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ABSTRACT

The creative interactions between composers and performers can have extensive consequences on the process of a work’s composition, as well as how it is interpreted, analysed and performed by later performers. Building on the research of Nicholas Cook, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, Christopher Small, Eric Clarke and Mark Doffman, and Jennifer Torrence, this research examines my role as a performer of works for classical guitar, as one who was not involved in their initial composition. This examination centres on my artistic agency as a performer, and the function of performance in the creative evolution of music through time. As a thesis by creative works, this project incorporates three recorded recitals. These performances form the artistic embodiment of the findings presented in the research, with the creative practice of engaging with the music in a performance setting being fundamental to the research process. The research in this study argues that the practice of interpretation and performance, when paired with analysis and reflexive critique, transcends repetition, resulting in a formative and fundamental artistic contribution to the life and ongoing development of a musical work. The relationship between composer Manuel M. Ponce and guitarist Andrés Segovia in the creation of the “Variations sur ‘Folia de Espana’ et Fugue” (1932) forms the centrepiece of this investigation. The study of their relationship is viewed through the prism of creative agency, to delineate the complex, individual artistic influences they brought to the work. This approach highlights Segovia’s extensive impact on the shape of the music, and provides a nuanced focus on Ponce’s creative voice. It demonstrates how the combining of their respective styles enriches the work. In doing so, this study engenders new knowledge and understanding of Ponce and Segovia’s relationship, and of the “Folia Variations.” These discoveries have artistic implications for the modern performer, interpreter, and analyst. Understanding the creative interaction of these two musicians provides a catalyst for the examination of my own creative agency as a performer. It informs how I artistically respond to the creative actions of others who have contributed to the work’s evolution. This same approach is extended to the investigation of a number of other works for classical guitar. The research in this thesis demonstrates how my engagement with works as a performer informs the findings of my analysis, and how the findings of my analysis have significant consequences for my creative practice. The conclusions of this study position the performer more centrally as an artistic contributor in music creation, whilst also demonstrating performance as fundamental to informing critical research processes. This project extends beyond current, similar research by combining creative practice theories and research with the embodiment of these findings in performance.
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INTRODUCTION

Within the context of Western art music, the act of musical creativity incorporates a number of different primary activities: composition, performance, and reception. Some individuals undertake all of these activities, while others have a tendency to specialise in one area. Prior to the nineteenth century, musicians in the Western European tradition largely inhabited the roles of the composer and performer concurrently. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, although musicians still wrote music for themselves to perform, there began a divergence in these roles: the acts of composing and performing developed into distinct, specialist fields.¹ Through the creation of these discrete roles, the process of composing Western art music came to be collaborative, with composers often enlisting the expertise of specialist performers in the creation of musical works, and these works relying on the creative endeavours of performers to be distributed. This distribution of artistic contributions contrasts with an enduring perception of individual creativity, derived from nineteenth-century conceptions of the romantic artist-hero.² Some performers of solo Western art music have grown to inhabit roles as commissioners, advisers, and collaborators. These creative interactions between composers and performers have potentially extensive consequences for the music, both in performance and in notation.

One compelling example of collaboration is the creative relationship between Mexican composer Manuel M. Ponce (1882-1948) and Spanish guitarist Andrés Segovia (1893-1987) in the creation of the Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue (1932) (hereafter referred to as the Folia Variations).³ The Folia Variations is one of 80 works for guitar resulting from their prolific collaboration between 1923 and Ponce’s early death in 1948. The product of three years’ work between 1929 and 1932, the Folia Variations is the longest and most intricate solo guitar

---

³ Arnold Whittall corroborates the significance of this partnership in the context of twenty-first century composer-performer collaborations, stating that “if few performers during the long twentieth century have appeared to be outright heroes to composers, fewer still might be thought to have functioned as long-term collaborators, not just by giving good performances of a significant number of compositions, but by helping to determine the nature and content of those compositions.” Arnold Whittall, "Composer–Performer Collaborations in the Long Twentieth Century," in Distributed Creativity: Collaboration and Improvisation in Contemporary Music, ed. Eric F. Clarke and Mark Doffman (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 26.
piece of their collaboration. The research in this thesis examines the work through its cultural and historical context, alongside the interpersonal dynamics and musical perspectives of these initial creators. This thesis also contends that an equally important creative process exists in the artistic contribution of later interpreters, analysts, and performers, including myself. As a development of these ideas, this thesis advances the concept of diachronic, distributed co-creativity to articulate the complex ways in which the creative life of a piece of music is the responsibility of many creative actors spanning through time. In this thesis, “the work” is used to refer to a piece of music in all its instantiations: its embodiment in sound through live performance and recordings, and its graphic representation in the score. Where necessary, more specific language is used to distinguish between these different forms.

Three concert recitals were performed and recorded as an integral component of this project. They function as the artistic embodiment of the findings in this research, and should be considered in full alongside this written thesis. Creative practice research, conducted by engaging with the works in a performance setting, contributed significantly to the conclusions arising from this study. I will make reference to these recitals to provide the reader with aural and visual evidence in support of the written arguments. When referring to specific sections of music, the relevant, timestamped URL will appear in a footnote (for example, see Recital 1, Recital 2, and Recital 3 below).4

Beginning with the Folia Variations, this thesis investigates works from the repertoire of the classical guitar that are the product of interactions between composers and performers. It employs creative practice research alongside methods of musicological inquiry, including critical historical analysis and musical analysis. In doing so, it aims to bring about new understandings of these works, and to explore the resultant artistic implications for the interpreter, analyst, and performer in the twenty-first century. While the creative consequences of the interaction between composers and performers formed the initial focus of this thesis, the investigation raised larger questions.

Two central questions drive the research in this thesis as a whole. The first central question is: what creative agency do I have as later performer of these works, and how is that agency

4 Recital 1: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k; Recital 2: https://youtu.be/XI3-L2dtJqY; Recital 3: https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhwo. Please note that these links are not public and should not be shared.
expressed? The second central question is: how does this research contribute to the reconsideration of the artistic role of the performer in the propagation of Western art music? From the first question flows a more specific consideration: as a later performer, one who was not involved in the initial creative act, what is my function in the creative evolution of the work? The second question interlinks with the research of Nicholas Cook, Christopher Small, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, and Eric Clarke and Mark Doffman, who re-examine the still-prevalent nineteenth-century perceptions in Western art music concerning the role of the performer. Beneath these questions lie others brought into focus by the methods of my research. These include: what are the consequences of the knowledge and meaning derived from this research for my own artistic engagement with the works as a creative practitioner? Further, drawing on the research of Henk Borgdorff, Hazel Smith, and Roger Dean, how does the understanding garnered from my investigation as a creative practitioner inform my scholarly findings? These questions and the focus on the creative agency of performers outside of the compositional process, clarify the position of this thesis, differentiating it from other recent creative practice research regarding collaborative creativity on the classical guitar.

In addressing these questions, this thesis utilises the concept of diachronic, distributed co-creativity to argue that the creative practice of interpretation and performance, when paired with analysis and reflexive critique, transcends repetition and is fundamental to the life and evolution of music. To focus these broader aims, the core of this project is centred on an investigation of the artistic interaction between Ponce and Segovia during the composition of the Folia Variations. Chapter 3, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 delve into the creative agency that these two musicians wielded in the creation of this work. These chapters aim to establish the different artistic perspectives they each brought to the collaboration, to examine the manifestations of their respective agencies, and to analyse the musical consequences. The interaction between Segovia and Ponce is expressed in the terms established by David Bakan.

---


7 Morgan Buckley, "Creative Performer Agency in the Collaborative Compositional Process" (Doctor of Philosophy, University of Cambridge, 2017).
of “agency” and “communion.” Bakan’s theories provide a framework for the categorisation and interpretation of the motivations that influenced Ponce and Segovia’s actions throughout their collaboration. Jennifer Torrence’s research helps to further situate the concept of agency within the discourse of relationships between composers and performers.

Understanding the creative agency of the two musicians at the heart of the *Folia Variations* is the gateway to discussions of my own creative agency as a performer of the work. Consciously considering my role in the interpretive process calls on the ideas of Cook, Leech-Wilkinson, Small, and Clarke et al, establishing a foundation for the investigation of performance as part of musical creativity distributed among many actors, and dispersed through time. Critically, the actions taken as part of this project are demonstrated to contribute directly to the evolving creative life of the work. The consideration of my own aesthetics, and how they interact with Ponce and Segovia’s, is integral to the findings of the investigation. In Chapter 6, these considerations are applied to other works for guitar that are the product of the interaction between composers and performers. This applies the core concepts and methods of my research in a broader context, showing their relevance to other creative interactions, from other time periods.

My investigation is conducted through creative practice research, musicological research, and musical analysis. Time spent with the guitar in hand, engaging with the works as an artist, contributes as much to the conclusions of this thesis as the musicological and analytical investigation conducted away from the instrument. This dual investigative approach calls on the notion of the “iterative cyclic web” of creative arts and research processes, devised by Hazel Smith and Roger T. Dean, which articulates the interchange of knowledge, information, and creativity between creative practice and academic research. This

---


11 Smith and Dean, *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts*, 19, 20.
combined approach, as both artist and researcher, shapes the output of this project: the communication of my findings can be found equally in the submitted recitals and this written thesis.

There are a number of conclusions deriving from this investigation that demonstrate the value of this research. The most detailed are the findings specifically concerning Ponce and Segovia’s relationship and the *Folia Variations*. This new research demonstrates that, indeed Ponce and Segovia did exert their personal and distinct aesthetic agencies during their collaboration, and critically that the product of this can be observed in the music. My investigations bring to light how the combined influences of Ponce and Segovia produce a work that exceeds their individual contributions. The merit in these findings is a deeper understanding of the artistic perspectives at play in the work, which leads to meaningful considerations for the interpretation and performance of the music.

Critically, this investigation demonstrates that, when informed by this type of research, there is significant scope for the expression of creative agency by later performers in the interpretation of musical works. It shows that this process is ongoing, and critical to the enduring life of music. This conclusion draws on Cook and others to reposition the performer more centrally in the process of music creation, and demonstrates performance as fundamental to informing critical research. This project goes beyond current similar research by demonstrating these concepts in action: providing substantiation of my findings by embodying them in performance. This type of investigation has not yet been widely applied to the understanding, interpretation, and performance of music for the classical guitar, and therefore brings more closely together what have until now been rather separate fields of musical enquiry.
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CHAPTER 1: CHARACTERS, CONTEXT, AND CONCEPTS

There are three central people whose histories, aesthetics, motivations, and actions shape the work that forms the focus of this study: Segovia, Ponce, and myself, Callum Henshaw (b. 1990). The lives and experiences of each of these musicians are crucial in understanding their interactions, artistic motivations, and musical practice, as they relate to the arguments put forward in this thesis. The Folia Variations forms the conceptual space through which we interact and relate. The following chapter introduces the historical foundations of this music, the history and aesthetic positions of these characters, and the concepts used to investigate them.

