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Abstract

Raymond Hanson wrote eight works for violin and piano. The remaining seven of these represent a substantial body of work for the violin/piano combination, of a style not usually associated with Australian composition. These works are not well known today. The ABC’s 78 disc recordings of some of the works have been destroyed, and copies of the music are not easily accessed.

Manuscript scores of these works are housed in the Rare Music Collection at the Sydney Conservatorium. Only one of the manuscripts includes a separate violin part. All of the manuscripts contain incomplete and inconsistent elements, particularly in respect to performance indications of phrasing, articulation and dynamic for the violin.

The aim of this thesis is to edit all of the available works for violin and piano by Hanson, maintaining the integrity of the composer’s work.

There are four areas of investigation. Hanson’s stated opinions and philosophies are discussed in terms of how they may have had an impact on his compositional style. A stylistic analysis of the works is conducted to identify specific compositional techniques that could give rise to stylistic comparisons with other known composers. The works are analysed for possible idiosyncratic use of performance indications, and there is an investigation into performance practices relating to the violin at the time these works were written.
The findings help to place these works by Hanson in the context of the music of his time both in Australia and the rest of the world. This provides a base of technical and stylistic references from which to draw conclusions about the undetermined aspects of the manuscripts. Consequently, the findings have led to a clearer stylistic understanding of Hanson’s music relating to the violin, and have shaped the decisions made editing the manuscripts.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Of the eight works by Raymond Hanson for violin and piano composed between 1938 and 1969, all but one (Northern Suite, composed in 1958) can be located. These works are held in the Raymond Hanson Collection, housed in the Rare Music Collection at the Sydney Conservatorium. They are manuscript copies of the piano score only, with the exception of Three Fancies for which there is a separate violin part. Although the copies are fair, there are many irregularities and omissions throughout all of the scores, particularly with respect to performance indications for the violin. The aim of this thesis is to edit all of the available works by Hanson for violin and piano maintaining the integrity of the composer’s work, and to determine an effective performance style specific to Hanson’s use of the violin. Due to the indeterminate nature of the manuscripts, the analysis required to realise an effective performance style has a direct bearing on the editing choices.

There are four areas of investigation: the first is a discussion of Hanson’s stated opinions and philosophies, how they were interrelated with his music making, and how they may have had an impact upon his compositional style. The second is the recognition of stylistic elements and specific compositional techniques employed that may give rise to stylistic comparisons with other known composers. The third is an analysis of the works for idiosyncratic use of performance indications concerning phrasing, articulation and dynamic. The fourth is environmental, and is pertinent to the instrument-specific nature
of the thesis. It is a canvassing of the common and significant performance practices, specifically in relation to the violin, at the time these works were written.

1.1 Philosophy

Malcolm John wrote of Raymond Hanson: “His ambition was to be himself, and Tagore’s ‘The Gardener’ or the Psalmist of King James’ Version of the Bible, where there is humility but no blood, mystery, yet touching the common man, come nearest to expressing his philosophy on life” (John, 59). This summary of the man’s philosophy is illuminating. Hanson’s words express his compulsion to communicate, with no apparent aspiration to be “above” the common man. The sentiment behind Hindemith’s claim that music is “meaningless noise unless it touches a receiving mind”(Hindemith A Composer’s World, 15) is echoed by Hanson’s comment: “If you want to be incomprehensible, go and get it. I don’t.” (Murdoch, 112), and his assertion: “Joe Blow is important” (John, 59) is a down-to-earth expression of the value, in line with Soviet Realism, that Shostakovich placed upon “comprehensibility by the masses”.

Hanson was a great advocate of the teachings of Hindemith. “I still think Hindemith has the answers to so many things. Hindemith is also a philosopher.”(Murdoch, 112)

Hanson’s highlighting Hindemith as a philosopher is a significant point. Hindemith’s method for teaching and analysing musical composition, detailed in The Craft of Musical Composition, is broadly discussed and often criticized. His method, to use specific
principals of composition to judge (analyse) music from all periods and styles equally is problematic (personal interview with Prof. Buesing, Composer, Freiburg University of Music). Prof. Buesing refers to Zwink’s article “About the Derivation of Series 1” (Zwink, 64-72) in which serious doubt is cast upon the scientific derivation of “Series 1” as it is explained in Chapter 3 of The Craft of Musical Composition. It should be noted that Prof. Buesing states nevertheless, “that Hindemith’s theories should be highly assessed as an artistic, and therefore a subjective rather than scientifically founded, consideration”. (Buesing, personal interview)

Hanson taught according to the principals detailed in The Craft of Musical Composition, but it was A Composer’s World to which he referred, having hit him “on the jaw and in the stomach” (Murdoch, 112). This book discusses primarily issues of a philosophical nature.

Hindemith claims that music can only register meaning upon the mind when its components correspond in some way to those stored in the memory. His claim follows that to go beyond the general order, shape, and mutual relationship of musical successions would degrade the participant to a “dull, apathetic receptacle”. (Hindemith A Composer’s World, 16)

Hanson’s requisite of comprehensibility, not only within an elite circle, resulted in his adherence to traditional principles and forms. Popular music was not an alternative medium for Hanson; “…he had little time for ‘pop’ music, feeling that there is an
oversimplification of musical thought, although often sincere.” (John, 59) Hanson’s criticism seems to refer to the restricted depth of communication resulting from “oversimplification”. He had a “great interest in jazz” (de Berg tapes) and had taught, according to the Hindemith method, some great Australian jazz musicians such as Don Burrows.

The focus of Hanson’s communication was that which moved him spiritually and emotionally. This is evident in the programmatic settings of many of his instrumental works. These include Doogor (Aboriginal Dreamtime), Gula (an ancient Sumerian goddess), My Day (dealing with aspects of a child’s daily life), and Preludes, Op 11 (six musical settings of the Australian landscape). His song settings are equally revealing: War! and The Pilgrim.

“In his settings of Rosetti and Gilmore as well as Tagore, Hanson reveals a preoccupation with metaphysical delights and a deep concern for life’s spiritual potential”. (John, 58)

Metaphysics, the study of ultimate causes and the underlying nature of things (Merriam-Webster), is essentially a search for commonality based on the premise that there is a “universal truth”. Hanson’s gravitation toward this part of philosophy is illustrated by his own endeavor to unite and integrate the content of his message with the many aspects, both stylistic and technical, of his chosen vehicle of communication: music. Unity of inspiration and technical application emerges as the core stylistic element, and the strength, of Hanson’s music.
Hanson said; “… what Beethoven had is the common touch… this wonderful contact between the creator and the listener… This is what I have endeavored to do through my life” (de Berg tapes). In the aim to unite the exalted and the common states of man within the context of his music Hanson would not have been alone. Roy Blokker reveals Shostakovich’s similar intention when he writes in reference to Stalin’s attack on Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District:

“Prokofiev once stated that he wrote music of two types: one for the masses and one for posterity. Shostakovich had been trying to fuse the two into one, and although his attempts did not fall short of his own expectations, they fell short of his government’s and he was attacked.” (Blokker, 25)

Shostakovich’s “reply to just criticism” in 1947 was his Fifth Symphony. The symphony enjoyed instant success, and it is clear that something positive was drawn from the coarse denunciation of 1936. The conciseness and close unification of the Fifth Symphony show a rethinking of the rambling style of the Fourth, while maintaining the Germanic conceptions of form that Shostakovich admired in Beethoven.

Two years later, Hanson produced his first work of symphonic dimensions: the Sonata for Violin and Piano Op 5, also a critical success (de Berg tapes). In style these two works share few similarities, but in technical application there are some interesting parallels. Significantly, one of these concerns the issue of unity.
The concession Shostakovich made to the demands of Soviet Realism by way of a “program” for the Symphony was apparently genuine, and related to the united orientation of the four movements.

“The theme of my fifth symphony is the making of a man. I saw man with all his experiences in the centre of the composition, which is lyrical in form from beginning to end. In the finale the tragically tense impulses of the earlier are resolved in optimism and joy of living.” (Ottoway, 25)

The issue of unity in the symphony has a great bearing on its composition, more so than formal structure, and the rhythmic motto that pervades all movements of the Fifth Symphony is possibly the most unifying factor. A similar application of motivic unity emerges as an enduring characteristic of Hanson’s compositional style. This and other parallels are discussed in the body of the thesis in relation to specific works.

The “motto” used by Shostakovich in the 5th Symphony is the “anapest” figure, the same figure used extensively by Hanson: the anapest holds motivic significance in five of the seven works for violin and piano. However, the stylistic similarity between the two composers in the use of the motive is negligible. While in the Shostakovich the figure is mostly percussive and militant, Hanson generally uses the figure within a melodic line in such a way as could be likened to Bartok and Janacek.
A number of parallels can be made between Hanson and other composers, both contemporaries and predecessors. However, at most these lead only to a vague stylistic reference. For example, while melodic contour, as in *Idyll Op 2*, can sometimes resemble that of the Slavic composers, any real likeness is obscured by Hanson’s expansive lyrical phrasing that is more reminiscent of French composers such as Debussy or Poulenc.

Hanson is known to have been largely self-taught. His compositional techniques reveal an ability both to analyse and to absorb (see page 73). At a time when tuition in the field was not easily acquired in Australia, such ability must have been prerequisite to any degree of achievement in composition: a musician driven to speak through composition must acquire tools of the craft. It stands to reason that only those who felt their message was vital would have accepted the challenge.

**Chapter 2**

**The Players**

Hanson had strong personal connections with many of Australia’s most gifted performers. By his own testament, he enjoyed including performers such as Igor Hmelnitsky in his creative process.
“I wish to express my gratitude to a fierce advocate of this Sonata, my friend Igor Hmelnitsky, an outstanding pianist and pedagogue. His dedication and stimulating support created for me the necessary inspiration to revise and complete this work.” (Inscription on score of Piano Sonata Op 12, signed Raymond Hanson)

In 1938, Jascha Heifetz, 37 years old, was at the peak of his career. He had commissioned the violin concerto of William Walton, which was composed at the same time as Hanson’s Op 5. He had performed in Australia already in 1921. The year 1939 saw Heifetz’ film debut in *They Shall Have Music*. He was being hailed as “the world’s greatest violinist”, inheriting the honorary title previously given to Fritz Kreisler, by this time into his 60s and still commonly accepted as the “best loved”. Menuhin was 22 years old. At the same time, Ginette Neveu had begun recording. Among many great violin virtuosi in the first half of the 20th century, these violinists had an extraordinary impact throughout the world. All four of these virtuosi toured Australia between 1920 and 1950. Tragically, Neveu died in a plane crash in 1949, not long after she had toured Australia, at the age of 30.

