation tradition is based on the fact that it remains fundamentally “open-ended”:

Musical codes have been used since man’s earliest efforts to transcribe sounds. From the accents for tonal inflection in many of the world’s languages, through the neumes representing chant in medieval monasteries, to the solfegge of musical pedagogy in recent centuries, codes for sound have always had the purpose of prescribing consistency of practice [...] Western musical notation as it has evolved over the centuries is a system of symbols that is relatively, but not completely, self-consistent and relatively stable but still, like music itself, evolving. It is an open-ended system that has survived over time partly because of its flexibility and extensibility (Selfridge-Field 1997: 3-4).

There have been a number of recent attempts to compensate for this element of ineffability in Western notation. For example, Gardner Read’s Source Book of Proposed Music Notation Reforms is an attempt “to examine comprehensively the major systems of musical notation proposed during the past five centuries”, to illustrate “the many attempts to improve upon or replace the traditional system” and ultimately to provide a “repository of suggested improvements in notation” (Gardner 1987: pg.iii). A major technological advancement towards what Selfridge-Field describes as the “lure of total representations” is considered to exist in the use of computer-generated notation models. In this regard she states:

Because of its power and memory, the computer offers an opulent possibility: the opportunity to represent entire musical works […] with as many attributes as the intended party is willing to identify and encode (Selfridge-Field 1997: 5).

There are two reasons; it seems to me, why pursuit of an all-encompassing and universal notation system is not a good thing.

First, such an ideal is impractical. To design a system that can account for every finest detail of every kind of musical language on earth – past, present and future - would require the
performer to decode many, many messages in order to realize the simplest piece. The information overload would become quite unbearable. Selfridge-Field ultimately admits, therefore, that the “lure of total representation” is probably not as ideal a situation as it may at first seem:

Every system makes sacrifices somewhere to optimize clarity of its preferred features (Selfridge-Field 1997:5).

For this reason tailor-made notation systems that have evolved naturally through centuries of use in different social and cultural contexts are likely to remain the norm. In each of these contexts it is therefore required of practitioners to accumulate the required tacit knowledge – to become acquainted with the social and cultural contexts in question – in order to fill in the gaps that the ‘preferred features’ in question do not provide, be these contexts for medieval and renaissance music (for example, Parrish 1978), for tonic-solfa (for example, Underwood 2003), for blind musicians (for example, Watson and Busbridge 1994), for analytical and theoretical use (for example, Brolsma 1972), for the many forms of non-Western notation (for example, Cage, Fukushima and Ota 1981), or for 20th-century music (for example, Read 1979, Ulrich & Pisk 1963 and Williams 2001).

Second, such an ideal is undesirable because it removes the human element from musical performance. Becoming acquainted, as described above, with the requisite social and cultural contexts means that the performer engages in so-called “performance-practice research”, which Richard Taruskin defines as “an attempt, on the basis of documentary or statistical evidence, to bridge the gap between what is written in musical texts and what was actually heard in typical contemporary performances” (Taruskin 1995: 18). But for the performer to stop engagement with the musical work at this point, says Taruskin, amounts to more than “historical reconstructionism” that produces mere “seminar reports in sound”. This, he says, is not performance. Thus:

The fruits of scholarship can mightily assist the performer’s purposes; but to insist that the performer obey the scholar is just as tyrannically limiting as it would be to insist that the scholar pursue no project that cannot be turned to the performer’s immediate advantage (Taruskin 1995: 30).
Instead, a musical work is not only about the creativity of the composer, but also about the re-creativity of its performances, and the job of the performer is to open up the “border between the creative and the re-creative” (Taruskin 1995:47). Seen in this light, the notated musical work must ultimately be regarded as a text in the Barthesian sense of the word, meaning that it does not exist on paper, but only in its performances, in its re-creations, and these re-creations are contingent upon the meaning and interpretations that each performer brings to it. It thus exists in a constant state of change, as an intertext that can never be fixed or closed (Barthes 1977:30). For this reason Stanley Boorman states:

> The relationship of the original musical text (the concept of the composer) to the notated text is the concern of the musicologist, rather than of the musical performer. The latter is expected to move forward from the notation, to produce a new musical text, reflecting both ability and musicality [...] [F] or both, the musical text [first] needs to be read and understood. [...] Once that is done, the notations can be used to create a performance of a piece of music, in a way that reflects both the text and the time and place of the performer (Boorman 1999:414).

In other words, notation is important, but it is not all-important. Along with performance practice research which requires engagement with the composer as “the original musical text”, notation may serve as a first step for the performer to ensure that he or she remains within the bounds of what Kofi Agawu would call “historically preferred meanings” rather than “fanciful meanings” (Agawu 1991:5), but the discretion and musicality of the performer is ultimately the essential ingredient that makes a performance truly great.

> [...] the notation itself is allusive. It is not the piece of music; it is not even a complete guide to reconstructing that piece. Instead it is an allusive guide, offering the performer hints alongside the instructions, and therefore depending on the musician’s ability to understand these hints and allusions (Boorman 1999:411).