CHARACTERS

The Folia and The Folia Variations

Understanding the origins of the Folia, upon which the Folia Variations is based, illuminates its importance to Segovia as a theme, Ponce’s particular engagement with it as a composer, and my own treatment of it in performance. The term Folia refers to both melodic and harmonic sequences, which had roots in Portugal and later appeared in “Spanish sources at the end of the 15th century [becoming] an integral part of the Italian dance style from 1500 to 1650.”\(^1\) In these early forms, the Folia was “repeated, presumably, a number of times as the accompaniment for a dance or a song.”\(^2\) The melody and harmony took on several schemes, but were eventually codified in the seventeenth century into the forms utilised in the Folia Variations: the melody was codified as the “tone-series 7,” and the harmonic progression was codified as the “scheme V” chord progression.\(^3\)
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2 Ibid.
From the early fifteenth century, the Folia gradually gained greater practical usage in Western art music, notably by Arcangelo Corelli who will be discussed later in the thesis. It was later adopted by composers through to the twenty-first century, particularly for the theme and variations structure. The sheer quantity of variations on the Folia theme, composed over two-and-a-half centuries, firmly established the Folia in the Western art music canon. There are four other famous theme and variations written for guitar using the Folia theme: Folies D’España, Op. 15 (1810) by Fernando Sor, Variation sul Tema Della Follia di Spagna, Op. 45 (1811) by Mauro Giuliani, Variaciones Sombre un Tema de Sor, Op. 15 (1908) by Miguel Llobet, and finally, Manuel M. Ponce’s Variations sur “Folia de España” et Fugue (1932).

At approximately 26 minutes in length, Ponce’s Folia Variations comprises a theme, 20 variations and a concluding fugue, and is one of the most substantial compositions for solo guitar. Both Segovia and Ponce had significant creative input into the work, and a focus from

---

Figure 1.1: Folia tone-series 7.

Figure 1.2: Folia scheme V chord progression.
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7 Willi Apel, The Harvard Dictionary of Music (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969), 323. Apel lists the following notable examples: Folia variations were written by Farinelli [see Playford's The Division Violin 1685], D'Anglebert (for harpsichord, 1689 see TaAM vii, 122), A. Scarlatti (for harpsichord; see TaAM xi, 112), M. Marais (for viola da Gamba; Pièces de viole, 1681), J.P. Fortsche (in the opera Die Grossmächtige Thulestr, 1690), Corelli (for violin, op. no. 12, 1700), Keiser (overture to Der lärchliche Prinz Jodelt, 1726), J.S. Bach (Bairaktarid, 1742), K.P.E. Bach (for piano, 1778; see K. Von Fischer, in RBM vi, 206), Géry (in the opera L’Amant jaloux, 1768), Cherubini (overture to L’Hotel de portugaise, 1798), Liszt (Rhapsodie bespangle, 1863), Carl Nielsen (opera Maskarade, 1906), and Rachmaninoff (Variations on a Theme by Corelli, op. 42, 1932).
the outset was for it to showcase the large variety techniques, textures, and musical possibilities of the classical guitar. The 1932 Schott edition of Ponce’s *Folia Variations* is the first published edition of the work, and the main score-based source for this research.\(^9\) There is no edition of the work that is free from Segovia’s input, as Ponce’s original manuscripts were presumed lost during the Spanish Civil War.\(^10\)

*Manuel M. Ponce*

Ponce was a Mexican composer in the early twentieth century who, from around 1912, was at the forefront of musical and cultural life within Mexico. He composed extensively for the guitar between 1923 and 1948, and wrote a catalogue of original compositions for solo instruments, chamber ensembles, and orchestra. Born in 1882 in Fresnillo, Mexico, Ponce began his musical studies at a young age with his sister, Josefina. The young Ponce displayed talent as a pianist, and composer for the piano.\(^11\) He studied piano and harmony in Mexico City at the turn of the century before making his first of two journeys to Europe in 1904, studying with Cesare Dall’Olio, Luigi Torchi, and Martin Krause.\(^12\) Ponce faced criticism of his musical style when living in Europe: Marco Enrico Bossi refused to teach Ponce, and told him “your style is too old-fashioned; your music would have been up-to-date in 1830 but not in 1905. You have talent but have been improperly trained.”\(^13\) His music at this stage was diverse but conservative in style, linked aesthetically to the harmonic vocabulary of the nineteenth century.\(^14\) Musical nationalism became a focus for Ponce from 1913 to 1920, with the aim of modernising Mexican music within the formulas of European art music traditions.\(^15\) Between 1925 and 1932, Ponce studied in Paris with Paul Dukas, where his focus turned to the modernisation of his musical idiom. He made “greater use of chromaticism and tonal instability,” creating “a modern harmonic style of unresolved dissonances, with a
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\(^10\) Manuel M. Ponce, *Obra completa para guitarra de Manuel M. Ponce: De acuerdo a los manuscritos originales*, ed. Miguel Alcázar (Mexico: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes; Ediciones Étoile, S.A. de C.V., 2000), 199. The Schott edition is supplemented with this publication of Ponce’s complete guitar works which contains some background information on the work and some minor corrections to the notation.

\(^11\) David J. Nystel, "Harmonic Practice in the Guitar Music of Manuel M. Ponce" (Master of Arts, North Texas State University, 1985), 4.


\(^14\) Mark Dale, "The Ponce-Segovia Collaboration: Creating the Modern Guitar Repertory" (Doctor of Philosophy, Monash University, 2005), 2.

\(^15\) Ibid.
prevalence of clashing half-steps.”

It was also during this time that Ponce began his collaboration with Segovia. Ponce’s development as a composer had a significant bearing on his work on the *Folia Variations*, as well as his relationship with Segovia. An appreciable portion of Ponce’s compositional output was devoted to the guitar. It was a review Ponce wrote of a concert by Segovia in Mexico City in 1923 that first drew the two together.

To hear the notes of the guitar played by Andres [sic] Segovia is to experience a feeling of intimacy and the well-being of the domestic hearth; it is to evoke remote and tender emotions wrapped in the mysterious enchantment of things of the past … Andres Segovia is an intelligent and intrepid collaborator … His musical culture allows him to transmit faithfully through his instrument the composer’s thought.

Miguel Alcázar writes in the prologue of the *Segovia-Ponce Letters*:

Segovia became interested in knowing that critic who had known how to grasp the subtleties of the language of the guitar and, upon finding out that he was dealing with a distinguished composer, asked him to compose something for the instrument.

This relationship was to last more than a quarter of a century.

**Andrés Segovia**

Graham Wade and Gerard Garno have already compiled a comprehensive biography of Segovia in their books *A New Look at Segovia: His Life, His Music (Volumes 1 and 2)*. Several other accounts, such as John Duarte’s biography, and two films by Christopher Nupen, also help to paint a picture of the musician. There are, however, important aspects of Segovia’s life that shaped his interaction with Ponce in the creation of the *Folia Variations*. Born in 1893 in Linares, Spain, Segovia was a self-taught guitarist. He established himself as one of the premier performers of the early twentieth century. He performed globally as a touring musician from 1913 until his last concert in 1987, giving thousands of recitals, and recorded extensively, producing over 50 albums that form one of the most substantial contributions to

---


twentieth-century guitar music. Segovia’s stature in the context of guitar throughout the twentieth century, referred to by some as “a living legend,” accorded him a significant position of high social power within musical collaborative relationships. Segovia’s impact on the classical guitar was substantial: he re-envisioned the guitar as a concert instrument, revitalised its playing techniques, and created a substantial new repertoire.

Segovia’s personal vision for the guitar was of particular consequence for his involvement with the Folia Variations and Ponce. Throughout his life, he strove towards a conscious and curated redefinition of the classical guitar in Western art music. In his autobiography he recounts his determination to create a lasting, substantial repertoire for the instrument, commissioned from renowned composers of the day. Duarte lists Segovia’s specific objectives:

To rescue the guitar from its folk-musical, strumming image, to demonstrate its virtues by means of his concert tours, placing it alongside the piano, violin and other ‘established’ instruments … and to create a substantial, original repertory for it, by collaborating with notable composers.

In much the same way as Ponce had individual artistic goals, Segovia developed his own artistic principles. In an acceptance speech given in 1969 for an honorary doctorate from Florida State University, Segovia outlined what he perceived was necessary to establish the guitar within the Western art music canon, described as his “five purposes.”

1) to extract the guitar from noisy and disreputable folkloric amusements… Listening to the persuasive voice of the guitar, I said to myself, 'how is it possible that such a beautiful instrument has no serious music composed for it?' My friends came to my rescue by helping me to find the kind of music that I was looking for;
2) I requested the living serious composers not in the field of the guitar to write for me. This was the second of my purposes: to create a wonderful repertoire for my instrument;
3) My third purpose was to make the guitar known by the philharmonic public all over the world;
4) Another, and fourth purpose, has been to provide a unifying medium for those

24 Duarte, Andrés Segovia, as I knew him, 117.
interested in the development of the guitar. This I did through the support of the now well-known musicological journal *Guitar Review*, developed by Vladimir Bobri; 5) I am still working on my fifth and maybe last purpose, which is to place the guitar in the most important conservatories of the world for teaching the young lovers of it, and thus securing its future.25

Segovia’s purposes reflect his specific aesthetic preferences. They show his desire to refocus away from the guitar’s folk-music past in favour of a European tradition he perceived to be of more historical and cultural worth, toward what he termed “serious music.” Notable composers with whom he worked include Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco, Federico Moreno-Torroba, Federico Mompou, Joaquín Rodrigo, Alexandre Tansman and Joaquin Turina. It is, however, his relationship and collaboration with Ponce that was the most prolific and, by Segovia’s own declaration, the most significant.26

**Callum Henshaw**

The final person in this discussion is me, Callum Henshaw, the author of this thesis, and performer of the works discussed. In the same way Ponce and Segovia brought to their collaboration a series of aesthetic parameters, historical influences, and pre-defined objectives, I too bring my own aesthetics, technical preferences, and goals to my engagement with the *Folia Variations*, and to my analysis of the collaboration. As a musician in this discussion, I embody the role of the later performer, one who was not directly involved in the composition of the work, but who nevertheless plays a creative part in its evolution.

I am an Australian guitarist and researcher, born in 1990, who started playing and performing at a young age. In 2013, I completed a bachelor’s degree in music with Honours at the Australian National University under Timothy Kain, who remains my teacher and mentor. I have won several national and international music competitions as a performer, and toured extensively in Australia and overseas.27 My interests lie in the performance of guitar music from a wide range of Western art music, from the music of John Dowland, Domenico Scarlatti, and J. S. Bach, through to the contemporary music of Nigel Westlake, Leo Brouwer, and Graeme Koehne. As a performer, my aesthetic aims are governed by the desire to present

26 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 78.
performances that contain music from these diverse eras and styles in a manner that creates a programme that is intellectually stimulating to me from a practice-based research perspective, challenges my technical abilities, and pleases an audience. I couple this with an academic interest in how repertoire is, and has been, created for guitar, focussing specifically on the role of performers in that process. I pair creative practice research with discussion and analysis to produce insights and contributions to the life of the music with which I engage. My interests have been strongly influenced by my long association with Kain and his involvement in the creation of new, primarily Australian, repertoire for the guitar. Kain has a significant history working collaboratively with Australian composers to create new guitar music, including Nigel Westlake, Robert Davidson, Ross Edwards, and Martin Wesley-Smith.

My role in this study is influenced by my position in time, historically removed from Segovia and Ponce. This affords me a temporally distant frame of reference on the creation of the Folia Variations, one that takes into account its full development from an outsider’s perspective. By the same token, my inherently subjective, personal aesthetic aims, and unconscious limitations, directly affect my engagement with both the Folia Variations themselves, as well as with Ponce and Segovia. Throughout this thesis, I will examine the ways in which my actions as an analyst, interpreter, and performer, who brings a different perspective to Ponce and Segovia, function as part of the development of the work through time.
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28 It must be acknowledged that the instrument on which I perform has some differences to that which was used by Segovia, particularly pre-World War II. Firstly, my guitar is lattice-braced, giving it more volume and projection to fill modern concert venues. Secondly, my guitar uses nylon strings, a development that was readily embraced by Segovia. While an examination of these organological differences might yield interesting results, it is beyond the scope of this thesis.
Context

The Performer as Co-creator

The experience of live or recorded performance is a primary form of music’s existence, not just the reflection of a notated note. And performers make an indispensable contribution to the culture of creative practice that is music.