Great individual performers were known for their distinctive stylistic traits. Recognizable personal style was important, and the four mentioned are representative of a great stylistic diversity.
Feats of artistic heroism were generally a bonus to one's public profile. If an artist were known to have risked life and “strad” practicing at the back of a moving vehicle, the story was bound to reach publication. Canadian-born English violinist Frederick Grinke “often had to practise on the train… kept in a state of anxiety lest his precious instrument, or its bow, should be damaged” (Brook, 48)

The violinist Frederick Grinke must have impressed Hanson. Inscriptions on the covers of both Three Fancies Op 19 and Legende Op 20 show respectively “For Frederick Grinke” and “For the interest of Frederick Grinke”. Grinke was renowned for putting “every ounce of enthusiasm into the work he loves”(Brook, 45), and known to feel “very strongly that one should not play violin unless one really enjoys doing so: an audience can always tell…” (Brook, 47)

Grinke toured Australia and New Zealand as leader of the Boyd Neel Orchestra in the late 30s. His return solo tour in 1947 may have been the catalyst for Hanson’s concentration on the violin during 1946. There is no date given to the Op 20, but Op 19 was written in ’46, as was the Concerto for Violin and Orchestra Op 21. For unknown reasons, both dedications to Grinke have been crossed through. Although Grinke was quoted at having been “delighted to find a great deal of genuine musical talent in Australia and New Zealand” (Brook, 49), he was never known to have played the Hanson works of 1946. Hanson dedicated the concerto to his friend and colleague, Sydney violinist Phyllis McDonald.
While Heifetz’ unsurpassed technical mastery drew excitement and placed greater focus on technical perfection in the first half of the 20th century, performance was generally critically evaluated in terms of "taste" and distinctive personal style. There is a well-known story concerning Ginette Neveu in a lesson with her teacher Georges Enescu,

“In the course of a lesson on the great Bach Chaconne, Enescu stopped her. ‘I play that passage rather differently’, he observed, demonstrating, ‘Yes’, said the nine-year-old, ‘and I play this music as I understand it’. Any other pupil would have been shown the door. In Neveu’s case, Enescu merely smiled and encouraged her to proceed.”

(Siepmann, Liner notes for Ginette Neveu CD)

This is worth considering: while today a “tasteful” interpretation of a work from a bygone era is generally expected to incorporate some thought regarding authenticity, this was not necessarily the case in the first half of the twentieth century. Composers such as Hanson might have expected their works, if given the distinction of endurance, to evolve in conjunction with the evolution of performance practice.

A rather large percentage of the works performed by violinists in the early part of the twentieth century was contemporary. The standard repertoire brought from the Baroque, Classical and Romantic periods was select. Kreisler cultivated some interest in lesser-known “dead” composers such as Pugnani with his collection of “classical manuscripts”. Even so in 1935, due to the persistence of American critic Olin Downs, Kreisler
confessed to the New York Times that all of the works in the collection were his original compositions:

“Fritz Kreisler was the last of the violinist/composers, ending a tradition that extended back to Corelli and Vivaldi and continued with Kreutzer, Spohr, Paganini, Vieuxtemps, Wieniawski, Joachim, Sarasate and others” (Eric Wen, Liner notes for Fritz Kreisler the complete RCA recordings).

The lasting value of the great violin works by Bach, Mozart and Beethoven defined the works in terms of “greatness”. Accordingly, the position taken by Hindemith was that a composer should aim to create “a composition of everlasting value” (Hindemith, A Composer’s World, 1). However, the performance practices current to the composition do not seem to have been considered inherent of the greatness of an “enduring” work at that time.

If the current standpoint places considerable importance upon “authenticity” of performance practice, how should the works of an era of great diversity in performance style be interpreted? One should not make the contemporary association of the words “authentic” and “correct” concerning performance practice. Composers in the 30s and 40s were not familiar with this. To begin, rather than evaluate interpretation in terms of what is “correct” or “authentic”, one might use past terms of reference such as “tasteful” and “colourful”. Menuhin remarked about Enescu:
“I heard him first when I was about eight; his sound appealed to me most – it was so colourful, so varied. He had an even greater palette than Heifetz. He didn’t have just one vibrato, he had an extraordinary range of vibratos, of all breadths and all speeds. Heifetz had a range of slides, but Enescu had more – he could make the violin speak.”[sic]

(Potter, CD Liner notes for Yehudi Menuhin)

Another consideration in reference to performance practices in the twentieth century is that the steady stream of violin virtuosi emerging from Europe was impeded for some years after the Second World War. Most of the celebrated players of the late 40s and 50s had established their careers before the war. As a result, the style of violin performance did not alter greatly until around the 1960s.

This was probably affected by the war in several ways. The most obvious is the catastrophic effect the war had on the Jewish people, from whose numbers many violin virtuosi are drawn. Another factor is the prerequisite to becoming a virtuoso of the instrument. There is no dispute that the individual talent must be extraordinary, but further to this, the virtuoso emerges only as a result of many years of uninterrupted, focused study. The study must begin around the age of 5 or 6 years (often earlier, as was the case with Heifetz and Menuhin) and must continue at least into the late teens, even in the case of an extraordinary “child prodigy”, if the level of skill is to be maintained into adulthood. There are no exceptions to this rule. A whole generation of violinists born between the mid-to-late ’20s, until the early ’40s, would have been affected. A new steady stream of great virtuosi has re-emerged since the early 1960s. Itzak Perlman, born in 1945, made his professional debut at Carnegie Hall in 1963.
Hanson wrote all but one of these works by 1960. *An Etching*, the miniature written in 1969, is a contrast to the other works in terms of idiom (use of the instruments) as well as style and compositional technique.

**Chapter 3**

*Idyll*

*Idyll*, written in 1938, is Hanson’s Op 2 and his first work for violin and piano. The manuscript piano score, not in Hanson’s own hand, is largely complete including performance indications for both instruments, but there is no separate violin part.
Idyll is tonal and Romantic. The form is roughly ternary, with the B theme repeated before the return of the A. Some use of the violin is reminiscent of Sibelius’ pieces for violin and piano, though Hanson’s idiomatic use of the violin is less developed; the Moderato section from bar 51 could sit more comfortably on the violin with a little alteration to the note sequence. It would be interesting to know if in 1938 Hanson were familiar with the pieces for violin and piano, which are even now seldom performed. Sibelius’ Op 2, composed 50 years earlier, is also a work for violin and piano. Both of the Op 2 works begin with a sombre melody of a slight Slavic character.

As the earliest of these works Idyll presents an interesting point of reference. Hanson’s formal tuition in composition was received much later. However, a number of technical and stylistic idiosyncrasies present in Idyll became lasting characteristics of Hanson’s compositional style. Analytic comments for Idyll are restricted to those that relate stylistically and technically to the later works.

A rhythmic pattern used repeatedly in the melody of the A theme appears initially from the pickup to bar seven. The pattern features the anapest rhythmic motive at the start of the bar. This modest rhythmic motive holds thematic significance in five of these works, and illustrates Hanson’s unifying use of motive: a prominent feature in the construction of most of these works. That the motive is already present in Idyll is notable. The anapest motive shapes the melodic contour throughout the “A” section, and into the section from 37, which links “A” and “B”.
The “B” section melody features a reversal of the anapest, as first seen in bar 87 in the violin part. Additionally, the prominent placement of the regular anapest within the “B” melodic material, as at bar 91, unifies the melodic content of the piece on a broader scale.

The *moderato* at bar 51 is preceded by an *accelerando* of four bars. Though not expressly stated, it is clear that the *accelerando* should arrive at the new tempo. In the 3rd movement of Hanson’s *Sonata Op 5* there is another example of an *accelerando* into a faster tempo. This device, to approach a new tempo by means of an *accelerando* or *rallentando* is employed in a variety of different contexts in several of these works.

Hanson makes frequent use of the *tenuto* line, the precise application of which is not clear. In most cases, the two commonly accepted practices are unsuitable. According to the classical definition: to hold the note for its exact length, the first *tenuto* in bar 7 is unnecessary. In a regular sequence of notes, the technical nature of the violin ensures the note be held for its full duration unless otherwise indicated. The second sense, that of a delay in meter as used by Verdi in *bravura* operatic lines, is not more suitable, especially given Hanson’s frequent use of the symbol. There is another *tenuto* for example at the beginning of bar 8. In bars 7 and 8, the symbol corresponds to the weight of the phrase, and could function primarily as an indication thereof. However, this possible explanation does not clarify any intention Hanson may have had for a specific technical application.

The bowings in the manuscript are largely consistent in relation to the motivic construction of the piece. The occasional inconsistency may reflect an intention to use
bowings to shape the phrase. It appears that in Idyll, phrase contour may have been more pertinent than motivic regularity to Hanson’s bowing choices. This is illustrated in bars 15 and 16 of the manuscript. The diminuendo in bar 16 is facilitated by a slur over the full bar in contrast to the regular treatment of the motive in bar 15.

Motivic significance is less in Idyll than in the sonata and the later works. Bowings in the edition are chosen primarily to affect a better playing style. Annotations on the editing of Idyll are also restricted, to where they relate technically or stylistically to the other works.

A problem arises, possibly as a result of Hanson’s idiosyncratic combination of Bartok-style melodic rhythm in combination with expansive, lyrical phrases that are less typical of the Hungarian composer. The result is irregular bow distribution, occurring generally where implied lyrical phrasing is contradicted by the physical limitations of bowing. Often, it is where a long down-bow is followed by a short note, to be played on an up-bow at the end of the bar. The speed of the bow is as a result much faster on the short note, producing either an accent (a louder note) or a different sound quality, usually more penetrating or coarse. Where the weight of the phrase occurs naturally on the first beat of the bar, a coarse accent on the preceding quaver is inappropriate, particularly if the phrase is of a lyrical nature. In such circumstances, bowing indications are added, or altered, in the edition. In reference to this problem throughout the thesis, the term “inappropriate coarseness” will be used.
To an extent the problem is illustrated in bar 7. Bowing adjustment avoids an inappropriate accent on the quaver at the end of bar. In this instance, slurs are added to the first two quavers of bars seven and eight (also in bars 147 and 148 where the theme returns). This maintains the lyrical quality of the theme while assisting regular bow distribution.

The dotted-rhythm figure that appears at the end of bars 8 and 9 represents another bowing concern. This is a stylistic problem, again relating to the nature of the instrument. In a lyrical context, the figure would sound jagged and clumsy if bowed separately. However, the problem is overcome easily by slurring the figure. No slur was indicated in bars 8 and 9 of the manuscript, but the up-bow on the first note of the dotted-rhythm figure followed by a down-bow on the first beat of the following bar, suggests that in this instance a slur is intended.

There is no tempo indication for the opening of the piece in the manuscript. The return of the “A” theme in bar 143 is marked Lento. This in preference to Tempo 1 suggests that a slower tempo may have been intended for the return of the theme. The edition reads Adagio at the opening.