In the forthcoming chapters of this treatise I shall proceed to consider Hans-Martin Linde and Markus Zahnhausen as “original musical texts”, then to consider the unconventional symbols in the notated texts of their works for the recorder, *Music for a Bird* and *Sieben Stücke für Alttblockflöte*, after which I shall return to consider the all-important role of the performer in making music of these “hints and allusions”.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
CHAPTER 3

HANS-MARTIN LINDE AND MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN

1. INTRODUCTION

Hans-Martin Linde and Markus Zahnhausen are both German-born 20th-century composers. In keeping with the prevailing spirit of modernism that brought about many changes in human endeavor in general in the 20th century, characterized by an impatience with older forms of art, politics, philosophy, etc., 20th-century German music is marked by its effort to break away from past musical practices, thus creating new harmonies, new instrumental effects for the orchestra and for solo works, to some extent the abandonment of old set forms, breaking away from older forms of notation, and bringing in kinds of notational signs that indicate new playing techniques designed to produce novel sound effects. Both composers have experimented with these unconventional ideas throughout their careers, Zahnhausen most of all. Both Music for Bird and Sieben Stücke have parts that are dissonant on the ear, or that use less common forms of tonality such as whole-tone and pentatonic formations. They play around with numerous effects, for example flutterzunge, frullato, finger vibrato and white noises. Multiphonics as well as different trills are also used, where performers are required to use unconventional fingerings and even the palm of the hand. Interestingly enough, Zahnhausen and Linde use a lot of the same new effects, but they do not always notate these in the same way. In this regard Zahnhausen comments:

Every composer has a language, which he understands; there is no ruling anywhere that says that musical effects are a set written language (Zahnhausen 2007).

Because of this absence of a relatively universal system for the use of new notational symbols in such music, recorder players are constantly challenged to explore the contexts in which such signs occur and to determine their compositional intention. This treatise is largely motivated by the need to rise to this challenge.
2. **HANS-MARTIN LINDE**

Hans-Martin Linde was born on 24 May 1930 in Werne, Germany. He is active as conductor, flautist and baritone singer. He studied the flute under Gustavo Scheck and composition and choral conducting under Konrad Lechner at the Freiburg Conservatory. After completing his studies he worked as choral conductor and flute teacher in his hometown, Werne, Germany. Whilst working in Werne, he became very interested in playing the recorder as well as the traverso flute. He became so interested in the recorder itself that he did research on all the different makes as well as the history of its existence. In 1955 he embarked on a long period of work with the Westdeutscher Rundfunk (West German Radio) in Cologne, involving regular chamber music recordings and an appointment as flautist, and later even as conductor with the Capella Basiliensis in Bâle. From 1976 to 1979 Hans-Martin Linde was head of the senior department of the Basel Academy of Music. From 1979 - 1995 he ran a choral conducting class, taught performance practice and directed the Academy's choirs. Linde has performed as a flautist in international concert halls and made several vinyl and CD recordings. Since 1983 he has increasingly been working as a conductor of instrumental groups and opera (Linde. Schott OFB 48).

Hans-Martin Linde has published articles on performance practice and methods for the recorder, and has composed works for orchestra, chamber and vocal ensembles. His compositions for the recorder have become firmly established in the 20th-century repertoire for that instrument. He uses avant-garde playing techniques and experiments with new compositional structures, but a link with tonality and old forms is nevertheless always detectable (www.hans-martin linde-biography).

Linde has also written a number of original and highly instructive books on the flute and recorder respectively, those for the recorder being:

- *Art Of Recorder Playing* (Schott, ED4677, nd)
- *Kleine Anleitung Zum Verzieren Alter Musik* (Schott, ED12322, nd)
Linde’s greatest musical interest is in Baroque and Renaissance music. As performer he made his name by touring widely and recording concertos for the flute by Leclair, Mozart, Stamitz and Dittersdorf, as well as recorder works by Sammartini, Vivaldi and Naudot. Linde has also recorded early English consort music as well as Italian chamber music from 1600 with his own ensemble, the Linde Consort. He had a wonderful playing relationship with the great recorder player, Frans Brüggen, with whom he performed in concert on many occasions (www.hans-martin linde-biography).

His interest in modern music developed much later in his musical career, together with his research into the recorder as instrument. Along with this came his fascination for novel instrumental effects and new notational symbols for the recorder. Music for a Bird is one of the works that derive from his interest in these modern effects. Music for a Bird was composed in 1968 and consists of seven short unaccompanied musical sessions for recorder, each exploring the bird-like sonorities of the instrument. It represents the 20th-century recorder player’s efforts to provide the instrument with a larger repertoire than it was given in the Classic and Romantic periods, elucidating upon its uses in contemporary as well as Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque music. Other works with similar effects include Suite für Sopraan, Alt, Tenor and Bass Recorders - OFB 168, Fantasien und Scherzi für Altblokköle - OFB 46, Märchen - OFB 154, Amarilli mia bella - OFB 133, Blokflöte virtuos - OFB 156, Una Follia nuovo - OFB 165 and Serenade - ED 7848. In these works we encounter a kind of chronological development of symbols, where some signs have gradually evolved through his oeuvre. However, one should be able to play any of his pieces once an understanding of the earlier signs has been gained (www.hans-martin linde-biography).

3. MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN

Markus Zahnhausen is a recorder virtuoso as well as a composer for the recorder. Zahnhausen has explored unconventional modern playing techniques and notational signs wider than Hans-Martin Linde has done, both because he has composed more extensively for

---

1 Frans Brüggen was born on 30 October 1934 in Amsterdam, Holland. He is a famous recorder player. He is considered among the foremost experts in the performance of eighteenth-century music. He studied the recorder with Kees Otten and flute at the Amsterdam Muziekleceum. (www.bach-cantatas.com(www.bach.cantatas.co/bio/bruggen-frans.com).
the recorder and because his musical career has been more firmly planted in modernism, being 35 years Linde’s junior.

Markus Zahnhausen was born in Saarbrueken, Germany in 1965. He received his musical training at the Richard Strauss Conservatory in Munich as well as studying musicology and Slavic languages and literature at the Universities at Trier and Munich. In 1988 he took up a position as teacher of recorder and chamber music at the Munich Volkshochschule. In 1994 and 1995 he was a visiting lecturer at the Carl Nielsen Academy of Music in Odense, Denmark and at the Royal Academy of Music in Copenhagen. Zahnhausen is also a music journalist who has worked for the Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts and regularly writes for the Bavarian Broadcasting System and for trade journals in Germany and abroad. His performance of early and contemporary recorder music has taken him throughout Europe in a great many concert appearances. He has completed CD recordings, radio and television broadcasts, including that of the Moscow Autumn Festival, the St Petersburg Spring Festival, the London Exhibition of Early Music as well as performances in Tatar Stan and the Urals. His musical oeuvre includes orchestral works, choral pieces, chamber music and all pieces with a special emphasis on the recorder. Zahnhausen is the chief editor of the Modern Recorder Library Series from Moeseler in Wolfenbuettel. Since 2002 Markus Zahnhausen has been on the teaching staff of the University of Music in Munich.

Markus Zahnhausen has a vast list of works that employ new notational symbols and sound effects. This list includes Klangreden-Duets for Recorder (Alt) and Traverse Flute, 1986 (Doblinger 04.462), Herbstmusik (Autumn Music) for Recorder solo, 1989 (Moeseler 22.440), Winterbilder (Winter Images 1990 (Moeseler 22.440) and many more. Zahnhausen’s set of novel sound effects and unconventional notation are mostly consistent throughout his works. This makes understanding the works much easier. In this treatise I have chosen to focus on his Sieben Stücke für Altsblockflöte, composed between 1988 and 1990, because it represents most of his innovations in this regard.
Zahnhausen has become a household name for any recorder player. On “What do the critics say” on Zahnhausens internet homepage\(^1\), Dan Laurin comments as follows:

Markus is a most interesting young composer. I have been studying his music long enough to realize that the seemingly simple scores focus on truly musical expressions rather than the agility of the players fingers. His style is very much his own and his musical language very attractive. In concerts the response of the audience is a pleasant mixture of appreciation and astonishment: it is most contemporary and very beautiful!

This statement sums up Zahnhausen as a composer of great experimental ideas, which sends a player into the tranquil “Zahnhausen fantasy world” of new experiences.

\(^1\) www.recorderhomepage.net/markus.html
CHAPTER 4

AN ANALYSIS OF UNCONVENTIONAL SYMBOLS IN THE NOTATION OF
“MUSIC FOR A BIRD” BY HANS-MARTIN LINDE AND “SIEBEN STÜCKE
FÜR ALTBLOCKFLÖTE” BY MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN

1. MEETING THE CHALLENGES OF THE UNCONVENTIONAL

Modern recorder music is filled with exciting and interesting sonorities that explore new possibilities for the instrument, along with its continued use in the more traditional manner. But such music is not easy music to perform. It challenges the performer to first acquire

- A very clear understanding of the unconventional notation symbols it contains and the sound effects these symbols are intended to convey
- The ability to master the often very tricky methods of using the instrument in order to produce the effects in question.

Because of the limitations imposed by such challenges on practitioners of the recorder, both performers and teachers, pieces such as Linde’s Music for a Bird and Zahnhausen’s Sieben Stücke are unfortunately not as widely performed and heard as they deserve to be. Both Linde and Zahnhausen have very specific effects in mind in their use of unconventional symbols so that the performer or teacher is not completely free to interpret these at his or her own discretion. There are also no traditions of tacit knowledge to draw from in such cases because these symbols and their effects are simply too idiosyncratic to the composers and the instrument concerned.

Because of this, many teachers of the recorder today are wary of teaching these specialized works to their students, not necessarily because these works are too difficult but because of their general lack of knowledge about these playing effects and how to successfully produce them on the recorder. Some will attempt to figure these out on their own by process of trial and error, but many prefer to steer clear of such works altogether for fear of getting it wrong.
On interviewing\(^1\) two of my peers in the field of recorder performance and teaching on the problem of the idiosyncrasies of these works, I received responses that confirm my suspicion that, unless a concerted intervention of some sort is made, the population of recorder performers and teachers to whom such music is accessible will always remain limited to a very small group of specialists in the field. The first interviewee, Linda de Villiers, has an honours degree in which she majored in recorder performance. She is widely recognized as a specialist performer and teacher on this instrument. De Villiers responds to the challenge as follows:

> I have a very enquiring mind, and will find the answer or try and interpret it as best I can. Because I have played a lot of modern works it makes interpretation a little easier for me (De Villiers 2008).