- Nicholas Cook, 2013 29

A core aspect of this thesis rests on the understanding that my actions as a performer, interpreter, and analyst form part of the evolution and creative discourse that constitutes a musical work, particularly as it is embodied in sound. The concept of performance as a primary expression of music has its foundations in the arguments of Cook in *Beyond the Score*. Cook makes a significant contribution to the notion that “the work” can be centred on the act of performance and the creative interactions surrounding performance, as opposed to centring on the graphical representation of music in the score. He argues for the conception of performance as an essential, intrinsic component of music, writing that “creative practice [is] not just based on, but made out of human actions and interactions … Music subsists in the collaborative action of people playing and working together, so that performances can be thought of as complex social interactions.”30 Cook goes on to clarify, arguing that the meaning of music can be seen as best inhering “in [the] continuously evolving tradition of performance ... it is performers who function as the principal motors of musical culture.”31

Cook contends that performers, their creative input through practice, and the sonification of meaning in performance, make a principal contribution to the ongoing understanding and interaction that constitutes a musical work, departing from the historical focus on the score as the main representation of the work. Small makes a similar argument using his term “musicking,” which positions performance as a collaborative, interpersonal process:

The act of musicking establishes … a set of relationships, and it is in those relationships that the meaning of the act lies. They are to be found not only between those organized sounds which are conventionally thought of as being the stuff of

30 Ibid., 1, 2, 3.
31 Ibid., 175.
musical meaning but also between the people who are taking part, in whatever capacity, in the performance.\textsuperscript{32}

Small thereby establishes performance as an act of creation and meaning generation that is, by its nature, an interpersonally connected one. These interactions need not be constrained to people in the same space or time. Elisabeth Le Guin argues that the “complex layering of interpretations that builds up around any work of art … constitutes the nourishment it must have in order to survive.”\textsuperscript{33} This perspective has its origins in German philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer’s \textit{Wirkungsgeschichte}, the history of something’s influence.\textsuperscript{34} Gadamer’s ideas are put into the context of the discourse on creative research in the arts by Borgdorff, who writes:

The fundamental ambiguity of art works renders interpretation an unfinished process in which the interpreter and the interpreted temporarily melt together in ever-receding interpretative horizons. This ‘effective history’ (\textit{Wirkungsgeschichte}) … enables the productive interpretation of art research to generate new meanings.\textsuperscript{35}

Borgdorff and Small’s ideas conceptualise the meaning of music as inhering in the relationships and interpretations built around it in a continuing, diachronic process, while Cook’s conception places performance at the centre of this. These theories acknowledge musical creation as extending through history, from a work’s original creators through to the future. They position music as existing as “an unlimited number of instantiations, all on the same ‘horizontal’ plane” instead of as a “single work located ‘vertically’ in relation to its performances.”\textsuperscript{36} This ties to Gadamer’s \textit{Horizontverschmelzung}, which describes understanding as ongoing, and that it “involves a process of mediation and dialogue” between the familiar and the new.\textsuperscript{37} A counterpart to this conception of music is the idea of distributed creativity, where a musical work can be seen as the consequence of the creative contribution of many creative agents.\textsuperscript{38} With its roots in distributed cognition and its promulgation through recent musical performance studies, this concept is part of a fundamental reassessment of the notion

\textsuperscript{32} Small, \textit{Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening}, 13.
\textsuperscript{35} Borgdorff, “The Debate on Research in the Arts,” 11.
\textsuperscript{38} Cook, \textit{Music as Creative Practice: Studies in Musical Performance as Creative Practice}, 65, 66.
that performance is a simple reproduction of the creativity embedded by a composer in the score. That is, in the words of Eric Clarke et al, that

musicians do not make manifest a preconceived idea, whether novel or not, but join with and follow the forces and flows of material that bring music into being. Their musicking invites listeners to join them as fellow travellers, to listen with the music as it unfolds in the world, rather than searching behind it for an originating intention of which it is the final product.

This concept is powerful in that it allows a shift in perspective on artistic agency in the process of musical creation to give a more equal status to the actions of performers. It is important to note, however, that this does not correspond to distributed authorship. Nicolas Donin observes that, “opposed as these notions might seem at first sight, single authorship and distributed creativity seem to work together.” He continues to clarify that “although the attitude that ‘everything creative comes from the composer’ is false and misleading, the opposite stance (for instance, that ‘the composer unduly takes credit for the creative work of others’) is little better.” The important distinction for this research, therefore, is that “intertwined creativities” can be distributed among many artistic participants, but that this nevertheless functions within the division of labour inherited from Western art music traditions. In Donin’s words, “each agent in the project contribute[s] in some way to virtually every plane of the creative endeavour, but to different degrees, and in different ways.” Cook posits that the creative life of a work “takes place over years and even centuries,” and that “the distribution of creativity across the living and the dead is the normal condition of classical music.” He argues that modern performances can therefore affect composers’ images, and for that reason “dead composers are influenced by modern performers, and so the relationship between them and their performers is one of collaboration after all.” Within the context of this study, this has the purpose of reframing both the
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40 Clarke, Doffman, and Lim, “Distributed Creativity and Ecological Dynamics: A Case Study of Liza Lim’s ‘Tongue of the Invisible’,” 663.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., 86. [italics in original]
45 Ibid.
46 Cook, Music as Creative Practice: Studies in Musical Performance as Creative Practice, 65.
47 Ibid., 65, 66. [italics in original]
contribution I am able to bring to a work through performance and research, and the way in which that contribution is expressed. Leech-Wilkinson articulates this succinctly, stating that “performance is a collaboration between composer and performer, a negotiation between what the composer put down and what the performer wants to make of it. Performer and composer are therefore on a much more equal footing than musicology has supposed.” A similar sentiment is echoed by Torrence, who writes that, “through modes of collaboration that recast performers outside their traditional roles one is able to imagine manifold becomings of the performer as co-creative artist exhibiting agency including and beyond the realms of a score and its interpretations.” The research of these authors supports the argument that my creative agency, manifested in this project through the interpretation, analysis, and performance of works, forms a significant part of the life of those works, in a process of artistic interaction with the composers and performers who brought them into being.

Morgan Buckley’s research also challenges perceptions surrounding the distribution of creativity between composers and performers. His dissertation considers the agency of the performer in the collaborative composition of present-day guitar works. Buckley notes, both through participation in first-hand collaboration with composers and the observation of contemporary collaborations, that “in addition to the performer’s authority due to their knowledge of the repertoire, they were also the authority on technical matters of the idiom.” Buckley goes on to note, in a similar vein to Donin above, that “although authority resided ultimately with the composer, it was shared with the performer in most aspects of the writing process.” The actions by the performers in Buckley’s study highlight the distribution of creative agency. These “interventions,” in Buckley’s terms, ranged from

requests to review sections, reduce or remove sections; requests to simplify difficulty or unsuccessful complexity; changes in dynamics and articulation, sometimes in conjunction with recommendation on tessitura and compass; clarification of performance directions; tempo and use of rubato; and issues surrounding sustain.

49 Torrence, "Rethinking the Performer: Towards a Devising Performance Practice," 9.
51 Ibid., 21.
52 Ibid., 170.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
Many of these same considerations will be discussed with relation to the *Folia Variations* and other works from the guitar repertoire. Buckley notes, however, the impact “that the collaborating performer might have on future interpretive performances of the works, which are considered a creative output of the shared creative process, has not been assessed by the research strategy.”\(^{55}\) This thesis, therefore, builds on Buckley’s research by considering aspects of distributed creativity at the genesis of a work, but makes a significant contribution by extending this discussion to incorporate the creative agency of performers beyond that point.

Utilising this combination of perspectives, I have come to understand the contribution of my creative acts as a performer, interpreter, and analyst as a process of diachronic, distributed, co-creativity. My artistic agency forms part of a continual evolutionary process (diachronic), that involves the layered creative input of many actors across time (distributed), and through these actions, I become an agent of creation, contributing a layer to the creative substance of the work (co-creativity). In theorising music as a co-creative act that lives in performance, each creative engagement produces meaning, understanding, and art, rather than repeating it.\(^{56}\) This idea challenges the more traditional perspective seen in Western art music, which continues to project an image in which the composer takes pride of place in the creative process indeed is often represented as the sole source of genuine creativity with performers, conductors, and record producers (among many others) relegated to supporting roles, or seen in the guise of ‘realizers’ of a composer’s creative imagination, as embodied in the written score.\(^{57}\)

A repositioned conception of what constitutes the musical work, placing more emphasis on its embodiment in sound than its representation on the page, acts as a step towards narrowing the divide built between composers and performers, and deconstructing this hierarchical assemblage.\(^{58}\) Within the context of this thesis, the creative collaboration and interactions between Segovia and Ponce are a focus and reference point for my own understanding and interpretation of the *Folia Variations*. My process thereby, in the words of Cook, “approaches ethnomusicology, except that the distance to be bridged is in time rather than in space.”\(^{59}\) By

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 188.

\(^{56}\) Cook, *Beyond the Score: Music as Performance*, 7.

\(^{57}\) Clarke, Doffman, and Lim, “Distributed Creativity and Ecological Dynamics: A Case Study of Liza Lim’s ‘Tongue of the Invisible’,” 628.


\(^{59}\) Cook, *Beyond the Score: Music as Performance*, 255.
dissecting the interpersonal relationship between Ponce and Segovia, I place myself into creative interaction with the pair, and from this I generate new meanings and interpretations.

The Composer, the Virtuoso, and “The Work”

Segovia and Ponce operated in specific and specialist roles: the composer and the performer. These separate roles were at that point, however, a historically recent development. As mentioned in the introduction, in Western concert music traditions prior to the nineteenth century “there was much less differentiation between the identities and respective roles of composers and performers.” The growing distinction between roles was influenced by a succession of social, economic, and ideological changes which occurred during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century. Enlightened thinking, with its emphasis on “free intellect,” the “dissemination of knowledge — and with it, of freedom and individual empowerment,” factored in the increased importance placed on the expression of the individual, and brought about the upheaval of entrenched systems of employment. This changing economic and social landscape was tied to the emergence of the bourgeois class: a middle class with discretionary income. The bourgeoisie were central in creation of this new marketplace where aristocratic patronage was no longer the primary mode of employment for musicians. This brought about altered musical demands, in that a musician’s employment was determined by their ability to appeal to the concert-going mass market. Appeal “was accorded, at least in theory, not to wealth, not to birth, but to persuasiveness: and persuasion, ideally, flowed from expertise.”