In the manuscript, an alternative ending for the violin is indicated. It is only scribbled into the empty lines of manuscript at the end of the score, but it appears to be in the same hand as that of the manuscript. However this is not Hanson’s handwriting. The piano part would need to be adjusted as the alternative extends three bars beyond the original
ending. Stylistically, the alternative ending does not sit well with the shape of the piece. *Idyll*'s overall shape is clearly defined, with a climax roughly two-thirds through and a decrescendo through the last twenty bars. The alternative, a long, climbing passage for the violin, sounds very much like an “ending” (an extended perfect cadence), but not like part of this piece. However, the original ending does not sit well on the violin. The high double-stop is exposed above the bell-like tones of the piano. It preempts the piano’s final chord by one bar, and the grace note indicated disturbs the clear resonance of the piano passage. However, the bell-like sonority of the violin’s double-stop blends well with the final chord of the piano. In the edition, an effort is made to preserve the character of the original ending. The violin’s double-stop is moved back one bar so that it coincides with the final chord of the piano, and the grace note is omitted.
Chapter 4

Sonata Opus 5

The Sonata Op 5 was written during 1938 and 1939. Hanson, in his mid twenties had still to this time no formal training in composition. Even the books by Hindemith, A Composer’s World and The Craft of Musical Composition, which were to influence him enormously throughout his life as a composer, were yet to be published.

The sonata has a Brahms-like opulence, and can be likened in form as well as in scale to the Romantic repertoire of the genre. Structurally, the work follows classic tradition. It has three movements. The first movement falls, as expected, into Sonata Form. The second movement is lyrical, and the third is in Rondo form.

The instrument voicing follows the classic model of foreground and background. Counterpoint and thematic or motivic work is conceptually less significant in this sonata
than its continual melodic flow. The organic nature of the melodic line gives an improvisatory impression within the traditional framework.

Harmony is approached within a modified classical construct; chords built on thirds, and often impressionistically coloured by the addition of the 6th, 7th or 9th of the chord. A rippling sextuplet begins the first movement. The key is E minor, but a strong sense of the tonality is avoided. The tonic chord omits the third and adds the minor seventh.

There is evidence of an early tendency away from traditional tonality. The first movement has an interesting polar (tritone) harmonic disposition of e minor to B flat major to e minor, in the manner of Bartok’s *Music for Strings, Percussion and Celeste*. It would be interesting to speculate if Hanson were familiar with the work by Bartok, which was written only two years earlier, and published in 1937.

Though it is Hanson’s earliest work of “symphonic” proportions, the sonata demonstrates a significant integration of styles. The use of violin and piano is idiomatic: flattering to the instruments individually. Yet without minimizing the technique of either performer Hanson maintains fine balance between the two instruments. In general the more resonant higher and lower registers of the violin are used to balance the thickly scored sections in the piano part.

The violin part is lyrical and technically demanding. In that way, again it may be likened to Sibelius’ writing for the violin. The connection is strengthened by some stylistic
similarities such as the symphonic scale of the work, traditional form and freedom of melodic line, and is supported by Hanson’s admiration for the Finnish composer. “…he often took Sibelius as a role model, frequently speaking of his admiration for the Finnish master to his harmony, aural and composition classes.” (Rumsey, CD liner notes)
Atmospherically the opening of the sonata is reminiscent of Sibelius’ violin concerto.

Hanson, a pianist, may have studied the compositions of a violinist in preparing himself to work with that medium. If so, an interesting contrast between Hanson and Sibelius may be illustrated. Robert Layton wrote about Sibelius: “Rarely is his keyboard writing idiomatic” and that he “made little attempt to exploit the sonorities and colouristic effects of the extremities of the keyboard” (Grove Vol.17, 286). That cannot be said for Hanson’s use of the violin in his Sonata Op 5. While Hanson’s use is traditional and exploits above all the lyrical quality of the instrument, it is neither simplistic nor cautious. Hanson has taken care to learn the nature of the instrument that he did not play. This illustrates his respect for the labour of composition, the nature of the instrument and the players.

From the simple accompanying figure at the beginning, the piano part grows into a style that is expansive and often flamboyant, in the vein of Rachmaninov. Although Hanson is described as a “passable pianist” (Murdoch, 112), performance of this sonata demands an extremely competent pianist.
Through effective integration of instrumental styles Hanson’s compositional style emerges. Thematic material is shared between the two instruments, though the violin holds the principle voice for much of the first movement. The piano carries most of the accompanying material in the movement. When the violin takes the accompanying role, albeit briefly, it does so within a lyrical context as in bars 193-195. At no time does the violin share the more pianistic accompanying material such as in the section from bar 74, or at the beginning.

Relating to the *Sonata Op 5* in terms of composition technique, some interesting parallels can be made between Hanson and Shostakovich. In particular Shostakovich’s *Symphony No. 5* shares some uncanny similarities of formal construction with the sonata. However it is important to mention that extra to the obvious dissimilarity of genre, in style and character the two works are not noticeably similar.

Some general stylistic elements in the last movement could be compared to some of those of Shostakovich. Most prominent amongst these are the strong pulsating rhythms. Some of Hanson’s use of *ostinato* is resonant of the Russian composer, though less oppressive in character. It is also possible to liken the introspective qualities in some slow movement melodies of the two composers, though also the severity of this quality is less in Hanson.
The shared ideal of Hanson and Shostakovich to maintain artistic integrity together with comprehensibility has resulted in a general similarity of musical language: the use of functional diatonic harmony.

Of the comparisons to be made between the two works, less obvious aurally but most notable analytically, are the ways in which they adhere to and similarly diverge from the canonized symphonic construction. The overall scheme of both compositions complies with the Germanic conceptions of form that define the canon. This is not surprising given the great respect both composers had for Beethoven. The first movements of both works are in sonata form. Both are marked *Moderato*: the first conspicuous departure from the traditional symphonic *Allegro*. The second distinction is that both first movements have three rather than two principal themes. This procedure had been used prior to Shostakovich, but his realization of it in the 5th symphony was new due to some uncustomary adaptation and transformation of thematic material.

An example of Shostakovich’s thematic transformation is in the recapitulation of the 1st movement. Both B and C themes reappear in transformation. At rehearsal number 17 (Boosey & Hawkes), the Lyrical B theme of the exposition brings back the strong D tonality in a dramatically expanded *Largamente*, in unison throughout the orchestra. It functions both as a climax to the development, and the beginning of the recapitulation. A comparison can be made with Hanson’s transformation of the B theme of the third movement of the sonata. A dramatically augmented version of the theme appears at bar 146, which climaxes with a statement in octaves in the violin. The B theme
transformation emerges at the end of the C theme section as an approach to the final recapitulation of the A theme. In both cases, the original lyrical B themes are barely recognizable due to their extreme transformation of character.

An *accelerando* (or *ritenuto*) combined with an increase (or decrease) in surface rhythm to approach a new tempo is a typical device of Shostakovich. Examples of this occur in both the first and last movements of the 5th Symphony. In the first movement, Shostakovich uses a *ritenuto* in approach to the *Largamente*. In the finale there is an accelerando from rehearsal number 105 that combines with an increase in surface rhythm leading to the *Piu mosso* at bar 108. A similar example of this occurs in the final movement of Hanson’s sonata. An *accelerando* from bar 69 leads to the *A Tempo* of the first return of the rondo theme at 101. Hanson’s *accelerando* also combines with an increase in surface rhythm. The indication at bar 69 reads “*accel poco a poco* (to A Tempo) (see Note)”[sic]. Unfortunately the “note” to which he refers is not contained within the score, and cannot be located. However it is clear that an increase of surface rhythm should produce a gradual and constant *accelerando*. At the shift to 9/8 in bar 91, Hanson has written in brackets, crotchet = quaver, and at bar 97, quaver = semiquaver.

Another rhythmic device used by Shostakovich, an example of which is to be found in the *Scherzo* of the symphony, is that of setting a familiar rhythmic structure and throwing it off balance with rhythmic displacement. The boisterous scherzo rhythm is established well before an occasional common-time measure displaces the rhythmic thrust, as at bar 70. This example is especially relevant due to the position of the “extra” beat. Both
instances that give rise to the extra beat occur at the junction of two phrases. The new phrase in bar 70 does not overlap with the previous on the first beat of the bar in the customary way. Instead, the previous phrase resolves on the first beat, and the new phrase begins on the second. Though the musical circumstances couldn’t be more dissimilar, the rhythmic displacement used by Hanson in the second movement of the sonata has a similar function: that of bridging two phrases. In this case, the whole of bar 34 is “extra” to the otherwise regular eight bar phrases.

4.1 Editing of Sonata Opus 5

There is a separate violin part for the 1st movement of the sonata up to bar 142. Some of the evolution of this work can be identified in the discrepancies between the part and the piano score. Both the score and the violin part are in the composer’s hand.

Although the part is not dated, a case can be made that it was written some time after the score. The manuscript paper; “Possum Music Paper No.3 (De Luxe) B. 6206”, used for the violin part is the same paper used for Seascape, composed in 1953, and An Etching, composed in June 1969. This paper was not used for any of the other works. In addition, the penmanship of the violin part, while differing somewhat to that of the score of the sonata and of Seascape, is identical to that of An Etching, the piece written more than 30 years after the sonata was completed.
Some indications within the music post-date the violin part, though without reference to a specific lapse of time. One example is the metronome marking for the opening *Moderato*. It appears to have been altered several times in the score. The tempo that is finally established seems to be “crotchet = 84”. In the violin part, this tempo is clearly indicated by the composer.

There is no means of ascertaining the composer’s motivation to alter the violin part. It is likely that some of the bowings in both the piano score and in the violin part are recommendations from violinists with whom Hanson played the work. There would no doubt have been some collaboration with the violinist Phyllis MacDonald who recorded the work for 2MBSFM with Hanson at the piano. Unfortunately, neither the recording nor the part used by Phyllis MacDonald can be located. For this reason, the violin part is an important document for comparison, in spite of its incompleteness.

Most of the indications in the first page of the violin part are directly as they appear for the violin in the manuscript score. However, performance indications in the remaining two pages of the violin part are sparse.

There are a few discrepancies and omissions in the first page. As these are infrequent, it is likely that they were intended.

A discrepancy occurs in bar 6, beats 3 and 4. The edition uses the bowing from the violin part, and this bowing is also applied to the parallel section in the recapitulation, in bar
The second alteration concerns the C# of the violin part at the beginning of bar 19. This was a minim in the piano score, but was changed to a crotchet in the violin part. The crotchet is used in the edition. This is consistent with the rhythmic pattern of the following bars, and prevents the end of the violin’s phrase from covering the beginning of the *agitato* material played by the piano.

The up-bow and down-bow indications in bars two and three do not appear in the violin part. As indicated in the score, the up-bow on the semiquaver at the end of bar two would result either in shortening the preceding note, or an inappropriate, coarse sound on the semiquaver resulting from poor bow distribution. In both cases the long, sustained opening phrase would be disturbed. In the edition a down-bow is indicated for the last semiquaver of bar 2, hooking it to the previous note. This also eliminates the need to retake a down-bow in bar 3.