The second interviewee, Lizelle Deyzel, has a bachelor’s degree in which she majored in vocal performance, but with substantial secondary training on the recorder. She also currently teaches recorder. Deyzel’s response to this same challenge is much less encouraging:

> I am too afraid, to be honest, to try out pieces by modern composers such as Zahnhausen and Linde because my knowledge of the modern effects is very little. Because I mainly played Baroque music I just don’t feel comfortable. I probably would never attempt it (Deyzel 2008).

I venture to suggest that there are likely to be more recorder teachers in the field today who fit Deyzel’s profile than there would be those that fit the profile of De Villiers.

The only means of intervening in this unfortunate situation is to look for answers beyond the musical score itself, to make a very deliberate effort to find out by alternative means what in fact is intended by composers such as Linde and Zahnhausen in their use of unconventional notation symbols, and then to disseminate such findings as broadly as possible.

One such way would be to listen to authoritative recordings of these works. It is unfortunate, however, that such recordings are mostly not readily available. Few recordings of such unusual works exist, aside from those on which the composers themselves perform their own works\(^2\). Not only are such recordings hard to come by, they are also not always extremely

---

\(^1\) See Appendix A.

helpful: merely hearing what is happening will not necessarily help you to know specifically how to produce the effect on the instrument yourself.

A second means of finding help in this regard is to turn to the very useful prefixes contained in the printed editions of such works. In the case of Zahnhausen’s Sieben Stücke the challenge is made somewhat easier by virtue of the fact that the Doblinger Musikverlag edition of the work is prefixed by the composer’s very specific and detailed instructions, describing both the effect that is intended with each unconventional symbol, as well as the method by which this effect should be achieved (Zahnhausen 1988/90). In Linde’s Music for a Bird however, although the composer has prefixed the Schott Muzik edition with a list describing the effect intended with each unconventional symbol, he does not prescribe the method by which this effect should be achieved (Linde 1971).

What is somewhat disconcerting in these prefixes, however, is to discover that, with each new piece or each new composer, the performer is often required to learn a whole new set of symbols. In the case of Linde’s Music for a Bird and Zahnhausen’s Sieben Stücke, for example, the composers may often intend to convey similar or sometimes even identical novel sound effects, but they will use entirely different symbols in order to convey these effects. For this reason the explanatory purpose of the prefix of playing instructions to the score becomes, in effect, an indispensable part of the score itself. Zahnhausen thus states:

Playing instructions play a vitally important role in understanding what is wanted
(Zahnhausen 2007).

Table 4.1 below shows a list of various unconventional symbols encountered in Linde’s Music for a Bird and Zahnhausen’s Sieben Stücke, where the symbols themselves are in most cases quite different, but where the intended novel effects they signify are in fact very similar or sometimes even identical.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LINDE’S MUSIC FOR A BIRD</strong>¹</th>
<th><strong>ZAHNHAUSEN’S SIEBEN STÜCKE FÜR ALT BLOCKFLÖTE</strong>²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Symbol](image1) Opening the hole slightly; Variations in the size of the hole will determine pitch | ![Symbol](image2) ¼ tone higher  
¼ tone higher  
¼ tone lower |
| ![Symbol](image3) Trill with specified finger | ![Symbol](image4) Trill with specified finger |
| RRR Flutter tonguing | Frull Flutter tonguing |
| ![Symbol](image5) Tone with humming sound | ![Symbol](image6) Tone with humming sound |
| ![Symbol](image7) Sharp attack, with mouth slightly open | ![Symbol](image8) Staccatissimo  
Portato  
Staccato  
Leggiero (between staccato and portato) |
| ![Symbol](image9) Glissando | Glissando |
| ![Symbol](image10) Glissando-unbroken | Glissando-unbroken |
| ![Symbol](image11) Notes repeatedly played | ![Symbol](image12) Notes repeatedly played |
| ![Symbol](image13) Labium vibrato | ![Symbol](image14) Labium vibrato |
| ![Symbol](image15) Finger vibrato | Finger vibrato |
| ![Symbol](image16) Breath | ![Symbol](image17) Breath |
| ![Symbol](image18) Herstel Cancellation of earlier marking | Ordinario Cancellation of earlier marking |

¹ Schott-OFB 48.  
² Doblinger-04.462
Because of notational discrepancies such as the above, if these prefixes or ‘playing instructions’ are not clear in every respect they may end up being less than helpful. Where adequate explanations are not given, or where such explanations are entirely unavailable, it is possible that the unconventional symbols may be interpreted in an inappropriate manner or confused with unconventional symbols encountered in previous works that are similar in appearance but different in intent. This is not to deny, however, that some degree of freedom of expression on the part of the performer is ever entirely inappropriate, especially if experience has given the performer or teacher some degree of certainty about the most likely effect to have been intended by the composer. De Villiers’ above response confirms that her experience in the performance of the modern recorder repertoire has given her confidence to rely on her ability to “interpret it as best I can” (De Villiers 2008).