Virtuosi, musicians who possessed “the ability to astonish as well as move,” exploited this bourgeois market. Initially, the predominant mode of virtuosity employed by these

63 Metzner, Crescendo of the Virtuoso: Spectacle, Skill, and Self-promotion in Paris During the Age of Revolution, 5.
64 Katherine Rebecca Carter Altizer, "From the Courts to the Marketplace: The Evolution of Viennese Musical Patronage, c. 1740-c. 1831" (Master of Music in Music History, West Virginia University, 2009), 1.
66 Ibid., 251.
entrepreneurs was by displays of technical prowess and showmanship, creating a “fire-storm of popular demand for music they advertised as ‘brilliant but not difficult’, music which piqued the ear but made no demands upon the mind. Facile virtuosity was the order of the day.”67 Carl Dahlhaus attributes the mass market as a significant factor in the emergence of the solo virtuoso. Within his exploration of large-scale nineteenth-century developments, lies an astute observation regarding the appraisal by critics of virtuosi, and how this factored in interpretation itself evolving to become an art form:

Around the mid[nineteenth]-century, the primacy of virtuosity was gradually undermined by the principle of interpretation, thus causing music critics, if haltingly at first, to judge virtuosity by the criteria of interpretation, rather than vice versa. This development was apparently linked to a change in the intellectual climate of the times.68 This shift, from the assessment of technical virtuosity to instead focussing on the critical judgement of interpretational virtuosity, contributed to the rise of the interpreter: a musician who existed without the necessity to compose or impress with showmanship. The change in aesthetic priorities towards reverence for musical interpretation along with the emergence of the interpreter-performer became a core of Western European musical culture. As explored later in this thesis, these changes were fundamental in shaping the aesthetics, perspective, and actions of Segovia in his interactions with Ponce.

These conditions during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, led to a museum-like reverence for the works of past composers, a pervasive attitude which continues to guide the musical culture of performance and composition in Western art music traditions.69 The idea of a “perfect” musical work emerged during the early decades of the nineteenth century, and with it the idea that “the work” lived not in sounded performance in the present, but in the text, or musical score, of the past.70 These musical “texts” stood “on par with literature and the visual arts.”71 Within this culture, Lydia Goehr details how “performances and their performers were respectively subservient to works and their composers,” and consequently defines the concept of Werktreue as synonymous with Texttreue: “to be true to a work is to be

71 Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-century Music, 9.
true to its score.”

Composers, too, focussed on the demonstration of an historical awareness within their music, consciously placing themselves within a lineage, whilst actively constructing it. Bruce Haynes articulates this chronocentrism as “the norm until well into the twentieth century (and still is in many conservatories), [with] musicians honoring their historical lineage and believing they were preserving a style of interpretation that formed an unbroken chain of authority and orthodoxy.”

It was these actions that created an “immutable repertory that alone can validate contemporary composers with its authority.”

Werktreue and chronocentrism also influenced concert programming, the genesis of which can be seen in the suggestions of Johann Nikolaus Forkel, who in 1802 wrote that “the most efficacious means of preserving in lasting vigour musical works of art is undoubtedly the public execution of them before a numerous audience.” Similarly, as Goehr observes, Franz Liszt advocated for the preservation of music in the same vein as fine art. In 1835 Liszt stated:

In the name of all musicians, of art, and of social progress, we require: … the foundation of an assembly to be held every five years for religious, dramatic, and symphonic music, by which all the works that are considered best in these three categories shall be ceremonially performed every day for a whole month in the Louvre, being afterwards purchased by the government, and published at their expense.

Consequently, through the latter half of the nineteenth century, three quarters of the music performed was by dead composers. Richard Taruskin notes that composers active at this time “had a powerful ‘counterhistorical’ incentive to become their elders’ epigones. The concert hall had effectively become a museum, and so it has remained to the present day.”

This reverence for the past is perhaps evinced most clearly by the mid nineteenth-century revival of the music of J. S. Bach. As Christian Wolff states:
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[J. S. Bach’s] music, because it represented the idea of musical perfection in such a striking and paradigmatic way, became the model for an ideal very early on ... Bach’s solo works for violin [were] ... perhaps the greatest example in any art form of a master’s ability to move with freedom and assurance.  

Within the oeuvre of J. S. Bach, it is his Chaconne from the Partita in D minor BWV 1004, which has received the most attention from later composers. Johannes Brahms wrote:

Using the technique adapted to a small instrument the man [J. S. Bach] writes a whole world of the deepest thought and most powerful feeling. If I could picture myself writing, or even conceiving, such a piece, I am certain that the extreme excitement and emotional tension would have driven me mad.

Nineteenth-century ideologies, therefore, were responsible for two important developments in Western musical culture: the rise of the solo, virtuoso interpreter-performer, and the idealisation and repetition of works of the past.

With this also came what Dahlhaus terms the “twin musical cultures” of the nineteenth century, with the figureheads of Ludwig van Beethoven and Gioachino Rossini. Dahlhaus positions them as representative of conflicting aesthetics. At one pole rests Beethoven’s instrumental music and musical ideology, which Dahlhaus argues is representative of music that was intellectually developed to be art and fixed in the score. At the other pole, he situates Rossini’s operatic compositions, as representative of music centred on performative entertainment. Dahlhaus encapsulates the lasting historical lineage left by these two musical cultures, stating that “the virtuosity of Paganini and Liszt was nourished on Rossini’s notion of music, Wagner’s music dramas on the aesthetic premises of Beethoven.” He further distils the aesthetic tension of the two worlds, writing that, “in a word, one musical culture which sees the essence of music in melody—the ‘inspiration’—confronts another dominated by the role of function—the idea that the crucial aesthetic factor is not the initial substrate but rather its subsequent development.” That is, a confrontation exists between the notions that the attraction of immediate aesthetic appeal precludes artistic substance, and that cerebral compositional development precludes musical appeal.
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This history provides the necessary economic, ideological, aesthetic, and social context that shaped the collaboration between Ponce and Segovia. Ponce and Segovia matured within a musical world where it was becoming accepted for composers only to compose and for performers only to perform. Ponce functioned within a musical marketplace based on dissemination to an indirect mass market, and relied on performers to make his works known. Segovia, somewhat conflictingly embodied aesthetic preferences from both poles of Dahlhaus’s twin musical cultures. He held a deep regard for the musical canon, the musical work in the Werktreue sense, and the desire for music that satisfied a high-art, intellectually focussed concept. Simultaneously, however, Segovia strove for success before a wide audience through virtuosic prowess. The culture of virtuoso performers, and Segovia’s relative fame as a performer in comparison to Ponce as a composer, gave him significant power within their relationship. As a twenty-first century scholar and performer, the historical developments of a musical marketplace and musical ideologies have influenced my own aesthetics and the way that I interact with Ponce, Segovia, and the Folia Variations. Developing as a musician some 80 years later, I have also found the distinction between the roles of the performer and composer as the standard. I too am subject to a mass-market musical economy, in which the performances that I give must appeal to a paying audience. These concerts can also be perceived as situated in, and contributing to the museum culture of music, perhaps most pointedly my performances of the Folia Variations, a work written by a dead composer 60 years before I was born. I, however, aim to bring a new understanding to my place within this inherited culture.

By repositioning my activities as co-creative, I take on a productive role in the evolution of each work that moves beyond repetition, and re-positions what constitutes the work, placing more emphasis on its embodiment in sound, and the social interactions that surround performance. This thesis, both in its written and creative forms, is therefore a contribution towards the realignment of what we call “musical works,” taking them to be the product of a “process of collaboration between composers and performers, and indeed critics and musicologists … such collaborations can extend over centuries, during which time works accrue new meanings as well as losing old ones.”85 In doing so, I take a critical perspective on the perpetuation of museum culture, and my place within it. Rather than seeing my output as
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looking back into museum culture, it becomes, in the words of Leech-Wilkinson an event in which I “create the work in partnership with musicians from the past.”

CONCEPTS

*Practice-based Research*

My performances along with this written study constitute the complete thesis, and are to be taken as an interwoven whole. The two outputs necessitated their own methods of research. Creative practice forms central method of inquiry utilised to gain an understanding of the practice and performance of works from the classical guitar repertoire. This calls on the concepts of practice-based research, procedural knowledge, and embodied meaning. Textual and musical analysis contributes to the understanding and interpretation of the interpersonal relationships in the study. This takes the form of the qualitative analysis of letters and the investigation of musical scores using rhythmic, harmonic, melodic, and aural analysis.

The style of practice-based research conducted in this thesis is well articulated by Henk Borgdorff, who terms it “research in the arts”:

> Research in the arts … concerns research that does not assume the separation of subject and object, and does not observe a distance between the research and the practice of art. Instead, the artistic practice itself is an essential component of both the research process and research results. This approach is based on the understanding that no fundamental separation exists between theory and practice in the arts. After all, there are no art practices that are not saturated with experiences, histories and beliefs; and conversely there is no theoretical access to, or interpretation of, art practice that does not partially shape that practice into what it is. Concepts and theories, experiences and understandings are interwoven with art practices and, partly for this reason, art is always reflexive. Research in the arts hence seeks to articulate some of this embodied knowledge through the creative process and in the art object.

The merits of practice-based research are also noted by Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt, who write:

> The innovative and critical potential of practice-based research lies in its capacity to generate personally situated knowledge and new ways of modelling and externalising

---
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such knowledge while at the same time, revealing philosophical, social and cultural contexts for the critical intervention and application of knowledge outcomes.\textsuperscript{88}

As a component of practice-based research, procedural knowledge, available through the creative engagement with musical works in practice, provides a fundamental element to their understanding. Graeme Sullivan states that meaning can be generated through experiences that are felt, lived, reconstructed, and reinterpreted.\textsuperscript{89} That is, by interacting physically with a work, through practice, interpretation, and performance, certain knowledge and understanding can be formulated that is not available through other methods of enquiry. Another way of framing this practical understanding is termed embodied knowledge.\textsuperscript{90} Mark Johnson’s research provides a philosophical and cognitive framework that connects embodied knowledge to practice-based research.\textsuperscript{91} He proposes that the body, as the mind’s connection to the spatiotemporal world, is pivotal in the structuring of meaning through image schema.\textsuperscript{92} Le Guin explores embodied, practice-based research with a focus on the music of Luigi Boccherini, with whom she positions herself in an active, reciprocal, and physical relationship.\textsuperscript{93} While my study does not take the concept as far as Le Guin’s, her argument that it is possible to orient oneself in artistic interaction with musicians of the past through a creative, instrumental engagement with their music, is nevertheless central to my thesis. As she says, this relationship “can and should be a primary source of knowledge about the performed work of art.”\textsuperscript{94} Embodied knowledge, therefore, articulates how the body is the site for uncovering and creating meaning. The body is also a medium through which that knowledge is displayed and communicated.

A fundamental aspect of my research process is the concurrent utilisation of, and connection between, practice-based research and musicological research methods. Smith and Dean’s “iterative cyclic web” is a methodological model which articulates this interaction.\textsuperscript{95} It demonstrates that creative research processes can begin either with artistic exploration or critical investigation, that movement between these procedures is not unidirectional, and that
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processes may often be repeated several times before continuing. For this project, performance serves as a fundamental mode of communicating research findings. As Charles Fisk states: “a performer’s analysis, no matter what conceptualizations it might explicitly draw upon, must both arise from and resolve itself in that performer’s technique as an embodiment of his or her musical imagination.”96 The connection between my practice-based research and my musicological research aligns my process and output with what Jillian Hamilton and Luke Jaaniste term a dual oriented, connective model of creative research.97 In their words, this “allows the researcher to both situate their creative practice within a trajectory of research and do justice to its personally invested poetics. [This model] perform[s] the important function of connecting the practice and creative work to a wider emergent field.”98 The creative and analytical activities of this project, therefore, are placed on equal terms. In much the same way as my practice, interpretation, and performance are a fundamental component of my research process, my analytical engagement also functions as a style of interpretation. Le Guin articulates this parallel, saying that “performance and analysis [are] two faces of interpretation, an act which is both art and science.”99

Borgdorff’s concept of “research on music” forms the cornerstone of the musicological analysis in this thesis. Research on music involves “investigations aimed at drawing valid conclusions about art practice from a theoretical distance.”100 This is a fundamental component of the critical appraisal of the relationship between Ponce and Segovia, and the relationship’s consequences for the composition of the *Folia Variations*. The findings from this research inform the decisions I make in my creative engagement with the work. There are two further aspects to my musicological research: the interpretation of primary and secondary historical sources, and musical analysis. As mentioned above, an important primary source is the published edition of the score. This source offers a window into the musical results of the collaboration between Segovia and Ponce. The letters written from Segovia to Ponce during their collaboration are a vital primary source in addition to the score. These
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letters provide valuable illumination of their creative process, interpersonal relationship, and the development of the *Folia Variations*.