In bar 18 is another bowing omission in the violin part. There is a small motivic cell, appearing first in bar 15 (B to D). It appears sequentially, in the same position in bars 15, 16 and 17. The cell facilitates momentum and shapes the rhythmic regularity of the phrase. For motivic regularity it is important is to preserve the slur from the fourth semiquaver of the bar into the following beat (E to G) as indicated in the manuscript score. However the following semiquavers bowed separately, as indicated in the score, are out of character with the long lyrical phrase. In the edition the indication is to slur all five semiquavers together. This prevents a disruption of the lyrical flow of the phrase at its conclusion. In addition, to continue the slur to the end of the second beat replicates the
phrase contour of the previous bars, and emphasizes Hanson’s use of rhythmic diminution at the end of the phrase by maintaining consistent treatment of the group of four semiquavers.

The “turn” motive, which appears for the first time in the violin on the fourth beat of bar 4, is the most obvious binding thematic element of the first subject. It occurs nine times within the exposition, all but twice in the violin part. Initially, it occurs within the context of a resolving figure at the end of each of the first three phrases: beat 4 of bars 4, 6 and 8. In the extended answering phrase from bar 11 its context is transformed. Rather than resolving in the established manner, it joins the sequential rhythmic contour of the phrase.

In the piano part of the manuscript, the phrasing of that motive is legato throughout the movement. However, the indications for the violin are inconsistent, and the effect is often disruptive to the otherwise lyrical melodic line. For example, all four semiquavers of the motive have tenuto lines at the first appearance in bar 4. Again Hanson’s use of the tenuto line is ambiguous. In this instance it may function as an illustration of the significance of the motive. Any practical realization of the tenuto at this juncture produces an ill-timed static effect. The phrasing indications for the piano are probably more representative of the composer’s initial concept, these being unaffected by the physical and stylistic concerns of bowing. A further justification of modifying the violin treatment of the motive in favour of the legato phrasing of the piano is that the unifying function of the motive is enhanced. The consistent legato phrasing applied to the motive throughout the
edition also facilitates a greater compatibility between the flow of melodic line and the “motoric” pulse of the accompaniment.

The violin’s semiquavers in bars 19 and 20 should be *staccato*, consistent with those of the piano. In bar 21 the piano part is legato. In the edition, to facilitate a corresponding less staccato effect for the violin in bar 21, the bowing is reversed. This is indicated by a down-bow on the first note of the figure: the second semiquaver of the third beat of the bar.

Other changes in the edition include separating the slur into the first beat of bar 23, and similarly into bars 24 and 27. This should not affect the original contour of phrasing. The *diminuendo* for example into bar 23 should remain. The intention is to maintain the regular rhythmic pulse of the *agitato* until bar 31, as established in bars 19-21, with perhaps a suggestion of arrival at Hanson’s *tenuto* in bar 25. The separate bow on the downbeat also facilitates easier placement with the piano: the writing for the piano in this passage gives rise to a slight pause over the bar-line.

The incompleteness of the 2nd and 3rd pages might suggest that the indications were under review. The *poco lento* at bar 32 marks the beginning of the second theme. From that point, no more bowings are indicated in the violin part, with the exception of one slur in bar 83. Ties are shown, but why one slur is indicated, at the exclusion of all others, is not clear.
The second theme is march-like in spite of its asymmetry, and is supported by a steady staccato quaver pulse in its accompaniment. Stylistically it is suited to non-legato bowing, so it’s possible that Hanson intended to omit some of the slurs from the manuscript score. In the score, the slurs in bars 37 and 39 over beats 1 and 2 and the slurs in bar 43 are consistent with the parallel material in the recapitulation, in bars 196, 198 and 202. These bowings are preserved in the edition. Also in support of the march-like character, the simpler detached bowing from bar 205 in the recapitulation is used in bar 46, the parallel bar in the exposition.

The notation of the march-theme is not consistent throughout the movement. In bar 32 the dotted-rhythm figure is punctuated with semiquaver rests. All other appearances of this theme, as at bar 45 in the violin, are notated without rests. The introductory piano passage from bar 27 is built upon the same thematic material. The notation for the violin at bar 32 corresponds with the piano introduction, except that staccato indications do not appear in the violin part. The further broadening of articulation at bar 45 complements the raised dynamic and balances the violin part against an embellished accompaniment. The character of the theme should be simple and controlled. The broadening effect produced by the discrepancy is consistent with the growth of the theme, and the detached character is not disfigured by the variation. For this reason it may be assumed that the variation of notation is intentional, and so these variations appear in the edition as they do in the manuscript score.
Some bowings in the edition are indicated to facilitate regular tone and bow distribution. The hooked stroke in bars 45 and 47 allows the figure to be played softly on the string with an even sound. For the *glissandi* in bar 50, slurs are indicated to avoid an accent on the lower note.

The slur over the two semiquavers at the end of bar 34 in the edition may be contentious. These notes are separated in the manuscript score, each marked with a *tenuto* line. Again, what is intended by the *tenuto* is unclear, but it is interesting that it appears again at a point of thematic significance: the extra beat of the phrase. The phrase in bars 32-33 is essentially repeated in bars 34-35, but the repeat phrase is expanded by an extra beat. Thematically, the extra beat occurs in the middle of the phrase, on the fourth (extra) beat of bar 34. In the edition, the articulation of the repeated material in bars 34-35 mirrors that in 32-33. The legato treatment of the “extra” beat avoids obscuring the compatibility of the two phrases.

In the edition, the term *rubato* is indicated for the violin in bar 42. The piano stops playing at that bar, allowing rhythmic freedom for the violin interjection. The short passage breaks away from the established march-like rhythmic confines in the manner of a short cadenza.

In the recapitulation, the manuscript shows another variation to the phrasing of the second theme. In bars 204 and 206, the dotted rhythm motive in the violin part is slurred. In this case the character of the theme established in the exposition is spoiled. It is
possible that the violin slurs are shown only in reference to bow direction: to hook the bow. An example of this use of the “slur” is on the first beat of bar 135 of the third movement. In this case, a slur to the repeated note is meaningless notation. Hanson would have expected the quaver to be rearticulated. In the edition, the phrasing of the second theme established in the exposition is used in the recapitulation.

A contrasting lyrical application of the dotted rhythm is introduced by the third theme. For the third theme there are some of conflicting indications for both instruments. While the indications in the violin part may result from bowing experimentation, there is one clear indication of the character of the theme. Hanson has written Legato into the piano part where the theme appears in bar 54. To this purpose, many of the bowings for the violin are modified in the edition. Regular slurs are given to the dotted-rhythm melody of the violin. At the end of the middle section, the third theme undergoes some development. The longer legato grouping of the motive from bar 128 in the edition is to complement the extended phrases, avoiding a pulse on each beat.

The rhapsodic middle section, in place of a true development, emerges from the third theme at the end of the recapitulation. It begins at bar 75 with a repeated-note arpeggio passage played by the violin. In the manuscript score, this passage is indicated with staccato dots. The staccato produces an unflattering, static effect, and is inconsistent with the Legato written into the piano score in bar 74. In the edition, the bowing is altered in favour of one that appears later in the work. From bar 51 in the second movement, the second statement of the first theme is embellished in the violin part with the same
repeated-note arpeggio figure. In the second movement it is slurred in groups of two semiquavers. An added benefit of using the same bowing at bar 74 of the first movement is the enhancement of motivic unity across the movements.

From bar 151 the slurs highlighting the hemiola produce an awkward, busy effect in the calando ending of the section. Again it is possible that the “slurs” are without reference to bowing. For example, at the end of the movement, from bar 233, there is a similar passage. At this point the “slurs” can only be understood to indicate the hemiola grouping, as the double-notes of the passage require detached bowing. In the edition, the hemiola pattern from bar 151 is indicated in the notational grouping of the quavers. The bowing indicated is one bow for each full bar.

For the second movement, most of the bowings in the manuscript are preserved in the edition. Phrasing of the first theme is unaltered. Only the down-bow, indicated at the end of bar 33 in the edition, is added. This supports the organic nature of Hanson’s asymmetric phrase. It allows the ninth bar of the phrase, resulting on an up-bow, to emerge as the pickup to the reprise of the first theme.

On the subject of asymmetry, Hanson’s own words are significant. It is noteworthy that Hanson refers to the broader rhythmic function of the “phrase” above that of regular rhythmic pulse:
“Rhythm is something I discovered early in life, although it is associated with beat it has a function of its own.” (de Berg Tapes)

About his own use of asymmetry in Preludes, which are “barred according to the phrasing”, Hanson said,

“…I feel I differed from Stravinsky, because when you hear Stravinsky you are conscious of that little 1/8 beat, you are conscious that he is doing this kind of thing. I believe that when my Preludes are played, you are not conscious of these differences, they seem to be perfectly normal and natural…” (de Berg tapes)

Throughout the editing process, the natural subtlety of Hanson’s use of asymmetry is a primary consideration in the bowing decisions.

The nature of the second theme is blurred by bow changes in the manuscript. The hemiola pattern of the theme from bar 68 should be played with the lilting momentum of a slow waltz in juxtaposition to the “fast” waltz accompaniment of the piano. The bowing in the manuscript, separating all three beats of the hemiola, places too much stress on the crossed rhythm, impeding the lyrical waltz characteristic. This belies the quintessential subtlety of Hanson’s use of rhythmic devices. In order to affect the desired lilt, the general bowing pattern throughout the section is to slur the first two beats of the hemiola on a down-bow. The third hemiola beat is played with an up-bow. The only departure from this pattern is in bar 85. The syncopation of the “F sharp” passing note
lacks clarity when slurred. In bars 85-6, the bowing of the manuscript is used in the edition.

In bar 96, the B flat indication is left off the second beat in the violin part. Although it is not unthinkable for Hanson to use a clash of B against B flat (this particular clash of tonalities is a feature of the opening theme of his Piano Sonata Opus 12, written at approximately the same time as the violin sonata), the resulting augmented interval, in this case within a lyrical melodic line, is out of character at this juncture. The B flat indication is also missing in bar 142 in the violin line, and from the treble stave of the piano in the same bar. These are assumed mistakes, and are corrected in the edition.

In the third movement there are some inconsistencies between the two instruments in the phrasing of the “rondo” theme. Significantly, the individual phrasing for each instrument remains largely consistent throughout the movement. This suggests that some instrument-specific treatment of the theme was intended. However, some of the bowings are clumsy. This disrupts the impetus of the theme that is characteristically a polka.

Some of the manuscript bowings are changed to establish a clearer shared stylistic concept between the violin and piano, but not to the extent of consolidating the phrasing of the two instruments. Many differences remain.

The first discrepancy is in the pickup to the theme, played first by the violin in bar 2, and by the piano in bar 10. There is also a notation discrepancy between the violin in bars 3-4
and in the piano in bars 11-12. This concerns an important rhythmic feature of the theme; a stress is placed on the second dotted crotchet beat of the bar. Where it appears in the violin part, initially in bar 3, a quaver rest is indicated before the second beat denoting a lift of the bow (similar to the gesture of the violin entry of the first subject of Tchaikovsky’s violin concerto 1st movement). In the piano part at bar 11 there is no rest, but a tenuto line over the second beat. Again Hanson’s use of the tenuto seems to announce the weight of the phrase, without a meaningful correlation to note duration; the first tenuto of the theme in the piano part occurs above the first of a tied pair of notes (on beats 2 and 3 of bar 11). While the treatment of the rhythmic feature differs between the two instruments, the distinction of the second beat in both cases provides compatibility. These idiomatic treatments of the theme are preserved in the edition.