A final and most helpful alternative would be to go straight to the horse’s mouth, as it were. I have been fortunate to have been able to establish a personal correspondence with Markus Zahnhausen, and to have questioned him directly on the meaning of the unconventional notational symbols encountered in his works. Coupled with the valuable insight I have gained through this correspondence, is my own experience in the performance of these and other modern recorder pieces. And on this basis I conclude this chapter by providing an analysis of the instructions contained in the works concerned that I trust may be of some assistance to teachers and performers of the recorder – whether or not they are specialists in modern recorder repertoire – to enable them to play or teach these effects for themselves. Those teachers who are good players may even pick up new ways to produce these same effects. As stated above, there is always a certain amount of freedom to experiment in modern music, within the bounds of an understanding of the kind of sound the composer has envisaged, along with a thorough understanding of the technical possibilities of the recorder itself. Although the following analysis is specifically focused on Music for a Bird and Sieben Stücke, these effects and the techniques through which they are accomplished are equally applicable to other works by Linde and Zahnhausen respectively1, as well as to works of their contemporarie1.

---

1 Klangreden-Duets for Recorder (Alt) and Traverse Flute, 1986 (Doblinger 04.462), Herbstmusik (Autumn Music) for Recorder solo, 1989 (Moeseler 22.440), Winterbilder (Winter Images 1990 (Moeseler 22.440)-Zahnhausen and Suite für sopraan, alt, tenor and bass recorders-OFB 168, Fantasien und Scherzi für Altblokkörte-OFB 46,
2. ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYING INSTRUCTIONS IN MUSIC FOR A BIRD BY HANS-MARTIN LINDE

The forthcoming analysis pertains to the score for this work, as contained in Appendix B of this treatise. Performers should note that this piece has a very free tempo at places unmarked. However they should adhere as strictly as possible to the indicated dynamic markings, since these play an important part in creating the desired effects. The changeover from one piece to the next may be treated at the performer's leisure.

Finger nomenclature:

0  Thumb of left hand
1  Index finger of the left hand
2  Middle finger of the left hand
3  Ring finger of the left hand
4  Index finger of the right hand
5  Middle finger of the right hand
6  Ring finger of the right hand
7  Little finger of the right hand
8  Hole at the end of the foot joint

No1. Liberamente
a  Senza vibrato - the bass note droned without vibrato
b  Slightly open the holes covered by the LH thumb and fifth finger of the right hand
c\(^1\)  The same fingering as b, but with less on the third finger of the left hand
c\(^2\)  The third finger of the left hand returned to a conventional position
d  This group of notes can be repeated ad lib, in any desired order
e  Con vibrato  the bass note droned in the throat with vibrato

Märchen OFB 154, Amarilli mia bella-OFB 133, Blokflöte virtuos-OFB 156, Una Follia nouvo-OFB 165 and Serenade-ED 7848.-Linde
\^1 African Dreams-Peter-Louis van Dyk; Konzert Stück-Loeb van Zuilenburg
f  *Glissando* up from the A-flat to the G-flat\(^1\) ‘unbroken’ by rapidly sliding from one note to the next

g  *Molto vibrato* – use much *vibrato* on the droned note with the thumb of the left hand, flattening the note

h  Use fingers 01345, and open the hole of finger 6 slightly.

**No2. Allegro**

Bar 10  a-*Glissando* ascending from the F sharp to the F natural ‘unbroken’ by rapidly sliding from one note to the next

Bar 11  b-The note is played with fingers 012 only, making a decrescendo in the sound that incorporates c which produces a *vibrato* by moving the right hand over the labium; the more the labium is covered, the lower the note will be.

**No3. Liberamente**

a\(^1\)-\(^2\)  The chord at a\(^1\) is produced by singing the specified top note and using the specified fingering of 013467 to sound the bottom note; while doing so, make a crescendo, and while the crescendo is produced, trill with the 5\(^{th}\) finger at a\(^2\).

b\(^1\)-\(^2\)  Rapidly repeat the B and G at b\(^1\), then slur it up to the B-flat at b\(^2\) by using the fingering of 0124567 but opening the holes of 0 and 7 slightly.

c\(^1\)-\(^2\)  Follow the same procedure as at b\(^1\) and b\(^2\)

d\(^1\)-\(^2\)  *Tranquillo* – Play calmly at d\(^1\) by repeating the notes at a free tempo softly, slowly and sweetly. Then make a brief *caesure* and proceed to the *rapido* at d\(^2\), repeating the notes rapidly in any desired rhythm. Note that this is done slurred.

e\(^1\)  The first note in each pair is produced by the fingering 0123467 with 0 and 7 slightly open, and the second note of each pair is produced by the trilling of the indicated finger at the specified dynamic levels and on the given note values

f  The note is produced by the specified fingering of 0123467, with 0 and 7 slightly open

g  The note is produced by the specified fingering of 1234567, then slurred into a flattened note by adding a slightly uncovered 0.
No4.  *Moderato and Presto*

Bar 1  
a Play the G-flat, then add the following fingering to further flatten the note: 0, then 012, then return to 0.

b Play the notes *ad lib.* - at any desired rhythm

c  *ma dolcissimo* - but very sweetly

d  *grazioso* - gracefully

e  *con brio* - with vigour

f  Flutter tonguing.