Practice-based inquiry, therefore, forms a fundamental component of my research process, while creative practice and practice-based research serve as pivotal sources of knowledge. Within the context of this thesis, these modes of inquiry are directed towards a deeper consideration of the work’s evolution through understanding the interpersonal climate within which it was composed. From this, I draw conclusions regarding the analysis, interpretation, and performance of works, and new understandings of my role as a co-creative actor in their evolution. Through these methods, this thesis demonstrates ways in which my practice and research generates new interpretive resources for future performers, and provides further interpretive insight into the musical consequences of Ponce and Segovia’s collaboration.

**Reflexive Critique**

An intrinsic aspect of my practice-based research is reflexive critique, a form of analysis that carries with it inherent subjectivity. As a researcher, I have my own personal aesthetics, history, education, and biases. The presentation of my findings requires me to explore these and maintain accountability for them.

Borgdorff presents the concept of “interpretive perspective,” in which the knowledge and understanding of artistic practices is derived from critical reflection, and that this critique forms a part of academic accountability.\(^{101}\) This idea of reflexive critique, where we become “aware of our own perceptual biases,” combines with Richard Winter’s position that no analysis will be final or complete, because inquiry will take the form of questioning claims, rather than making claims. The result of inquiry will thus take the form of a dialogue between writers and readers concerning possible interpretations of experience, rather than a single interpretation thrust upon a passive reader by a writer expressing certainty. This process of questioning claims provides a dimension of validity.\(^{102}\)


David Schön describes this as “reflection on action,” a process that explores the meanings and understandings that have been brought to practice or research, both “in the relative tranquility of a postmortem” or while in the midst of the activity.103

My research has commonalities with autoethnography, through the inclusion of personal experience in the research and the use of analytic reflexivity.104 Autoethnographic research methods require, in Dwayne Custers’ words, “that we observe ourselves observing, that we interrogate what we think and believe, and that we challenge our own assumptions.”105 My approach emphasises the procedural aspects of research involving reflexivity. It does not, however, use the autoethnographic techniques of “layered account” such as vignettes or evocative descriptions.106 Leon Anderson’s perspective on autoethnography provides a useful method for the reflexive investigation conducted in this thesis, and has been utilised in other creative practice theses.107 Anderson avoids the prevalence of “evocative autoethnography,” which adopts a literary and emotional narrative voice.108 Instead, his approach, “analytic autoethnography,” has closer ties to structured analysis. It applies to research in which the researcher is “(1) a full member in the research group or setting, (2) visible as such a member in the researcher’s published texts, and (3) committed to an analytic research agenda focused on improving theoretical understandings of broader social phenomena.”109

Every aspect of my autoethnographic research conforms to Anderson’s definition of analytical autoethnography. Firstly, I am a “complete member of the social world under study.”110 I am an active participant in the creation of the music I am studying. My research documents, analyses, and demonstrates purposeful engagement, and records the events, conversations, and output of the research in performance and in writing. I am part of the formation and reformation of the music and concepts that I study.111 Secondly, as a researcher, I have ensured that I am visible within the text. In my creative practice, this is self-evident: I am the solo performer of the works. Within the written component of my research, I make myself
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visible in the critical interrogation of my creative practice and in my interpretive analysis of the works. I use my own experiences to illustrate analytical insights, and pair them with the experiences and thoughts of others, such as those of Segovia, Ponce, or Kain. Further, I discuss my changing beliefs and relationships that emerge throughout the course of research.\textsuperscript{112} My visibility is exhibited most strongly in my role as a co-creator in the continuing growth of the musical works with which I engage. My reflexivity demonstrates what Anderson describes as a “self-conscious introspection guided by a desire to better understand both self and others through examining one’s actions and perceptions in reference to and dialogue with those of others.”\textsuperscript{113} Through this type of critical reflection, I generate new understandings about the works and characters of my study, while my own place in history and personal style play a role in shaping the identity of the works with which I engage.\textsuperscript{114} This leads, lastly, to my analytical agenda. By establishing the performer as a co-creator, I reflect on and act to change the broader social perceptions that surround the investigation and performance of music. Analytical autoethnography meshes well with Smith and Dean’s iterative cyclic web to unite my scholarly and creative activities, in that it requires the researcher to engage in a “spiralling refinement, elaboration, extension, and revision of theoretical understanding.”\textsuperscript{115}

In practical terms, self-reflection involves the recognition and critical awareness of my own personal context, predispositions, and aims, making them open to the reader, something which has already occurred in the section of this chapter outlining my role as a central member of the research. Through the course of the thesis, my preferences are acknowledged when they are active in my interpretive and analytic practice. This can take the form of highlighting my predispositions, such as a tendency towards a particular right-hand technique, or to interpret the tempo of a work in a certain way. More critically, it takes the form of my inclination to view music from a guitarist’s perspective, preferencing execution in a live setting coupled with a mindfulness of audience appeal. This gives me a more innate understanding of Segovia’s perspective within the collaboration than Ponce’s.
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Composers and Performers

Composers have long tailored their music to suit specific performers. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart composed the aria “O, wie will ich triumphieren” for Ludwig Fischer’s character Osmin in Die Entführung aus dem Serail. Mozart wrote, “in working out the aria I have ... allowed Fischer's beautiful deep notes to glow.”

In a similar vein, Beethoven composed for the specific capabilities of individual instrumentalists. For example, Ignaz Manker’s adroit tuning abilities allowed for Beethoven to compose more innovative timpani parts in Leonore, taking “advantage of the fact that Manker could tune to notes other than tonic and dominant, and [scoring] a tritone for the two drums.”

There are further historical precedents of performers contributing to the compositional process through their instrumental expertise. Both Clive Brown and Boris Schwarz describe the creative relationship between violinist Joseph Joachim and composer Brahms as one based on mutual musical respect and aesthetics. Brown discusses how Brahms tailored aspects of his violin compositions to suit Joachim’s tone production and instrumental technique. From the other perspective, by analysing letters between the pair, Schwarz uncovers Joachim’s advice to Brahms, regarding his violin concerto in D major, Op. 77, on compositional and technical considerations. In March, 1879, Joachim wrote:

I want to send you the score to Frankfurt and insert white slips of paper wherever I think that, in order to make it comfortable for the soloist, the accompaniment could be made thinner, whether by leaving out the double basses, or by using short notes rather than sustained ones in the strings or wind.

These relationships between composers and particular performers are examples of the significance these collaborations have had in historical contexts, while the correspondence
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between Joachim and Brahms has parallels to the process of collaboration that will be discussed in relation to Ponce and Segovia.

The guitar has comparatively brief history in relation to other classical instruments such as the violin or piano. Prior to Segovia’s influence, the repertoire was composed largely by guitarist-composers. The great icons of this era include Fernando Sor (1788-1839), Dionisio Aguado (1784-1849), Ferdinando Carulli (1770-1841), Matteo Carcassi (1792-1853), Mauro Giuliani (1781-1829), Luigi Legnani (1790-1877), Giulio Regondi (1822-1872), Napoléon Coste (1805-1883), and Johann Kaspar Mertz (1806-1856). Later, the guitarist-composers Francisco Tárrega (1852-1909), Miguel Llobet (1878-1938) and Emilio Pujol (1886-1980), continued the tradition of composing and performing their own music. Many of the technological developments that helped to develop the modern instrument were the innovations of Antonio Torres in the 1850s. During this time, Tárrega began to broaden the repertoire of the guitar through transcriptions, primarily of nineteenth-century works, a practice Segovia continued. Nevertheless, it was during the early twentieth century that non-guitarist composers began to write music for the instrument. The first works are believed to be Mozartiana (1903) by Eduardo Fabini (1882-1950), and Variazioni (1900-1910) composed by Ottorino Respighi (1879-1936). As Márlou Vieira notes, however, the 1920 work Hommage pour le tombeau de Debussy by Manuel De Falla (1876-1946) was the first to significantly impact the repertoire.

The products of collaborations between composers and performers are abundant in the repertoire. This is partly due to the technique required, which is not necessarily transparent. In this regard, composing for the guitar warrants practical knowledge of the instrument either on the part of the composer or an instrumental collaborator. A letter from Segovia to Ponce in December 1940 highlights both the difficulty of guitar technique, as well as the role Segovia saw himself playing as an instrumentalist in the compositional process:

The guitar is an instrument of capricious and illogical technique, which theoretical possession no one, not even I myself, can boast of. Throughout all your guitar production, you have had to change entire sections of works already finished do you remember? And my suggestions have always been to give greater instrumental fluency to your compositions, to place them on the guitar like they belong there, and not to distort their expression, to cover up so that the deep poetic mists that float in all your works, not dissolve and, in the end, that all the recourses of that beautiful instrument, along with my experience in handling it, serve to interpret your works with the greatest fidelity possible.\textsuperscript{127}

Hector Berlioz famously wrote “it is almost impossible to write for the guitar unless one is a player oneself. Yet most composers who use it are far from familiar with it and write things of unnecessary difficulty with no sonority or effect.”\textsuperscript{128} More recently, the English composer Stephen Dodgson wrote that “it is definitely a mistake to think of the guitar (as many do, apparently) as first and foremost a harmonic instrument; a mistake, because it leads the innocent into writing too many notes.”\textsuperscript{129}

The changing nature of the relationship between composers and performers provides historical and critical context to the discussion of Ponce, Segovia, and myself. Lukas Foss examines the reasons why these relationships exist, arguing in favour of the efficiencies that come with discrete, specialised musical roles.\textsuperscript{130} Rodger Smalley contends that as scores have become more complex and detailed in the period from the renaissance to the twentieth century, the performer has experienced a decrease in musical freedom.\textsuperscript{131} Similarly, Arnold Whittall traces collaborations between performers and composers in the long twentieth century, examining the partnerships between Benjamin Britten and Peter Pears, Igor Stravinsky and Robert Craft, Olivier Messiaen and Yvonne Loriod, and John Cage and David Tudor, among others.\textsuperscript{132} In an example of concurrent creative practice and traditional research, the cellist Fabrice Fitch and composer Neil Heyde describe their collaboration as a “site for the playing out of the dialogic aspects of artistic creation” as they investigate “the performer’s potentially
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significant mediation between composer and piece.”¹³³ Fitch and Heyde’s research contributes to a persistent theme of this thesis: the idea that the creative, collaborative exchange between the performer and composer is fundamental and formative in the creation of a work. For Fitch and Heyde, this took the form of several technical discoveries on the part of the performer, that were then adopted by the composer.¹³⁴ Heyde notes that in some regard, the importance of these additions “seems much greater than many of the details notated in the score.”¹³⁵

Torrence offers a more detailed description of the different ways a performer might be involved in the compositional process, particularly in more contemporary contexts. Her model describes the performer as either an “interpreter,” “adviser,” or “deviser,” depending on the level of creative agency the performer has.¹³⁶ Much like Fitch and Heyde, Torrence argues that the artistic interaction between the composer and the performer is “itself a practice, and therefore it is not only through collaboration that a piece is made, but it is also through collaboration that artistic practices are made.”¹³⁷ Torrence also highlights that, in the instance of her collaboration with composer François Sarhan, “the new artwork could not have been made by the composer alone, or by me alone; it required both of us working in relation to each other.”¹³⁸ This concept is echoed by Buckley who writes that, in the context of the contemporary collaborations between guitarists and composers,

the style of each composition was determined not only by the composers’ musical style and its engagement with performance technique but also by the context of the repertoire and the tactile exploration of the instrument ... [The performer’s] creative input went beyond simply technical consultation; they impacted on the work in preliminary, developmental and editorial stages through modalities other than notation such as spoken and performed feedback and interpretation.¹³⁹

The idea of the performer being a creative agent in the compositional process will be explored in depth with regards to Ponce and Segovia’s collaboration on the Folia Variations in the chapters to come. These examples of analysis in scholarly and historical contexts situate my own examination of Ponce, Segovia, and the Folia Variations. They show the creative
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collaboration between composers and performers, with composers tailoring elements of a work to suit a performer, performers making an active contribution towards the work in notation and performance, and the concept of distributed creativity.