Changes to the violin part include a slur from the 4th beat of bar three into the first beat of bar four. This allows the second “lift” to occur again on an up-bow, and facilitates a smoother line of phrase. Similarly, there is a slur extended from the C (4th beat of bar 4) over the following two semiquavers.

The slur into the first beat of bar five is broken. In the third full bar of the theme, the weight should be on the first beat, as illustrated by the tenuto in the parallel phrase for the piano in bar 13. On the violin, a compatible effect is better achieved with a separate down-bow.
The answering four bar phrase in bars 6 and 7 is jagged if bowed separately as indicated in the manuscript. The legato phrasing of the piano from the parallel phrase at bar 14 is used, and also at bar 105 where the material reappears.

The rondo theme thus maintains some of Hanson’s instrument specific characteristics, but within a uniform contour of phrasing.

A correction is made where the violin carries the accompanying material from bar 10. Without a slur joining the two notes of the annotated semiquaver trill, this may be interpreted several ways. A separate bow could be used for each semiquaver, or it could be played tremolo. It appears that Hanson intended the semiquavers to be slurred in groups of six, having marked the first group with a down-bow and the second with an up-bow. This would also ensure compatibility with the piano effect at the beginning of the movement. To avoid misunderstanding, the slurs are indicated in the edition.

In the Andante ma non troppo from bar 31, the violin melody is a free augmentation of the thematic material played by the piano, incorporating material from the hemiola waltz of the second movement. In the edition, where the waltz reminiscences occur (bars 41-42, 44-45, 52-53 and 55-56) the slur is extended over the full two bars. This accommodates the faster tempo of the third movement while retaining the lyrical character of the waltz.

There are some other bowing changes in the edition from bar 131. These maintain consistent articulation of the thematic material throughout the rhythmic diminution up to
The sonata is a substantial and valuable work. The inconsistencies, while obscuring conclusive results of a stylistic analysis, illustrate Hanson’s willingness to make modifications: a nurturing approach to composition. This does not release the performers from accountability to the composer’s stylistic intention. It does render inappropriate an analysis of performance style based solely on the written detail.

Chapter 5

*Three Fancies and Legende*

Hanson’s year of most concentration on the violin was 1946. That year he wrote three substantial works for the violin, including the violin concerto. *Three Fancies* was the first of these works.

These “quirkishly titled small pieces” once enjoyed a greater degree of popularity than many of Hanson’s other works. In particular the second of these *Of the Platypus who envied the Hawk in his flight* was “once frequently heard on ABC radio”. (Covell, Pg. 160)

As well as enjoying popularity, these pieces were recognized as humorous. On the subject of humour, Hanson’s response is:
“...I can only say this: that the third Fancy, that is, the Fancy of the fugue that wishes it could waltz, seems to tickle the fancies of people who know the fugue as a form and find it rather strange, in the middle of it, to hear little facets of references to the style of the Viennese waltz, it’s so odd to think that in a fugue one can hear a Viennese waltz style. That is the kind of humour that perhaps I’ve been nearest to…” (de Berg tapes)

Hanson continues on the subject of humour, citing two other examples amongst his works, Critic and Procrastination. He speaks of his form of humour in terms of “just toying semantically” and refers to “semantics” in terms of connotative meaning both musical and linguistic. However, in terms of compositional technique, Hanson makes no attempt to explain his use of humour further to the example of conflicting stylistic reference in the “fugue”. (de Berg tapes)

The issue of unity is both semantically and structurally significant in Three Fancies. The titles of the pieces share a unity of intention, the third fancy bringing about a triumphant conclusion; the yearning subject matter uniting the three is musically less resolved in the first and second than it is in the third. Of a Fugue that wishes it could Waltz begins in the manner of a fugue with a solo statement by the violin of the fugal subject. Reference to the waltz intensifies throughout the piece, until, at the end of the piece, the waltz character is dominant. The final statement of the fugal subject appears in transformation: bombastic, reminiscent in character of the waltz from Berg’s “Tavern Garden” scene in Wozzek.
Additionally, the musical allusions of the two opposing subjects of each title are integrated. This is most easily recognized in the integration of the fugue and the waltz. As both subjects are musical forms, there is not the subjectivity of the musical reference as is the case in the other two titles.

Motivic unity is significant to the structure of both the first and the third Fancy. Use of adaptable themes and thematic transformation, as seen in the sonata, are more concentrated in the Opus 19.

Legende was written directly after Three Fancies. The piece is essentially through composed, although the final Moderato section is in effect a separate movement. It is a somber work.

In aesthetic and also in form, Three Fancies and Legende are distinct, yet in compositional style and technique, particularly in relation to the unifying function of motive, there are notable similarities. The compositional techniques used in these works are discussed in detail as they relate to the editing of the manuscripts.

5.1 Editing of The Fancy of an Elephant who dreamt he danced like a fawn
There is a full manuscript violin part for the *Three Fancies*. The first of these …*of an Elephant who dreamt he danced like a fawn* is marked for phrasing and articulation until bar 68. The style of phrasing is well suited to the violin, though little effort was made to ensure that, as bowing indications, the phrasing supports a consistent direction of the bow for specific gestures. From bar 69 until the end of the piece, there are no bowing, articulation or phrasing indications in the part.

The violin line in the piano score has bowings only in the first two bars. However, the dynamic markings in the score are comprehensive for both instruments. While many of the dynamics for the violin coincide with those for the piano, there are a number of indications for the violin that are independent of the keyboard dynamics. It is curious that, with the exception of the *mp* in bar 3 and the *mf diminuendo* three bars from the end (bar 192), none of the dynamics was entered into the violin part.

Notwithstanding the incompleteness of both the score and the violin part, the extent of the detail in the two combined outlines Hanson’s concept for the piece, and how this was to be applied technically to the violin. The indications from both manuscripts are consolidated in the edition. Dynamic markings for violin and piano throughout the edition are as they appear in the manuscript score. The bowing indications in the first section of the violin part are also preserved in the edition.
The careful detail of the phrasing and articulation markings of the first 68 bars in the violin part provides a solid base from which to draw conclusions about how the remainder of the piece should be played.

The piece comprises two main sections, and is built entirely upon three principal thematic ideas. The first section states the three main themes separately, and in the second section the three combine and interact. As the three themes appear initially within the bowed section, a model gesture is given for each motive. Hanson’s phrasing for each motive is preserved consistently throughout the edition.

Some of the phrasing in the manuscript is “quirky”. The phrasing of the opening thematic material in bars 3 and 4 is inconsistent with the same material in bar 11. This discrepancy generates some uncertainty concerning the phrasing to be used later in the piece, where that material reappears without indication. However, the regularity of articulation used in the first statement at bar 3 establishes the second as a variant. As all subsequent appearances of that material are within a developmental context, the indications in bars 3 and 4 of the manuscript violin part are used in the edition at each recurrence.

Some additional bowings are indicated in the first 68 bars of the edition. These are intended to support the phrasing and articulation according to the manuscript. The up-bow indications in bars 4 and 6, for example, avoid reversal of bow direction for the recurrence of the gestures, thus supporting a consistent gesture. There are other instances where the bowings, as they occur in the manuscript, might benefit from adjustment.
Where it is primarily a matter of convenience and is not pertinent to a motivic gesture, in the edition bowings are left largely to the discretion of the player.

There are some fingerings indicated in the violin part, giving evidence that it was used in spite of the incompleteness of the bowing indications; the fingerings are evidently a subsequent addition to the part as they are not in Hanson’s hand. The fingerings are neither of common practice, nor particularly effective; those indicated in bars 13 and 14 recommend a jump into 5th position, followed immediately by another shift on the same finger. However it is true that violinists’ fingerings, apropos how they are used, are largely idiosyncratic. The number of possible variations within any piece is infinite. Within the interpretational boundaries set by the composer in the performance indications, individual choice of fingering broadens the scope of interpretational contribution by the player, particularly in terms of timbre. This should be encouraged. To this end, in the edition all fingerings are left to the discretion of the player.

In order to maintain regular phrasing of the repeated pattern from bar 54, slurs are added to the first two quavers in bar 55 and to the 4th and 5th quavers of bar 59. Although it is not the phrasing used for the initial statement of the motive in bar 10, it is the phrasing indicated for its second appearance in bar 11, and is consistent with bars 57 and 58.

Hanson indicates *poco lento* over the rest in the violin part at bar 62, but in the score, it is indicated above the violin entry in bar 64. In the edition, a ritenuto is indicated from the
beginning of bar 64, arriving at the poco lento at the first downbeat of the third theme in bar 65.

The relaxed tempo of the *poco lento* in combination with the *legato* bowings establishes the contrasting lyrical character of the third theme. There are no more bowings in the manuscript from that point. In the edition the legato phrasing is continued until bar 80.

The anapest rhythmic motive is a feature of both the second and third themes. It is therefore vital in its unifying role due to its efficacy in the adaptability of the two themes. The motive is slurred in both themes each time it appears in the bowed section of the manuscript. The reappearances of the motive in the un-bowed section of the third theme occur in bars 70, 73, 78 and 79. In the edition these are slurred correspondingly, as are all subsequent appearances of the anapest motive.

Bowings in the edition for the remainder of the third theme are explained as follows: the slur across the bar-line from bar 68 to 69 appears irregular when compared to bar 64. However, in the extended first phrase beginning in bar 64, articulation of the downbeat is largely avoided. In bars 67 and 71 this is influenced by the placement of the anapest motive and its established phrasing. Also in bars 68 and 70, articulation of the downbeat is avoided; both times as a result of a tied B flat. Maintenance of the syncopated lilt of the phrase, also into bar 69, seems appropriate. Following this, a diminution of the pulse occurs in bars 73, 75 and 76. The first beats of each of these bars provide the impulse of a
new, diminished, phrase. These downbeats are each articulated by a separate bow in the edition.

A possible example of Hanson’s humour is illustrated with characteristic subtlety in bars 88 - 94. Structurally, this short section functions as a link between the two main sections of the piece. The melody used in the link is thematically disconnected from the rest of the piece. It contains no thematic material that is common to any of the three main themes. But, the melodic fragment upon which the link is constructed is recognizable as a familiar children’s-playground “taunt” (generally sung to the vocal “nye-nye-nye-nye-nye-nye”). The taunt motive appears three times in six bars. The third appearance, in bars 93-94, is the most definitive. It is tempting to suggest a smeared effect for the motive, or even to play it slightly off-key. However, this would belie the archetypal understated humour of Hanson’s music. In the edition the first three notes of the motive are slurred to reinforce the swinging quality of the “tune”. As a result, the nature of the passage is essentially legato.