---

No5.  *Liberamente*

a  Sing the top note whilst sounding the bottom one using the specified fingering

b₁⁻³  Sing the top note at b¹, then at b² sound the bottom note by using the specified fingering, 013467, with 7 slightly opened. Then trill with finger 5 at b³, making an ascending crescendo.

c  Double tongue the notes by saying (t k t k) or (d g d g)

d  Decrease the rate of acceleration from the F sharp to the G.

---

No6.  *Liberamente*

a  Whilst playing the note with the left hand, cover the labium with the right hand and make slow movements to cause a vibrato. Do this at a free pace.

b₁⁻³  Sing the top note at b¹ and sound the bottom note by playing the specified fingering of 013467 at b². Rapidly repeat the E-flat to the B-flat whilst trilling with finger 2 at b³. This effect is completed by changing to the specified fingering of 0123457, while making a subtle *vibrato*.

c  Make a humming sound; an octave lower than the given pitch, if able

d  Proceed as at a, but pause on the C

e  Make a sharp attacking sound with your mouth slightly open, to cause an agitated *pizzicato* sound.

f  Flutter tonguing

g  *Glissando*, relaxing breath pressure
**No7. Liberamente**

a. Play the F and hum the E, the semitone below, thereafter making a long pause
b. Decrease the rate of acceleration from the B natural to the B flat.
c. Cover the labium with the right hand while the left hand fingers the note specified; at the same time crescendo from a rustling sound (say *shhhhh*- voiceless into the recorder) to a whistling sound. (say *zzzzz*- with voice into the recorder)
d. An unbroken *glissando* from the G to the F sharp.

---

**3. ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYING INSTRUCTIONS IN SIEBEN STÜCKE FÜR ALTBLOCKFLÖTE BY MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN**

The forthcoming analysis pertains to the score for this work, as contained in Appendix C of this treatise.

*Finger nomenclature:*

0. Thumb of left hand
1. Index finger of the left hand
2. Middle finger of the left hand
3. Ring finger of the left hand
4. Index finger of the right hand
5. Middle finger of the right hand
6. Ring finger of the right hand
7. Little finger of the right hand
8. Hole at the end of the foot joint.

---

**No1. Prelude (Nocturnal Apparition)**

a. Trill by flattening the note
b. Make a finger vibrato with the nearest non-note finger
c. Flutter tonguing

---

1 A clear distinction in articulation between (double-tonguing (t k t k)
2 with soft double-tonguing (d l d l).

No2. Harlequin’s Serenade and Dance

a Finger vibrato
b Flutter tonguing
1 The two sections of the piece can also be played separately (Serenade and Dance)
If only the Serenade is played, the piece ends at the fermata in brackets.
2 Glissando from F sharp to the E sharp by covering hole 8
3 Multiphonics\(^1\) – Over-blow the top note to sound the bottom one.

4 Blow lightly over the labium covering it slightly with the right hand moving it up and
down while blowing, this causes the whistle sound.
5 Create noise effect by striking the foot end of the recorder with a ring

No3. Toccata (Schlaflied für einen Kolibri)
No unconventional notation symbols occur in this piece.

No4. Minimal Music
No unconventional notation symbols occur in this piece.

\(^1\) A multiphonic is produced by over blowing the bottom note to sound the top note with the specific fingering given.
No5. *Viva Vivaldi!*
1. Finger vibrato with specified finger
2. Labium vibrato by moving the right hand over the labium with slow back and forth movements.
3. Pause on the note.

No6. *Homage à D. SCH*
2. Smooth transition: trill *flattement*. Trill with the finger at the *flattement* point.
3. Strike the wood of the recorder with a ring on the ring finger of the right hand.
4. Make a *decrescendo* by lightly tilting the left index finger while reducing breath pressure with good support.
5. Multiphonics (over-blowing)
6. Fade out the lower multiphonic tone by greatly increasing your breath pressure.
7. Constant trilling with finger 4
8. Constant trilling with the fingers indicated. **NOTE:** When 7 appears trill with full hole being closed by trill. If 7 appears trill with only half the hole closed causing the half tone effect.

No7. *Take five! (a vocal percussive finale)*
1. Take a breath in the beginning as if you are getting a fright of some sort
2. Play the following notes very piercingly as if you are bored, and then attack the notes fiercely towards the end.
   - Pitch the notes for the voice. Then try to drone them in your throat while playing the notes
   - Speak without voice on the t k t k t k, precisely in the notated rhythm
4. Noise effect produced by the foot. There are two ways to do this:
   - Stamp the floor with your right foot, alternating the heel and toe
• Stamp feet one by one

5 Now by using the mouth, say t k t k into the recorder. This can be joined together now with the stamping of the foot

6 Strike the wood of the recorder with the ring on the ring finger of the right hand

7 Speak the words in an over-dramatized manner
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION TO THIS STUDY

The historical overview with which this study began stressed two things:

- At no point in its history has music notation in the West provided a complete record of musical practice.
- Like music itself, notation is, always has been, and probably always will be, in a constant state of change. It is not, never has been, nor ever will be, a fixed and closed system of musical coding.