**Ponce, Segovia, and the Folia Variations**

The research presented in this thesis develops several elements in the existing literature concerning the relationship between Ponce and Segovia. While discussion surrounding the two musicians is often focussed their creation of repertoire, there are few critical studies of their collaboration. Further, these studies do not apply their findings regarding the creative relationship to the interpretation and performance of the music. This is particularly true for the *Folia Variations*. No current studies extend the analysis of their collaborative relationship to the interpretation of the work in performance, nor do any draw information from practice-based investigation of the work to inform academic findings.

*The Segovia-Ponce Letters* are a core primary source of information on Segovia and Ponce’s relationship, offering an unparalleled window into the working and personal interactions, even if only Segovia’s letters remain. In his “Prologue” to the letters, editor Alcázar notes that

> it is very interesting to follow—throughout all of this correspondence—the genesis of various works of Ponce, as well as the changes Segovia suggested for some of them and the reasons given; … [to follow Segovia’s] relations with publishers, and his impressions of critics, artists and composers whom he knew during this period.\(^{140}\)

Fifteen of Segovia’s letters concern the *Folia Variations*, totalling almost ten percent of their published correspondence. The early letters show the development of a close friendship, built on respect and admiration, and a musical partnership that matured and strengthened from its formative years. Segovia’s commission was for a medium-length work, designed to showcase the spectrum of the guitar’s technical and musical capabilities.\(^{141}\) The letters reveal the evolution of the *Folia Variations* from these relatively humble beginnings into an ambitious work on a grand scale, and illuminate the detail of the problem-solving processes tackled by the two musicians in the work’s composition. For example, the letters highlight the changes made to the structure, the rewriting of variations multiple times, the shortening of the work,
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and the characteristics of expression in individual variations.\textsuperscript{142} They also give insight into the first performances and incomplete recording of the work.\textsuperscript{143}

The absence of Ponce’s replies to Segovia creates an interesting situation: as a researcher I am left to construct Ponce’s half of the conversation. Some can be inferred from Segovia’s writing: he makes mention of Ponce’s previous letters, or includes examples of unpublished music sent by Ponce. Overwhelmingly, however, Ponce’s voice is found in his music. The difficulty of this task is acknowledged by Whittall, who writes that “any such partnership, in which two individuals spend so much time together ... is an immense challenge to the historian, hungry for facts that incontrovertibly delineate cause and effect.”\textsuperscript{144} Throughout the course of this thesis, the 1932 edition of the \textit{Folia Variations} is the source used to interpret Ponce’s creative voice. As mentioned, this score was edited by Segovia and is therefore not free from his influence. The notion of interpreting the score as the voice of the composer is not new, as Cook reflects: “the score stands in for the absent composer ... with such relational values as care, fidelity, commitment and sincerity coming into play. Rehearsals of classical music may equally be haunted by the absent composer and display the same values.”\textsuperscript{145}

Secondary sources include Alcázar’s edition of Ponce’s complete guitar works, which offers some brief historical and biographical information.\textsuperscript{146} Similarly, Corazón Otero presents an evocative biography centred on Ponce’s connection to the guitar.\textsuperscript{147} David Nystel more critically appraises Ponce’s guitar music.\textsuperscript{148} Focussed on Ponce’s harmonic practices, Nystel traces Ponce’s musical development through his guitar music. While he does make mention of Segovia’s role in the repertoire’s creation in his introduction, Nystel does not factor in Segovia’s role in Ponce’s music beyond that point.\textsuperscript{149}

Portions of the research presented in this thesis hinge on an in-depth understanding of the compositional techniques employed by Ponce in the \textit{Folia Variations}. This builds primarily on
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the work of John Clyde Ingwerson. He conducts a rigorous analysis of the compositional procedures in each variation, and briefly discusses the collaboration between Ponce and Segovia. He does not extend his analysis of the influence of Segovia beyond that which is explicit in the letters. Throughout this thesis, I frequently call on Ingwerson’s analyses, particularly with regards to his identification of salient harmonic content, Ponce’s use of specific intervallic structures, and small-scale rhythmic motifs. Where Ingwerson is primarily concerned with the composer, I am more interested in the creative agencies of Segovia and Ponce in the *Folia Variations*, exploring how they both influenced the work and the role of interpersonal dynamics on the resultant music.

There are three investigations into Ponce and Segovia’s relationship that are significant in situating my critical appraisal. Peter Segal’s doctoral thesis focuses on several aspects of Segovia’s contribution to Ponce’s guitar music. Concerning the *Folia Variations* directly, Segal discusses the basics of Segovia’s contributions to the work, suggesting that his primary influence on the work was through the contribution of fingerings to the score. In Chapter 3, I explore some of the issues raised by Segal’s study. The broader discussions in Mark Dale’s thesis have elements in common with my research. In particular, Dale highlights the contrary aesthetic preferences of Segovia and Ponce, discussed in the next chapter. The importance of the *Folia Variations* in Dale’s study, however, is minimal. Chapter 3 reassesses some of Dale’s conclusions regarding the consequences of Ponce and Segovia’s relationship for the *Folia Variations*. Graham Hall’s study follows similar lines of enquiry to both Dale and Segal’s, but with a particular focus on the *Folia Variations*. Hall’s tracing of the development of the work through the *Segovia-Ponce Letters* has relevance to my own study. With the exception of his discussion of the theme, the details of which are considered in more depth in the next chapter of this thesis, Hall does not draw connections between Segovia’s aesthetic influence on the work and its execution in performance. Similarly, there is no discussion in Hall’s
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thesis of the knowledge to be gained from practice-based investigation of the work. Rather, Hall focusses on describing techniques of execution and techniques of composition separately.\textsuperscript{159}

Peter Poulos's thesis examines the development of Ponce’s neoclassical style across his guitar compositions, including the \textit{Folia Variations}. In particular, Poulos discusses Ponce’s use of motifs to create structural bonds between each variation and the theme, as well as between some variations independent of the theme.\textsuperscript{160} Poulos’s research has parallels with my own in this regard, as discussed further in Chapter 2. Jordan Peterson’s recent thesis also explores the structure of the \textit{Folia Variations}. Using primarily Schenkerian analysis, Peterson attempts to demonstrate how the \textit{Folia Variations} can be interpreted as following a structure akin to sonata form.\textsuperscript{161} Peterson also includes analysis of the musical textures in the \textit{Folia Variations}, through the analogy of orchestration, to strengthen this analysis and to demonstrate links between variations.\textsuperscript{162} In this way, Peterson’s work ties in with the research presented in this thesis, offering an alternate perspective on both the micro and macro structures at play in the \textit{Folia Variations}, something which is once again discussed further in Chapter 2.

My study utilises elements of Segal, Dale, Hall, Poulos and Peterson’s research, particularly to establish Ponce’s creative voice, understanding Segovia’s motives as a musician, and forming an interpretation of the structure of the \textit{Folia Variations}. Significantly, however, my research takes a different critical view of Segovia and Ponce’s relationship and its effect on the music they created by exploring the nuances of their creative interaction in the case study of the \textit{Folia Variations}. In tandem, my research also differs from these authors by critically applying my findings in both scholarly and creative contexts, to a re-envisioned presentation of the role of the performer as a co-creator.

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 32.
\textsuperscript{160} Peter Stephen Poulos, "Towards a Contemporary Style: Manuel’s Ponce’s Neoclassical Compositions for Guitar" (Master of Music in Music History, University of Cincinnati, 1993), 106.
\textsuperscript{161} Jordan Thomas Peterson, "A Multithreaded Analytical Approach to Fate and Legacy in Manuel M. Ponce’s Variations Sur “Folia de España” Et Fugue" (Master Of Music, Temple University, 2019), 10-33.
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 15-20.
CHAPTER 2: AGENCY, ORIGINS, AND STRUCTURE

Segovia and Ponce, whose creative agencies shaped the initial composition of the *Folia Variations*, also bring their influence to bear on the structure of this thesis. Due to the work’s development over several years between 1929 and 1932, the variations themselves were not created in the same chronology as they are published. This, consequently, implies that there was no preordained, overarching structure that encompassed the entire published work. Instead, this research argues that Segovia and Ponce’s artistic agencies, both individually and in collaboration, are the defining creative forces in the work. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 explore the variations through their connection to these creative forces. Given this non-sequential analysis of the variations, this chapter explores the origins of the work, including the motivations and aesthetic priorities of the two musicians who created it, and the large-scale structures that can be interpreted between the variations. Exploring a conception of the work as a whole at this point of the thesis provides a scaffold from which to engage with the individual variations as they are presented in the rest of the study.

AGENCY AND COMMUNION

The concept of agency can be defined as “the capacity for an actor to act or make independent choices in a given context … agency is typically referred to in the context of an agent’s (or individual’s) capability or ability to act in a goal-directed manner.”¹ Within the context of relationships between composers and performers, the way in which each individual exercises creative control over aspects of the work can be viewed as a manifestation of their creative agency. David Bakan uses the term “agency” in a difference sense, that is also applicable to Segovia and Ponce’s relationship. In Bakan’s framework of interpersonal orientation, he uses the terms “agency” and “communion” to describe the motivations behind

people’s actions and interactions. C. Randall Colvin and Matthew J. Bundick offer the following synopsis of Bakan’s theory: “Agency is characterised by the individual … who fulfils [their] needs by controlling [their] environment and achieving individually based goals. Self-satisfaction is the overreaching motivation of the agentic person.” They characterise “communion” through contribution to a group, the provision of support, and the “individual … whose needs are fulfilled by becoming one with a group of others … The communal individual is interpersonally oriented and will frequently provide support to [their] friends and loved ones.” For the purposes of clarity within this thesis, a linguistic distinction is made between the idea an individual’s “agency” (defined above as the capacity to act or make independent choices in a creative context) and “agency” and “communion” (which are descriptors of behavioural motivation in the sense used by Bakan). The capacity of the individual to make choices and change will be referred to as “agency” (as in “creative agency” or “artistic agency”), while the behavioural motivations will be described as “agentic motivation” and “communal motivation.”