An indication to accelerate from the last statement of the taunt motive (bar 93) to a Tempo marking in bar 99 appears in both the piano score and the violin part, but only as rough additions to the manuscript. The indications in both parts seem to be written, nonetheless, in the composer’s hand. The violin part reads poco accell [sic] and the piano score reads accell poco a poco [sic]. As previously discussed, Hanson used the device of an accelerando into a faster tempo in Sonata Op 5. This appears to be the intention here
too; the effect is musically compelling. The indications are unified. The edition reads
accelerando poco a poco in both parts.

Although the anapest figure at the end of bar 94 marks the beginning of a section of
motivic development, the Tempo at bar 99, bringing back the first theme (in the
subdominant), creates an impression of a recapitulation. This is due to its dramatic arrival
at the peak of a crescendo, together with the return of the original tempo. Another false
recapitulation comes 16 bars later. This is even more deceiving, in the tonic key at the
end of a decrescendo. In the edition, both false recapitulations of the first theme have the
bowing of the first statement of the theme at bar 3. The motivic fragment, originally from
the first beat of bar 4, is developed as an accompanying figure in the violin in bars 103-
105. The same phrasing is used in the edition.

The phrasing of the four-note motive that first appears in bar 10 is less easily resolved in
the developmental section. Hanson phrased the motive three different ways in the first
section. The second and third versions occur in bars 16 and 17 of the manuscript violin
part. As the surrounding material is gigue-like and for the most part detached, the more
legato phrasing from bar 16 is used in bars 112 and 124 to highlight the full statement of
the motive. In both instances, a development of the motive follows the full statement. For
this the bowing from bar 17 is used. This maintains the gigue-character of the section
while supporting the adaptability of this motive with that of the first beat of bar 4.
All use and development of the rhythmic figure reintroduced in bar 128 maintains the staccato character of its first appearance in bar 22.

An interesting adaptation of the second theme appears in the violin part in bar 153, in counterpoint with a recapitulation of the third theme. The music in the violin part from the second half of bar 153 to the first crotchet of 155 is exactly as it appears in bars 41-43, the third and fourth bars of the original second theme. The second theme is adapted as an obbligato, played by the violin, to the third theme played by the piano. The dynamic indications of the manuscript illustrate the dominance of the third theme material, which is consistent in character with its first statement. The piano part is marked $f$ against the violin’s $mf$. The second theme material in the violin is adapted to the lyrical nature, and to the slower tempo, of the third theme reintroduced in bar 152. In the edition, the bowing of the second theme material from bar 153 retains the same line of phrase as in its original statement. The slurs are extended twice to support the new lyrical character.

5.2 Editing of *The fancy of the Platypus who envied the Hawk in his flight*

The manuscript violin part for the second fancy is entirely without bowings, although tied notes are indicated. As with the first fancy, dynamics are missing from the violin part, but again indications specific to the violin appear in the piano score. For the first 23 bars all dynamic indications appear as “hair-pin” markings. They are carefully placed, and seem to be part of the original manuscript. The first reference to actual dynamic is the $p$ in bar
27. This indication seems to have been added later. It is loosely written and less carefully placed.

In the edition, the level of dynamic indicated at the beginning of the piece is *mp*. This reflects the poised, uncomplicated nature of the music, and facilitates subtle gradations of dynamic and tonal colour. Most importantly, it allows room for the growth of the piece, and also for the *decrescendo* to the *p*, indicated in bar 24. All of the dynamics that appear in the manuscript score are preserved in the edition.

The violin sustains a melody throughout the piece. This melody is essentially one long phrase that grows steadily in pitch and dynamic toward a climax almost exactly two-thirds the way through the piece. The climax point is the loudest and highest point of the melody. It then subsides though the remainder of the piece to the pitch and dynamic level of the opening.

The character of the piece is heavy and lyrical. The bowings should support a smoothness of line that is implied by the imagery of the title. This would be consistent with both the flight of the Hawk, and the under-water motion of the Platypus. Bowing should also facilitate the subtle swells in dynamic indicated in the manuscript.

There is no angular contour to the melody. All of the shorter notes, quavers and semiquavers, occur within a linear (scale) context. In the edition, these are all slurred. The motivic cell that recurs most often throughout the piece is a group of three
descending notes, usually a minim or crotchet followed by two quavers (a reversal of the
anapest), as in bar 8. It also appears once in diminution in bar 32. In the edition, this
three-note cell is generally slurred as a group, with the surrounding bowings chosen to
support effective bow distribution.

There are some bowings indicated, with a different pen, in the manuscript score from bar
36. These bowings are not transferred to the edition, although the edited bowings read
only a little differently. The descent of the melody features a softly lilting figure of
dotted-crotchet/quaver. This figure is extended twice, creating a suspension over the bar-
line into bars 38 and 40. The bowings indicated in the edition are meant to parallel the
downward motion of the Hawk in flight. The suspensions relate to the sporadic gliding
motion. The impulse created by the change of bow relates to the regular rhythm of the
wing-movement.

5.3 Editing of The Fancy of a Fugue that wished it could waltz.

Performance indications in the manuscript score and violin part of the third Fancy are
few. Only the first nine bars of the violin part contain indication for bowing, articulation
or dynamic. Even less is indicated for the violin within the piano score, and that is
inconsistent with the violin part. Fortunately, Hanson’s clear concept of phrasing for the
piece can be determined by the few indications in the manuscripts, notwithstanding the
inconsistencies. The Fugal construction here aids the editing process. Almost all of the
thematic material used in both the subject and the counter-subject is represented in the first few bars of the piece.

The first five bars of the violin part are marked with scrupulous detail. These indications are all preserved in the edition. The slur over the second half of bar 6 in the violin part, which appears comparatively sketchy, is replaced with the phrasing given to the same figure as it appears in the piano entry in bar 7. The diminuendo in bar 6 to “mp” in bar 7 in the violin part is also preserved in the edition, as is the bowing in bar 8.

The slur indicated in the violin part in bar nine, the beginning of the counter-subject, seems to be in the same hand as that in bar 6. Though this may not have been Hanson, it agrees with Hanson’s phrasing for the piano in bars 18 and 19. The legato character is maintained in the edition, but the slur is separated on the second beat of the figure to support the lilt of the waltz.

The figure on the first beat of bar 10 remains detached in the edition, with a “hooked” up-bow on the semiquaver. This “skip” rhythmic figure appears in various ways throughout the piece. It first appears on beat 1 of bar 6. Another variation is on beat 1 of bar 45. This is a rhythmic and intervallic inversion of the first beat of bar 10. Irrespective of the context in which it appears the bowing for this figure in the edition “hooks” the semiquaver to the previous note.
By bar 11 most of the thematic material used throughout the piece is presented, and where it reappears, consistent phrasing is maintained. Explanations are following.

The four-note “Charleston” figure that first appears at the last semiquaver of bar two reappears many times, altogether in three different rhythmic positions. The other two positions can be seen from the first beat of bar 11 and from the 8th semiquaver of bar 70. Irrespective of its positioning, the articulation should be consistent. Ideally, the first note of the figure should always be played on a down-bow.

The scale figure, appearing initially in bar 3, is related to that in bar 6. Both begin on the second semiquaver of the dotted-crotchet beat with a slur to the third. The remaining three semiquavers of both are marked with staccato points. Both appear in inversion as can be seen in bars 12 (from the D sharp) and 14 (from the C sharp). The scale in bar 44 does not fall into the same category. It has a strong pulse on the main beat, and correlates better to the repeated note figure at the beginning of bar two. This is consistent with the scale as it appears in bar 17 in the piano part of the manuscript. Therefore, in the edition, the scale in bar 44 does not have the slur, nor does it at the beginning of bar 60 where it appears as an extension of the scale in bar 59.

A new motivic cell relating to the first two notes of the main subject, the interval of a perfect fourth, appears for the first time in bar 13, and again in bar 15. The bowing for this cell uses Hanson’s phrasing for the piano where the motive appears in bar 14 of the manuscript score.
The prominent “waltz” rhythmic figure appears for the first time in bar fourteen in the violin part: the last two quavers of the bar. To bring out the waltz character these notes should be “lifted”: a resonant staccato. There is a riotous transformation of this figure from the second half of bar 66. Again, this should be played slightly off the string.

The duration of the second note of the main subject, bar 1, is inconsistent in the score and violin part. In the violin part it is a quaver followed by a quaver rest. This probably best represents Hanson’s intention as it is supported by the performance indications. Also, the quaver rest facilitates a lift of the bow, producing a clearer articulation of the second gesture.

An interesting transformation of the fugal subject appears at bar 48. The theme is complete and recognizable, but in inversion. This feature gives rise to another significant parallel with Shostakovich, again pertinent to the 5th Symphony. In the first movement of the symphony a similar transformation, of the B-theme, appears in the coda. The character is consistent with the original statement of the theme, and the passage is recognizable, but the melody is in inversion. This thematic treatment, the inversion, was new to Shostakovich in the 5th symphony. It is described as the “dual theme” (Souster, 3), and remained fundamental to Shostakovich’s method of composition. In the edition, all performance indications for the inversion of the theme from bar 48 are consistent with the original statement.
The final statement of the subject in bar 72 is transformed into a new character that is boisterous, more dance-like that fugal, supported by some wild accompanying material. The contour of the original phrasing is preserved to maintain consistent treatment of the motives, but the articulation is different to reflect the new character. The second note of the theme remains a crotchet. Also, the comma indicated initially in bar 5 is omitted from the corresponding position in bar 76. In the edition this is substituted with a retaken down-bow on the F sharp. The retake imitates the original gesture, but with a “boisterous” inflection.

The figure in bar 61 appears only once in the violin part. It appears, with phrasing indicated, in the piano part in bar 16 of the manuscript. In the edition this phrasing is used for the violin in bar 61.

A contentious choice of phrasing in the edition is that indicated in the violin part in bars 57-60. This motive actually relates to the “skip” motive, but in the latter context, lends itself to a more lilting “waltz” identity. The phrasing indicated in the edition is to slur the dotted quaver to the semiquaver.

There are some notational discrepancies between the violin line in the manuscript score and the violin part. In bars 18 and 21, there are some enharmonic differences. Also, the notes on the second beat of bar 21 are reversed in the violin part if compared to the score. Bar 64 shows a rhythmic discrepancy between the two versions. Both of these are stylistically feasible. In the piano score the rhythmic pattern in bar 64 is consistent with
that in bar 36, and bar 64 in the violin part is consistent with the pattern in bar 37. There are other discrepancies too. In bar 29 there is a double stop in violin part that is not indicated in the score. Bar 31 indicates different notes in the two manuscripts. Both versions are functional: compatible with the harmony.

The most interesting aspect of the aforementioned discrepancies is that neither version appears more “correct”. It is fair to assume that the violin part represents the latter version of the piece. This would normally be the case. In support of this assumption is the near total absence of performance indications in the score. It follows that the discrepancies may represent the evolution of the work, the changes being essentially subjective choices made by the composer. All things being equal, where discrepancies relating to the violin line occur, the version in the violin part is preserved in the edition.