Seen in this light, the idiosyncrasies of the unconventional notation symbols encountered in the recorder repertoire of contemporary composers such as Hans-Martin Linde and Markus Zahnhausen are by no means an anomaly. Throughout history, notated scores have functioned merely as incomplete guides to the reconstruction and the realization of musical works. Along with the decoding of these instructions, a host of acculturated meanings have always been taken for granted on the part of the writer of such guidelines. Performers need to have the ability to “read between the lines” in order to add to the musical realization that which remains unspecified in its notation, hence to make sense of the music in a manner that Kofi Agawu has called “historically-preferred” rather than merely “fanciful” (Agawu 1991: 5).

However, the growing individualization typical of 20th-century modernist culture certainly widened the gulf between musical practitioners, exacerbating the isolation of the composer from his or her audience. From the side of composers this in turn spurred the necessity of introducing measures aimed at bridging the gulf\(^1\), measures such as the “playing instructions” with which the two works discussed in this treatise are prefixed. The problem in the case of modern recorder repertoire, however, would seem to have been made worse by the gulf that has developed between, on the one hand, a relatively small group of specialist performers on the instrument who take the trouble to come to grips with the unconventional symbols and

\(^1\) Schoenberg, for example, took great pains to “explain” his music to the German public through his writings, his teachings, and his analysis seminars.
sounds as well as the challenging new playing techniques required in order to bring these novel sounds about, and, on the other hand, the bulk of recorder players and teachers as well as the general concert-going public, who have not kept abreast of these novelties.

The cause of this gulf amongst its practitioners is a matter of debate. Perhaps it lies with the general prevailing hostility towards modern music; perhaps with a sentimental attachment to and preference for the ‘traditional’ Baroque and pre-Baroque repertoire of the recorder; perhaps with the general social function that the recorder has increasingly come to fulfill in recent times: that is, as an instrument which carries the burden of its suitability to elementary musical instruction and therefore one whose practitioners sometimes forget to celebrate its full potential; or perhaps there is another reason for it entirely.

Whatever the case may be, the works of composers such as Linde and Zahnhausen deserve to be performed and heard more often than they currently are. It is my firm belief that they are not as generally unplayable or unteachable as many practitioners in the field believe them to be, and I trust that this treatise will be a useful tool in the hands of those who are brave enough to rise to the challenge! (Williams.2001)
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APPENDIX A – BRIEF VERBAL INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED WITH TWO RECORDER TEACHERS IN NOVEMBER 2008

LINDA DE VILLIERS

Question 1
Would you feel comfortable teaching a student a work with modern playing effects even if you were not entirely sure how to produce every effect?

Answer:
Yes I would. I have a very enquiring mind, and will find the answer or try and interpret it as best I can. Because I have played a lot of modern works it makes interpretation a little easier for me.

Question 2
Do you find it difficult to teach modern recorder works?

Answer:
Yes, I do enjoy teaching the students about the interesting sounds and effects, but it is rather difficult to teach these interpretations, sometimes literally interpreting what you think it is.

Question 3
Are you relatively familiar with modern music specifically written for the recorder?

Answer:
Yes, I have performed works specifically by Hans-Martin Linde, Peter-Louis van Dyk, Markus Zahnhausen and Loeb van Zuilenburg, and have spent much time experimenting with their playing effects.
LIZELLE DEYZEL

Question 1
Would you feel comfortable teaching a student a work with modern playing effects even if you were not entirely sure how to produce every effect?

Answer:
I am too afraid, to be honest, to try out pieces by modern composers such as Zahnhausen and Linde, because my knowledge of the modern effects is very little. Because I mainly played Baroque music I just don’t feel comfortable. I probably would never attempt it.

Question 2
Do you find it difficult to teach modern recorder works?

Answer:
The modern pieces without these types of effects are no problem; for example, the list C of an external exam, which are just modern pieces; but as I said, not works specifically containing those complicated signs.

Question 3
Are you relatively familiar with modern music specifically written for the recorder?

Answer:
I am familiar with the composers yes, but not too much on their works as well as their styles.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
APPENDIX B – “MUSIC FOR A BIRD” BY HANS-MARTIN LINDE
Music for a Bird

Liberamente

Hans-Martin Linde
(1968)

Allegro

© 1971 Schott Musik International, Mainz - © renewed 1999

Das widerspricht der Kunden in der Zeichnung und kann nicht mit im Wortlaut verlegt werden.
Omission/denlacking of music is forbidden for tax, and may result in criminal or civil actions.
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APPENDIX C – “SIEBEN STÜCKE FÜR ALTBLOCKFLÖTE” BY MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN
Für Clas Pehrsson und seine Stockholmer Blockflötenklasse 1990:
Claudia Müller, Göran Månsson, Ingrid Söderberg, Helena Dannvik,
Johanna Glaser, Elin Ljunggren und Agneta Hellström

Flauto Dolce Solo
Sieben Stücke für Althornblockflöte
1888-90

Markus Zahnhausen

Nr. 1 Prelude (Nächtliche Erscheinung)
Calmo (*=ca. 96)

Veloce e misterioso (d = ca. 200)