Kenneth Locke asserts that agentic motivation and communal motivation “function as cardinal axes along which we chart the course of our social lives.” He argues that our propensity towards either communal or agentic motivation are in a constant, situationally dependent state of re-evaluation. Agentic and communal motivation are used to understand the interactions between Segovia and Ponce. In many instances Segovia’s peremptory, directive attitude can be interpreted as agentically motivated, in that it may be seen as having been motivated by his strongly held interests as a guitarist. Similarly, manifestations of Ponce’s creative agency can also be seen as agentically motivated, particularly in the exploration of individual aesthetic priorities in some variations. In other instances, however, Ponce and

---


Although Bakan’s theories are from the 1960s, the concepts are still in use in current psychology. For example, Karin Pöhlmann’s 2001 study looks into the effects of these two social motives in a group of 620 people, using agentic and communal action to formulate understandings and conclusions around the individuals’ attainment of various goals.


3 Colvin and Bundick, "In Search of the Good Judge of Personality: Some Methodological and Theoretical Concerns," ed. Hall and Bernieri, 60.

4 Ibid.


6 Ibid., 72.
Segovia’s interactions demonstrate elements of communal motivation. They behave as collaborative partners in the creative process. Understanding aspects of Segovia and Ponce’s individual creative agencies, and the styles of interpersonal orientation exhibited in their relationship informs my interpretation, both analytical and performative, of the Folia Variations.

Segovia’s Aesthetic Priorities

The guitar unfortunately has never had a Bach, a Mozart, a Haydn, a Beethoven, a Schumann or a Brahms…

- Andrés Segovia, 1948

To consider Segovia’s aesthetics first might seem to belie the priority of the composer’s role in the creation of the work. Yet, the identification of Ponce’s creative agency in the Folia Variations is inextricably tied to his collaboration with Segovia. By the same token, variations where Segovia’s priorities are at the fore are necessarily mediated through Ponce’s compositional practice. As Dale acknowledges, the Folia Variations “became the site where both men negotiated and argued their respective aesthetic values and goals.” Parsing out the manifestations of Ponce’s independent creative voice is made possible through an assessment of the contrast, tension, and concordance with Segovia’s. As such, Segovia’s aesthetic presence in the work warrants exploration first, and gives context to the discussion of Ponce’s aesthetic contribution.

The establishment of a canon and the guitar’s place within it, the Werktreue concept, the conflict between high-art and commercial aesthetic motives, and Segovia’s place of power within the relationship, all fundamentally influenced the Folia Variations. Throughout the work’s composition, interpretation, and performance, Segovia perpetuated the nineteenth-century aesthetics and ideas he inherited. His “five purposes” (discussed on page 10) distinguish him as a twentieth-century musician shaped by nineteenth-century musical and cultural ideals, manifesting in his reverence for composers and works of the past, and a desire

---

to actively cultivate a position for the guitar within a historical lineage. Segovia aimed to align the guitar with the status of instruments such as the violin and piano already comfortably established within the Western canon. Dale observes that

Segovia looked to the piano and violin works of Johann Sebastian Bach, Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven, Robert Schumann, and others as models for the modernisation of the guitar … Segovia’s models are historical and mirror his conservative aesthetic values.\(^9\)

Recalling Segovia’s first purpose, “to extract the guitar from noisy and disreputable folkloric amusements,” it is clear that, in Segovia’s opinion, the guitar did not have a repertoire that was on par with that of these composers, and that he did not hold guitar’s past composers in high esteem.\(^10\) Segovia’s attitude has parallels with Goehr’s assessment that “reconstructing or rewriting the past was and remains one of the most characteristic ways for persons to legitimize their present, for the process aids in the general forgetfulness that things could be different from how they presently are.”\(^11\) That is, Segovia’s position may be interpreted as seeking to distract from the guitar’s past.

Segovia’s commissioning of repertoire for the guitar sought to elevate the instrument to an equal footing with more established instruments.\(^12\) The \textit{Folia Variations} may be understood as a means for establishing the guitar within the canon through its magnitude, the inclusion of a large number of guitar techniques, demonstration of a distinct historical lineage and awareness, and a high-art premise. Segovia’s veneration of past composers shaped his creative decisions and musical goals, not least in the creation of the \textit{Folia Variations}. This is particularly evident in his choice of composer, musical form, and theme, each of which are discussed further in this chapter. Details of the specific requests Segovia made for individual variations can be linked to his nineteenth-century aesthetic values, and are discussed in Chapter 3.

Segovia’s third purpose, “to make the guitar known by the philharmonic public all over the world,” indicates his desire for commercial success.\(^13\) Segovia wished to create “a listenable

\(^9\) Ibid., 158.
\(^10\) Segovia, “Transcript of Andres Segovia’s Acceptance Speech Upon Receiving the Degree of Doctor of Music Honoris Causa at Florida State University,” 1-3.
\(^12\) Segovia, “Transcript of Andres Segovia’s Acceptance Speech Upon Receiving the Degree of Doctor of Music Honoris Causa at Florida State University,” 1-3.
\(^13\) Ibid.
repertory … pieces that fell upon the ear of the listener pleasantly.”\textsuperscript{14} This striving for popular appeal, however, can be understood as the source of an aesthetic conflict within Segovia, and manifests in the \textit{Folia Variations}. Segovia’s priorities as soloist and virtuoso interpreter-performer may be seen as being in conflict with his perpetuation of the \textit{Werktreue} centric priorities of reverence for composers of the past. Segovia strove simultaneously for populist and commercial appeal and the conflicting abstruse aesthetic appeal of high-art music. These desires can be characterised as his high-artistic ambition and his commercial ambition. Balance between high-artistic merit and approachability has its roots in Viennese classicism. Charles Rosen states that “the creation of a classical style was not so much the achievement of an ideal as the reconciliation of conflicting ideals — the striking of an optimum balance between them.”\textsuperscript{15} Rosen goes on to state that, particularly in the music of Mozart, there emerged conflicting stylistic ideals between solo piano music intended for broad, amateur appeal, and the increasing complexity of symphonic music.\textsuperscript{16} This same tension is typified by Segovia’s request for two cadenzas for Ponce’s \textit{Concierto del Sur}:

\hspace{1em} Why not write two Cadenzas for this movement? One you have already written, delicate, poetic, noble, appropriate for more knowledgeable and sensitive audiences. Another more brilliant, with greater wickedness and effectiveness for less musical audiences... And leave the care of administering them up to me…\textsuperscript{17}

These artistic tensions provide a constant backdrop to Segovia’s decisions through the work’s evolution and performance, while the aesthetic consequences of these two ambitions, documented in the \textit{Folia Variations}, are explored in the coming chapters.

Quite apart from Segovia’s somewhat conflicted aesthetic agenda, his widespread fame and powerful personality had a direct impact on his collaborative relationship with Ponce. The veneration of the virtuoso interpreter-performer, and their influential place in musical society, had established a musical and social climate where Segovia held a significant position of authority when collaborating with Ponce.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 43-47.
\textsuperscript{17} Segovia, \textit{The Segovia-Ponce Letters}, 230.
\textsuperscript{18} While it must be noted that, ideologically, composers also held significant power as the venerated creators of works, Segovia’s fame in comparison to Ponce’s was consequential in the power dynamic.
His giant personality dominated the lives of all classical guitarists for so many years … He was the founding father of the guitar in the twentieth century, bringing together all previous traditions, creating a new technique and a new sound quality. For decades, Segovia set the standards and the pace.19

As this statement from Wade and Garno attests, Segovia’s influence reached far beyond those with whom he was in close contact.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in Segovia’s suggestion to publish the *Folia Variations* as a work falsely attributed to a composer of the past. In the letter of commission, quoted more fully at the end of this chapter, Segovia wrote, “if you do not want to sign your name to it [the *Folia Variations*], we will assign it to Giuliani, from whom there are many things yet to discover, and from whom they have just given me a manuscript in Moscow.” Kevin Manderville’s thesis details the multiple, intentional misattribution of Ponce’s works to past composers, including Alessandro Scarlatti and Silvius Leopold Weiss (1687-1750).20 The most prominent example of this is Ponce’s Suite in A minor composed in 1929 just prior to the *Folia Variations*, which Segovia attributed to Weiss, and continued to do so long after Ponce’s death.21 Segovia’s suggestion to publish the *Folia Variations* under the name of another composer illuminates his aesthetic priorities, while also underscoring the uneven power dynamic between him and Ponce. It shows that Segovia indeed wanted to use the *Folia Variations* to establish a musical canon for the guitar. The resulting work’s stylistic attributes are at times, however, in opposition to this vision but also engage with the musical characteristics and approaches that were important to eighteenth and nineteenth-century composers.

Further, Segovia was the primary performer of the music he commissioned, meaning that if composers wished their music to receive premieres and further performances, they were principally reliant on Segovia.22 This enabled Segovia to exercise considerable agency in his collaboration with composers, evident in his interactions with Ponce.

21 Ibid., 31.
Ponce’s Aesthetic Priorities

The aesthetic perspective that Ponce brought to the *Folia Variations* can be understood through a consideration of his development as a composer. Ponce’s modernisation of his style and his nationalistic perspective are two key aesthetic characteristics that shaped the *Folia Variations*. In an interview in 1920, Ponce stated: “For the future I have no other projects than to keep writing music, trying to follow modern orientations.” The nature of Ponce’s modern orientations were influenced by his particular musical journey, from his early education in Mexico to the maturation of his style through study in Europe.

As a consummate pianist, Ponce’s over 200 piano works offer a window into his style, uninfluenced by the aesthetics of collaborators. His works for piano have been categorised into three periods by Dahlia Guerra: the First Period in romantic style from 1891-1924; the Second Period in modern style from 1925-1932; and the Third Period in modern style with an emphasis on nationalism from 1933-1948. With regards to Ponce’s output for guitar, however, Guerra’s periodisation is less applicable. As Dale observes, much of Ponce’s guitar works “appear quarantined from the progressive harmonic language, and non-traditional methods of musical construction applied in his piano and chamber music.” Compositions external to Segovia’s influence, such as those for piano and ensemble, “reflect a rich variety of compositional influences including the salon repertoire, romanticism, nationalism, neoclassicism, and pre-conquest music.” Nevertheless, Guerra’s assessment of Ponce’s priorities establish a clear artistic trajectory from romanticism to a more modern idiom. This is significant in understanding the aesthetic notions that were at the forefront of Ponce’s compositional idiom at the time of his collaboration with Segovia on the *Folia Variations*. By contrast, Ponce’s guitar music exhibits the distinct aesthetic influence of Segovia, discussed below.

---

23 Michelle Yip, “Stylistic Development in the Piano Works by Manuel Maria Ponce (1882-1948)” (Doctor of Musical Arts, The Graduate School of the University of Cincinnati, 2008), 42.
25 Ibid., 58, 66, 70.
26 Dale, “The Ponce-Segovia Collaboration: Creating the Modern Guitar Repertory,” 239, 240. While this statement is true for the bulk of Ponce’s guitar music, progressive harmonic language can be observed in the *Concierto del Sur*, the *Sonata for Guitar and Harpsichord* and the *Theme Varie et Finale* in particular.
27 Ibid., 298.