No attempt is made in the edition to continue Hanson’s thoroughgoing style of dynamic marking throughout the piece. Further to the composer’s indications, only general indications of dynamic level consistent to the growth of the piece are entered into the edition. It should be understood however, that the dynamic contour of the phrasing indicated at the beginning of the violin part should apply to the main subject where it reappears.

No attempt is made to indicate the articulation of all semiquavers that are not specifically marked legato. There are inconsistencies in the manuscripts on this point. In bar two in the violin part, the repeated note figure, no staccato points are indicated, in contrast to the
same figure in bar 9 in the piano part. Even so, it would be incongruous to play this figure “on the string”. Throughout the editing, staccato points are entered primarily to illustrate individual motives so that they are performed with a consistent inflection. However, it should be understood that the character of the piece requires also the unmarked semiquavers to be played “off the string” in general.

While many “up” and “down” bow indications appear in the edition, these are entered only where the direction of the bow is pertinent to the phrasing and articulation, as governed by the motivic content. Indications for bow direction solely for the purpose of convenience are again left to the discretion of the player.

Where phrasing omissions occur in the piano part of the manuscript, corrections are made only to support a unified concept for the piece. Overall, the phrasing concept is determined by consistent handling of each motive. By this method, the concept is also applied to the piano part.

5.4 Editing of *Legende*
The manuscript score for *Legende* is in Hanson’s hand. It includes performance indications for both instruments and is for the most part complete, but there is no separate violin part.

There is an unaccountable irregularity in the bowing of the opening solo violin statement of the first theme. The first and second phrases of the piece are constructed of identical thematic material, but inconsistent bowings in the manuscript disturb their symmetry. Another consequence of the irregularity is that the motive built upon the anapest figure, a key unifying element again in this piece, is obscured in the second phrase.

There are two key motives built on the anapest figure in the first section of the piece. The first of these appears initially at the beginning of bar 2, and the second at bar 15. The phrasing for both of these motives, in the first instance, is legato. The character of each remains consistent until bar 96, at which point the first motive is transformed. Bowings in the *Moderato* are more “eccentric” overall. Even so, usage of the anapest figure throughout the section alternates between only two distinct variations of articulation. One of these is legato, consistent with the character of the motive in bar two, and the other is staccato. The contrasting versions can be seen in juxtaposition in the violin part in bar 120. Throughout the piece, treatment of the anapest figure allows it to speak clearly as a unit, with the emphasis on the first of the three notes.

The weight of the first phrase rests clearly upon the anapest motive. Hanson illustrates this with a crescendo toward the motive where it appears in the second bar. However, the
focal point of the second phrase is less obvious. There are no dynamics indicated for the second phrase to illustrate the weight of the phrase. In addition, the arrival of the phrase is clouded by its rhythmic displacement, an “extra” bar bridging it with the first. The second statement of the anapest motive, in bar 7, is the only instance throughout the manuscript where the motive is obscured by incongruent phrasing. The slur across bars 6 and 7 significantly reduces the effect of the motive, at which point the weight of the phrase would have otherwise naturally occurred. The result is that there is no satisfactory reference to a focal point in the second phrase.

The bowing for the second phrase in the manuscript belies the thematic accountability customary of Hanson’s use of phrasing. The unifying significance of the anapest throughout the piece requires the bowing of the second phrase to be consistent with that of the first. For this reason, the bowing of the second phrase in the edition is altered to mirror that of the first.

There are some minor discrepancies concerning the bowing of the second anapest motive, appearing initially in bar 15. The legato treatment of the motive is constant until bar 65, but in bars 69, 70 and 71 the slur is omitted. Then, in bars 72 and 73, the slur is indicated only for the first two semiquavers of the motive, in place of the longer slurs used initially. In terms of bowing, the phrasing marked in bars 72 and 73 is ineffective. An inappropriate, coarse accent results on the first beat of those bars that is neither indicated in the manuscript, nor implied by the contour of the phrase. Throughout the edition,
bowing of the second anapest motive preserves the character of its first appearance in the manuscript at bar 15. All three notes are slurred.

Similarly, the inappropriate coarseness of poor bow distribution could occur throughout the manuscript where long notes are followed by a quaver at the end of the bar. In some instances the quaver is slurred to the previous long note, as in bar 41, but often no slur is indicated. In bar 48 for example, the slur is omitted. This is particularly inappropriate at the end of the decrescendo. In the edition where this condition arises, for example in bars 100 and 101, a slur is indicated.

The performance indications for phrasing and articulation in the *Moderato* are fundamental to the motivic concept. While the bowings are not always comfortable, the musical intention of Hanson’s indications should not be altered by changes made to the bowing. Occasionally there is reason to adjust the direction of the bow so that the gesture of specific motives remains regular. This can be done efficiently in the routine way of playing two successive up bows in a row of staccato semiquavers. Adjustments of this type are not indicated in the edition. Again, where the bowing concerns are solely a technical matter, the choices are left largely to the discretion of the player.

There is one small omission in the manuscript at the beginning of the *Moderato*. This concerns the appearance of the final anapest motive. The opening thematic material of the *Moderato* features a motive constructed of two successive anapest figures. This motive appears four times: first in bars 109-110, and again in bars 115-116, 139-140 and bars
141-142. In all but the first appearance, the first anapest group is marked staccato and the second is slurred. These indications are omitted in bars 109-110 of the manuscript. This is assumed to be an oversight and is corrected the edition.

There are also staccato indications missing in the manuscript. Again it should be understood from the character of the *Moderato*, where a semiquaver is not otherwise indicated, it should be played off the string.

**Chapter 6**

*Seascape*

Seascape was composed in 1953. In 1952 Hanson began working on his oratorio, “The Immortal Touch”, set to text from Tagore’s *Gitanjali*. This was a project of magnitude and personal spiritual significance. It illustrates the confidence Hanson must have had in his technical command of the craft of composition at that time. Upon hearing *Seascape*, beyond a doubt the composer that is best brought to mind is Hanson himself. Hanson has
integrated the most significant aspects of his own compositional style and technique in this work.

Hanson’s method of unifying a work thematically using adaptable and transformable thematic material is extended further in Seascape. The adaptability of the first three thematic ideas is demonstrated by the differing sequences in which they appear in the two instruments. If the order of sequence in the piano is “A” at bar 1, “B” at bar 8 and “C” at bar 17, then the order of sequence for the violin is “B” at bar 2, “C” at bar 8 and “A” at bar 17. Each thematic idea is adapted to the other two.

There is a clearly identifiable integration of harmonic and intervallic relationships. Third relationships are present throughout, but the tritone, in juxtaposition with the perfect 4th, dominates the melodic contour. Harmonically too, the intervals of perfect 4th and 5th contrasted by the tonal uncertainty of the tritone, are persistent throughout the work.

In oscillation, the significance of the “perfect” intervals and the tritone must result in the rise and fall of tension and relaxation. This is according to Hindemith’s concept of the nature of intervallic relationships. Briefly, the tritone is the most vague interval due to the unusual relation it bears to its “combination tones” and to its urge for resolution without a root independent of its musical context. The perfect 4th is the “building stone” that is second in strength and clarity only to the perfect 5th, due to its “combination tones” doubling one of its factors. (Hindemith Craft, 57)
These intervallic relationships can be identified in the first three thematic ideas. The vertical “A” material introduced by the piano uses the tritone, E flat to A as the foundation of the first arpeggiated chord. The static chord that follows is built upon perfect 4\textsuperscript{th}s. The first phrase of the more linear “B” material, as it appears initially in bar 2 in the violin part, is built upon the tritone, B to F. The second phrase, symmetrical to the first, is built upon C to G flat. The clarity of the perfect 4\textsuperscript{th} appears at bar 5 with C to G, and B flat-F-C relationships. The lyrical C-thematic material also features the 4\textsuperscript{th}-tritone juxtaposition. This can be seen in bars 8 and 9 of the violin part in the progression from G flat to C to F.

Hanson’s practical application of the concept best expressed by Hindemith, using harmonic tension and relaxation, is where the association commonly made between Hanson and Hindemith is plausibly recognizable. Even so, the music bears only a minimal stylistic resemblance to that of Hindemith.

The rhythmic structure is another unifying element in Seascape. There are no changes in “real” tempo. While the surface rhythm undergoes many fluctuations, the quaver pulse remains constant throughout the piece. This avoids any static moments, and provides an unbroken “undercurrent”.

The programmatic nature of the piece integrates these compositional techniques in a broader sense: conceptually. Hanson’s choice of imagery, of a scene in motion, can be related to all of these examples: the layered, wave-like progression of the three adaptable
themes, the constant “ebb and flow” usage of harmonic and melodic tension and relaxation, and a fluctuating surface rhythm in combination with a steady undercurrent. The associations to be made with a “seascape” are instantly recognizable.

6.1 Editing of Seascape

The phrasing and articulation indicated in the manuscript is central to the musical concept of the piece, as are the indicated dynamics. The phrasing is thematically consistent and musically effective. Again, there is no separate violin part, but the indications for both the violin and piano within the manuscript score are essentially complete and clearly marked. On a technical level, that is, as bowings, they are well formed and, as a rule, functional.

In the edition, all changes and additions to the bowings, in the absence of incongruence in the manuscript, are intended to support the phrasing and articulation as indicated or implied in the manuscript. Slurs are added in bars 11 and 12 to avoid inappropriate coarseness at the end of the phrase. This slur also supports consistency of phrasing with the same material in bar 111. In bar 17, the first slur is divided to support a fuller sound quality. It also facilitates a “lift” on the C of the second beat, due to the resulting up-bow.

Specified up-bow and down-bow indications are added only where they are particularly supportive of the existent articulation. For example, in bar 27 the up-bow indicated for
the A flat ensures that the G occurs on a down-bow. This in turn forestalls shortening the quaver at the middle of the bar.

Four changes in the “5/8” section beginning at bar 47 support regular bow distribution compatible with the indicated dynamics. These changes occur in bars 54, 77, 88 and 89, and again should not disturb the phrasing indicated by Hanson.

The way the violin part reads in the section from bar 94 until bar 107 benefits from some clarification with regard to bow distribution. Of these added markings, the one in bar 99 does in fact alter the phrasing as it was indicated in the manuscript. The change is intended to clarify the crossed rhythm of the notated hemiola, which tends to be obscured by the original bowing.

The final alteration is in bar 114. This is to maintain consistent treatment of the triplet feature. It also facilitates more regular distribution of the bow.

The concentration of musical ideas and the integration of many significant compositional techniques have produced a concise and beautiful work. There is an accord that extends even to the imagery selected for the program of this piece, which befits the composer’s recognizable style of ruggedly lyrical melody. *Seascape* can be placed amongst Hanson’s most heralding works.
Chapter 7

*An Etching and a Portrait*

*An Etching* is the title Hanson gave to his final work for violin and piano. With the exception of the sonata, all of these works carry titles that are aesthetic, mostly with a suggested (or stated, as with *Three Fancies*) imagery. Regarding the title, the imagery for this piece is less transparent than for the other works. Also stylistically, this small piece is the most difficult to place.
In structure the piece does not seem to imitate the genre characterized by its title, etching being a precise technical process. The concept appears more improvisatory than constructive. Structurally, the compositional technique employed is obscure.