Copyright 1991 by Ludwig Doblinger (Bernhard Herzmanesky) KG, Wien – München
Calmo (come primo) \( d = \text{cc 95} \)

Cantabile e libero \( d = \text{ca. 59} \)

Come una reminiscenza \( d = \text{ca. 96} \)
Nr. 2 Harlekins Serenade und Tanz
a) Harlekins Serenade (\(\text{\textit{j}} = \text{ca. 168}\))

\[\text{\textit{Calmo}}\]

\[\text{\textit{poco rit.}}\] a tempo
b) Harlekins Tanz

Introduzione \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \)

Un poco meno mosso \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \)
Nr. 3 Toccata (Schlaflied für einen Kolibri)

Presto possibile
Nr.6 Hommage à D. SCH. (Notturno)
Adagio (d=ca. 72)

A tempo di valzer (d=ca. 63)

Rubato a tempo

accelerando e cresc.-
Furioso ed estatico ($j=\text{ca.} 112$)

Disperato ($j=\text{ca.} 92$)

Flöte

Ring

 senza vibr

 decresc. poco a poco

ppp

rit.

Segue attacco
APPENDIX D-LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR LINDE’S “MUSIC FOR A BIRD”

From: elisabeth.schneider@schott-music.com [mailto:elisabeth.schneider@schott-music.com]
Sent: 12 January 2009 03:06 PM
To: Bosman, Nicky (Ms) (Summerstrand Campus South)
Subject: Permission

Letter of permission

Your print request of January 12, 2009 for extracts of SONG FOR A BIRD by Hans-Martin Linde

Dear Nicky Bosman,

We are pleased to grant you the non-exclusive right to reprint the whole work SONG FOR A BIRD by Hans-Martin Linde in your article ADDRESSING THE IDIOSYNCRASIES OF CONTEMPORARY NOTATION, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO UNCONVENTIONAL SYMBOLS IN MUSIC FOR A BIRD BY HANS-MARTIN LINDE AND SIEBEN STÜCKE FÜR ALTBLOKFLÖTE BY MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN. The following acknowledgement and copyright notice must be stated in your article:

© By kind permission of SCHOTT MUSIC GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz - Germany.

This permission is granted free of charge. This permission does not cover faithful graphic reproductions of engraved music taken from our publications. If you wish to make a faithful graphic reproduction of the original engraved music, an extra fee will be charged.

The right granted to reprint of the mentioned above work is non-exclusive and refers only to the kind of article stated. All other rights are reserved. The permission granted cannot be transferred to others. This permission will be terminated without prior written notice, if your article is not affected within two years after the date of issue of this letter of permission. Any alteration, omission and/or addition to the original music extract is subject to our prior written permission. In case of infringements on the terms and conditions given above, this permission ceases without further notice.

With kind regards

Elisabeth Schneider

Legal Department
SCHOTT MUSIC GmbH & Co. KG
Weihergarten 5 · 55116 Mainz · Germany
Postfach 3640 · 55026 Mainz · Germany
Amtsgericht Mainz - HRA 0831 · Ust-ID-Nr. (VAT-No.) DE149025549
fon (+49) (0) 61 31 - 24 68 71
fax (+49) (0) 61 31 - 24 62 51
mailto: elisabeth.schneider@schott-music.com
http://www.schott-music.com
To
Ms. Nicky Bosman
Department of Music
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
POBox77000
PortElizabeth
6031
SOUTH AFRICA

Printing Permission

Vienna, 13th Jan. 2009

Dear Ms. Bosman,

referring to your request of today grant you our permission to include our work

Markus Zahnhausen: Flauto Dolce solo, 7 Stücke für Blockflöte (1088–1990)
© Copyright 1991 by Ludwig Doblinger (Bernhard Herzmansky) KG., Vienna – Munich

in your treatise for masters degree with the title: ‘Addressing the idiosyncrasies of contemporary notation, with specific reference to unconventional symbols in MUSIC FOR A BIRD by HANS-MARTIN LINDE and SIEBEN STÜCKE FÜR ALTBLOCKFLÖTE by MARKUS ZAHNHAUSEN’.

Please take care, that the name of the author, the composition as well as our copyright-note and the sentence: With kind permission by the editor is printed on the appropriate place in your treatise and let us have one complimentary copy.

This license covers no other rights than our permission to reprint the referenced piece of music in your treatise and you are not allowed to make any alterations to the copyrighted material without our prior consent in writing. You are not entitled to copy it for further purposes, to upload it in a database for use of a third part, or to make it available for download or to make it available to a third part.

In the case of an intended printing of a commercial product, for example the printing of your treatise as a commercial book or the uploading of it in a database, our company has to be contacted before this printing will take place in order to obtain a further permission.

This letter is sent to you as attachment to an e-mail and we beg to kindly sign at the foot confirming our agreement and fax the copy to us.

Thank you for your interest in our publication
and with best wishes,

Mag. Martin Sima
(Copyright Department)
APPENDIX F - RECORDINGS OF PERFORMANCES OF LINDE’S “MUSIC FOR A BIRD” AND ZAHNHAUSEN’S “SIEBEN STÜCKE FÜR ALTBLOCKFLÖTE”