The term “etching” could be understood according to the definition “to delineate clearly”. This could be relevant in terms of performance style: the precision required in performance, rather than as a suggestion of a musical manifestation of the art form. Alternatively, it could be pertinent to Hanson’s musical intention. *An Etching* could be a “sketch”: a musical description of a compositional style extrinsic to Hanson.

Like many of Hanson’s works, *An Etching* is atonal in the sense that it is “not tonal”. The musical context also gives an impression of atonality as it is defined by the styles of composers such as Messiaen and Webern. Both visually and aurally, the score bears a slight resemblance to the music of some serialist composers, in terms of interval contours and the figurative rather than melodic significance of the voicing: as in Webern’s “Three Pieces for String Quartet”. However, Hanson’s characteristic interval relationships, triad and fourth, are still present. Whilst Hanson used some “serial” methods in other works, this is not the case in *An Etching*. The piece does not follow a transparent formal construction. There is no “row”, nor does Hanson use a particular group of notes as a ground structure.

*An Etching* is almost unrecognizable as having been composed by Hanson. As it stands alone stylistically amongst these works, the piece cannot be seen as emulation of style.
Yet it is a noble imitation. Hanson neither makes a mockery nor a criticism of the incorporated extrinsic characteristics in this piece. It is an attractive and cohesive piece, void of vulgarity, that is flattering to its own style of composition.

In performance the piece requires a temperate, elegant approach. The gesture is poised and delicate. Rhythmically, the piece is best described as filigree. Voicing is figurative and ornamental rather than melodic, and there is an intertwining dialogue between the two instruments requiring fine placement. Pulse, while inwardly essential for the performers, is not an outward rhythmic feature. The piece should sound free and improvisatory, but again this is only achieved when performed with clarity and without rubato. In terms of performance technique and style, the strictness of interpretation required is the greatest difference between this small later work and Hanson’s earlier works for violin and piano.

Although there is not a great deal of motivic thematic work, a motivic cell appears initially at the end of bar four in the violin part. This cell recurs a further six times throughout the piece, all but once in the violin part, providing unity for the work in a motivic sense. The first reappearance of the cell is in bar 8 in the violin part, which is followed immediately by the piano. Subsequent repetitions, all in the violin part, are in bars 13, 15, 16, and finally in inversion in bar 17.

This cell resembles a birdcall, which encourages a closer look into a possible Messiaen parallel. The Bell Minor has a call that is quite similar, playing on an interval that varies
between a semitone and a tone. Other figures appearing only once correspond with
uncanny accuracy to the calls of other Australian birds. The most significant amongst
these are:

1. The Pied Currawong, corresponding with the opening violin figure.
2. The Eastern Whipbird, corresponding with the violin figure from the last
   semiquaver of bar 1.
3. The Galah, corresponding with the piano figure from bar 10.
4. The Willi Wagtail, corresponding with the violin, first half of bar 15.

The “Willi Wagtail” figure is, in both pitch and rhythm, extraordinarily precise. Other
possible representations could include; the Brown Thornbill or Magpie on beats 3 and 4
of bar five in the violin part and the Little Crow at the end of bar 9, the glissando
downwards from B flat in the violin part. (All birdcall references taken from David
Stewart, Nature Sound CDs)

All of these birds are commonly found throughout NSW.

Arguably the most important “bird song” piece by Messiaen is Oiseaux exotiques,
written in 1955-6. This work is constructed upon the songs of 48 birds adapted to the
twelve-tone scale.
In addition to the bird songs, Messiaen incorporated some personal stylistic characteristics of musical language. Amongst these the tritone and the use of modal harmony are prominent. These do not feature in *An Etching*. However, interval relationships of the third and the perfect fourth are present in the Hanson piece, as is the use of impressionistically coloured harmony. These characteristics of musical language have strong Hanson associations.

The Mode 2 (octatonic scale) and 3 (alternating 2 semitones and 1 tone) are frequently used by Messiaen, and are present also in *Oiseaux exotiques*. Each of these scales appears once, prominently, in the Hanson piece. Mode 3 appears in bar 6 of the violin from the F sharp, seven notes in sequence. The Octatonic scale appears in bar 17, again in the violin part. While Hanson’s short piece is unbroken in concept, the clear exposure of these two scales seems to tender a clue in reference to the “who am I?” riddle.

Phrasing is marked clearly into the manuscript and appears fundamental to the concept of the piece. If the piece were constructed upon birdsong, the phrasing would need to correspond. In the edition a few bowing indications are added. These are intended to facilitate effective performance of Hanson’s phrasing. For example, the bowings of bars 14 and 15 could result in a jagged, clumsy effect that would disturb the soft dynamics indicated. The down-bow and up-bow indications facilitate easier bow distribution so that the section can be played comfortably in the middle of the bow.
The slurs over the notated trills of the last two bars in the edition are possibly contentious. These notes could also be played tremolo, but it is likely that they were intended by Hanson to be played under one bow. Hanson used a similar notated trill in the 3rd movement of the Sonata Op 5 (bar 10-18). This also appears without a slur indication in the manuscript, but is clearly intended to be legato (as discussed earlier). The slur in the final bars of *An Etching* is also supportive of the “fade-out" ($p – ppp$) effect of the indicated dynamics.

The dynamic markings are sparse in the manuscript, but those indicated appear fundamental to the concept of the piece. In the other works, dynamics are used largely as a defining feature of phrase contour and functional harmony; this is naturally not the case in *An Etching*. Neither Hanson’s customary organic phrasing nor his functional use of harmony is present in *An Etching*.

The dynamics indicated in the manuscript seem to support the “bird song” theory: the crescendo for the “Whipbird” and the decrescendo for the “Magpie”. The dynamic range of the piece remains between $pp$ and $mp$, save for a single moment of $mf$ at the beginning of bar three in the piano (treble). The subtlety of the dynamics could also support a perception of distance.

Messiaen was completely transparent about the material he used in *Oiseaux exotiques*. He produced a program in which he described each bird. He stated the order in which the bird-songs appeared. He even outlined his harmonic reference to the colour of the birds;
Messiaen claimed to have strong instinctive associations specific to certain chords and colours. An example of this is the E major chord, which Messiaen associates with the colour red-orange. He used E major for the Red Cardinal from Virginia.

If Hanson were imitating the constructive method of Messiaen, he did so in the context of a riddle. There is no documentation to suggest that he used bird songs in *An Etching*, and no explanation of the title of the work: no attempt to explain why this piece departs so radically from Hanson’s characteristic style of composition.

With Hanson, it is tempting to look for a riddle. Several of his manuscripts contain curious, unexplained inscriptions. The cover of *Seven Songs*, Op 39 has “Music by Bengali”, crossed out; Bengali is the language of Bengal, Tagore’s native language. There are other interesting associations in some of the titles. An undated work for 6-part choir using text from Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* has the title of Thomas Hardy’s last novel, *Under the Greenwood Tree*. There is no explanation offered for this association.

As previously stated, many of Hanson’s works have titles of a programmatic nature. The Opus 11 has a descriptive program for each of the six preludes, in Hanson’s own handwriting. However, a technical, compositional explanation is not forthcoming. The man known for his special ability to impart both knowledge and inspiration did not choose to explain himself. Perhaps this was a symptom of the reserved nature he was said to have had. It may have been a decision not to dissolve the “mystery” of the music, permitting the listener the excitement of personal discovery, or just the manifestation of a private sense of humour.
Etching, at a guess, could refer to: bird songs “clearly delineated” within the twelve-tone scale. It could also be a “sketch” of another composer, Messiaen, and at that perhaps specifically without reference to colour. Hanson was not known to have had instinctive associations between specific chords and colours.

7.1 Portrait of Australia

There is one more piece for violin and piano by Raymond Hanson. It is a transcription by the composer of the theme from Portrait of Australia, a film commissioned by Caltex Oil, Hanson’s Op 46. The melody is dulcet, utilizing primarily the more resonant lower and upper registers of the violin, and lyrical. Apart from one piano interlude, the violin holds the melody throughout. The melody, though atypically calm, is recognizably Hanson, particularly through the characteristic melodic placement of the anapest motive.

The most atypical feature of this piece is the role of the piano. This is probably a consequence of it having been conceived as an orchestral piece. The accompaniment is restful, perpetual, and harmonically impressionistic. In style this piece bears a strong resemblance to another violin-piano transcription: Heifetz’ transcription of Poulenc’s Movements Perpétuels.
Due to the simplicity of the transcribed theme, neither technical, nor stylistic justification is warranted for the purpose of editing.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

Poulenc once wrote, “I know perfectly well that I’m not one of those composers who have made harmonic innovations… but I think there’s room for new music which doesn’t mind using other people’s chords”. (Myers, liner notes, “French Violin Sonatas”)

A basis of tradition can be found in many elements of Hanson’s musical language and compositional technique. Some significant parallels between Hanson and Shostakovich in relation to formal techniques illustrate this. The enormous respect shared by the two twentieth-century composers for Beethoven and the symphonic canon that his works defined may have contributed to these parallels.
Two of Hanson’s talents are widely recognized: the ability to absorb intuitively, and a gift for teaching. This presupposes another talent: the instinct for analysis. This is necessary in the transition between learning intuitively and teaching effectively.

In the techniques Hanson used and taught it is clear that the Australian knew what other composers around the world were doing. Stylistic comparisons can be made between Hanson and a number of his contemporaries and predecessors, as illustrated throughout this thesis. However, it is important to observe that Hanson’s work emulates no particular style or school of composition. Nor is it a fusion of styles. Hanson’s harmonic language is broad, incorporating the functions of diatonic harmony with elements of impressionism and atonality, yet his melodic construction maintains a distinct character. This is relevant to the editing of the manuscripts, as Hanson often exploits the lyrical qualities of the violin.

Hanson’s style is not eclectic, but it is idiomatic and thus may have been to an extent motivated by contemporary performance styles. Hanson’s integration of idiom is significant to this collection of works. Even the earliest works demonstrate sensitivity for the individual qualities of the violin and piano.

Also relevant is Hanson’s integration of his personal characteristic elements, such as his distinctive understanding of the nature of rhythm, with elements drawn from tradition. The integrated elements shape a compositional style that is recognizable through a variety of musical contexts.
These compositions by Hanson contain elements ranging from the idiosyncratic to the traditional, drawn from inspiration and technique. Recognition of the diverse elements united in these works is a significant outcome of the investigations. Through the clear recognition of the existing “pieces of the puzzle”, more succinct conclusions could be reached about the missing pieces: the omissions and inconsistencies in the manuscripts.

This edition represents one considered interpretation of a valuable collection of works for violin and piano by Raymond Hanson. I hope this will engender interest in the works, and that many violinists will enjoy playing them, as I have done and continue to do.
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