The term “pre-conquest” in this context referring to the period prior to the Spanish conquest of Mexico.
Ponce’s modernisation of his style occurred during his study in Paris with Paul Dukas between 1925 and 1932. Robert Stevenson observes that Ponce’s “musical style became immeasurably more contrapuntal and his rhythms tauter … Accused by Bossi in 1905 of writing in an 1830 style, Ponce in the 1930’s was an avant-garde.” Although, Ponce was not strictly avant-garde in his exploration of dissonance in comparison to others’ contemporaneous explorations of non-tonal compositional approaches such as serialism. As Dale observes, Ponce valued “tonality [as] an intrinsic component of what is beautiful in music … his belief in the primacy of tonality directed him away from radical techniques such as serialism, and drew him instead toward the neoclassical and impressionist techniques of Stravinsky and Debussy.”

Ponce took an interest in the use of independent melodic lines, developing “profuse counterpoint” with “melodic lines in each hand [on the piano that] move independently of one another.” His modern style is clearly observable in the Preludios Encandenados (1927), which contain plentiful examples of chromaticism and unresolved dissonances.

Guerra refers to the chromaticism, parallel chord movement, and a lack of harmonic repose in bars 52-60 of “Prelude No. II: Agitato” as an example of chromatic, non-functional harmony that deviates furthest from traditional functional language.

---

31 Luis Gaytán, "An Introduction to the Piano Music of Manuel M. Ponce" (Doctor of Musical Arts, Louisiana State University, 2014), 40.
33 Ibid., 102.
Similarly Ponce’s *Quatre Pièces pour Piano* (1929) experiment with polytonality to create a highly dissonant language paired with frequent rhythmic syncopations. In all, Ponce’s language, particularly during his period in Paris, developed to include “modality and impressionism, bitonality and pandiatonicism, and musical passages that bordered on atonality.” Dale observes that Ponce’s piano and chamber music explores non-serial post-tonality along with “polytonality, formal concision, atomised melodic lines, and non-tertiary harmonic structures.” Although, as previously noted, his guitar music was representative of a more conservative approach due to the less progressive influence of Segovia, extended dissonant passages and an equivocal approach to tonality colour the *Folia Variations.*

---

38 Ibid., 241.
Segovia’s conservative influence can be observed in the pastiches composed for guitar during this same period. As Peter Frary notes, Ponce’s works Balletto (composed between 1925 and 1932 and attributed to Weiss), Preludio (unknown composition date, possibly mid 1920s, attributed to Weiss), Suite Antigua (1931, attributed to Alessandro Scarlatti), and the Suite in A minor mentioned above, are all pastiches of baroque, Classical and Romantic music that were the result of Ponce’s collaboration with Segovia. These pastiches provide important context to stylistic priorities of the compositions that resulted from their partnership, in contrast to the music Ponce worked on alone. They are works firmly embedded in the practices of eighteenth and nineteenth-century composers, rather than establishing an independent, contemporary voice.

Throughout Ponce’s life, the folk melodies and rhythms of Mexico became increasingly central to his compositions. Luis Gaytán details Ponce’s vision of a Mexican art music that was oriented around three precise goals:

To research, collect and classify folk songs from all regions of the country. To choose the most appropriate musical materials from the music collected for the creation of suites, sonatas, etc. Finally, to write completely original works without including quotations of folk material but reflecting a deep understanding of the Mexican soul.

Ponce’s Mexican nationalism is observable in his piano music, including the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra (1910), which was hailed as “the opening phase of musical nationalism in Mexico.” His solo piano music often makes explicit reference to Mexican origins, including the Tema Mexicano Variado (1912), Rapsodias Mexicanas (1911 and 1913), and Balada Mexicano (1915). Gaytán positions Ponce’s nationalistic music at the forefront of a fundamental shift in the Mexican artistic landscape, in which he concentrated his “creative efforts on the research of folk sources [and] on the development of an ideology and method for the creation of nationalistic Mexican music.” This is echoed by Dale, who observes that “Ponce’s nationalism progressed from a moral duty to a political and cultural imperative. Mexico must have its own voice, and this voice should unite rather than divide Mexicans.”

42 Otto Mayer-Serra, Panorama de la Musica Mexicana (México: El Colegio de México, 1941), 95.
Ponce’s musical nationalism was therefore clearly one of the core principles of his idiom leading up to and through the period in which the *Folia Variations* were composed. Yet the *Folia Variations* are curiously devoid of Mexican influences. Other works for guitar written during this period like the *Sonata Mexicana* (1923), *Tres Canciones Populares Mexicanas* (1928), or the work for orchestra, *Cantos y Danzas de los Antiguos Mexicanos* (1933), strongly declare their Mexican roots. That these Mexican influences were not expressed in the *Folia Variations* suggests the influence of Segovia’s eurocentric aesthetic purpose. Hence, in searching for, and interpreting, the expression of Ponce’s artistic voice in the *Folia Variations*, this thesis looks to the evidence of his modern style.

Lastly, aspects of reticence in Ponce’s music, through the parameters like tempo have been understood as reflecting qualities of his personality. Alcázar notes, “the allegro was mostly shaded by adding indications such as *moderato, non troppo, serioso*, espressivo, *piacevole, semplice*, etc.” Alcázar goes on to characterise this reservedness as a quintessential facet of Ponce’s disposition,

in which introversion and reflection predominated, producing a tranquil and restrained personality that did not need expansive outbursts to attract attention. These qualities can be found in all his music which shows a perfect balance between affection, expression and reflection.  

The musical manifestations of this aspect of Ponce’s personality at times contrasts Segovia’s more direct musical character, a distinction which is illuminated through the analysis of particular variations.

**ORIGINS**

Having established the aesthetic priorities that both musicians brought to the creation of the *Folia Variations*, there are three fundamental components of the work over which Segovia exerted creative responsibility that require examination: the choice of the composer, the

---

45 Ponce, *Obra completa para guitarra de Manuel M. Ponce: De acuerdo a los manuscritos originales*, 15.
46 Ibid.
choice of the form, and the choice of the theme. As the commissioner of the work, the motivation for the work and choice of these parameters rested with Segovia. An understanding of his influence through these choices underpins a consideration of the individual variations.

The Choice of Composer

As we have seen, the nineteenth century saw the gradual divergence of roles between composer and performer. At the same time, historical instances of composers writing new works for specific performers emerged. These trends paved the way for Segovia’s prolific commissioning of new works from the early 1920s onwards. The relationship kindled between Segovia and Ponce led to his choice of Ponce for the realisation of a major new work for the guitar. Segovia makes patently clear his affection for Ponce’s work. In a letter to Ponce he wrote: “You are a great musician, dear Manuel, and that your great talent coincides in your persona with your great soul makes me enormously happy. I feel, besides, a great impatience for everyone to know you, to love you, to admire you as I do.” While later he wrote that “between the least of what I like of yours and what I prefer from another composer, there is still much in favour of your work.”

Despite the flattery of his words, Segovia’s sentiments still communicate a clear high regard for Ponce and his compositional abilities. The Folia Variations specifically, in Segovia’s eyes, was to be the centrepiece of this new repertoire, a magnum opus for the guitar that crystallised its place in the Western art music canon. Segovia’s letter to Ponce on February 26, 1930, clearly indicates that he saw Ponce’s abilities, albeit mediated through Segovia’s aesthetics, as being pivotal to achieving this goal:

Believe me, if you take the time, and finish [the Folia Variations] as I wish, this work will be a chaconne for the guitar, sufficient to raise the reputation of an instrument, as low as it has been, to the stature of the most noble ones, and not for the passing age, but from here on.

47 Segovia, "Transcript of Andres Segovia’s Acceptance Speech Upon Receiving the Degree of Doctor of Music Honoris Causa at Florida State University,” 1-3.
48 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 52.
49 Ibid., 78.
50 Ibid., 50.
51 Ibid., 66.
The reference to the genre of chaconne, which calls to mind the seminal works of J. S. Bach discussed in Chapter 1, suggests some parameters against which Segovia wished the success of the *Folia Variations* to be judged: high-artistic merit and a comprehensive display of the full technical and sonic capabilities of the guitar. At the same time, it demonstrates Segovia’s reverence for composers of the past, and suggests he saw Ponce as a potential equal to the most prominent in Western art music. Segovia’s choice of Ponce as the composer was therefore heavily influenced by his extra-musical aesthetic aims rooted in nineteenth-century ideals, his specific goals for the *Folia Variations*, and the desire to position the work as part of an historical lineage.

The other fundamental creative choices Segovia made at the genesis of the work, the form and the theme, are identified in his first letter of commission to Ponce in December 1929:

> I want you to write some brilliant variations for me on the theme of the Folias de España, in D minor, and which I am sending you a copy of from a Berlin Manuscript. In a style that borders between the Italian classicism of the 18th century and the dawning of German romanticism. I ask you this on my knees … If you do not want to sign your name to it, we will assign it to Giuliani, from whom there are many things yet to discover, and from whom they have just given me a manuscript in Moscow. I want this work to be the greatest piece of that period, the pendant [i.e., counterpart] of those of Corelli for violin on the same theme. Start writing variations and send them to me, and try to see that they contain all the technical resources of the guitar, for example variations with simultaneous three-note chords, in octaves, in arpeggios, rapid successions that ascend to the high B and then fall to the low D, suspensions in noble polyphonic motion, repeated notes, a grand cantabile that makes the beauty of the theme stand out, seen through the ingenious weave of the variation, and a return to the theme, to finish with large chords, after going through all the noble musical cunning of which you are capable, to distract the listener from the definitive proximity to the theme …! In all twelve or fourteen variations, a work for a whole section of the program, which will not be long because of the contrast of each variation with what precedes and follows it. The theme is charming. Have them play the ones by Corelli on the gramophone, if you do not remember them, and you will see how it is a great sin that this theme, which the oldest version is the Berlin Manuscript, for lute, Spanish, moreover, to the core, is exiled from the guitar, or feebly treated by Sor, which is worse.

You already know this that this petition of mine is an old one. Go back to those first days of your stay in Paris. Remember? Three or four years ago, and actually, a violin performance of the Corelli variations, profoundly stirred my desire to play some variations of equal or superior importance, written by you. Do not refuse me now, and ask in exchange for whatever sacrifice: except that of renouncing the variations …!

If you start on the work, continue sending me the parts that you are composing…

---

52 Ibid., 50. [brackets in original]
This letter establishes much of the foundation upon which the rest of the work was built. Not only does it stipulate the theme and variations form and the basis of the theme, Segovia also contributes ideas towards numerous variations. These will receive their own discussion in later chapters. This letter supports the interpretation of Segovia’s nineteenth-century aesthetics: the reference to, and reverence of, musical styles and composers of the past, the comparison to the violin as another solo instrument, and a passion to bring the guitar to “equal or superior” status to those instruments already established in Western musical traditions. Segovia’s words highlight his conception of the nascent *Folia Variations* as being from another epoch, endeavouring to construct “the greatest work of that period [the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries].”

**The Choice of Form**

Theme and variations form has a significant history in Western art music. Timothy Rhys Jones writes that “variation form derives from the practice of improvising embellishments in successive strophes of songs and dances in the 16th century.” Sixteenth-century vihuelist, Luis de Narváez, wrote some of the earliest examples of this form in a set of *Diferencias*. This history was acknowledged by Segovia early in the composition process when he asked Ponce, “what do you think about calling them ‘Diferencias’ like in earlier times?” Composers used forms with established histories to consciously position their work within a specific historical lineage. To this end, theme and variations form was used extensively by eighteenth-century composers, such as Haydn and Mozart, and later by nineteenth-century composers like Beethoven, Franz Schubert, Robert Schumann, and Brahms. For the same purpose, variations on the theme of another composer were also widely composed.

---

53 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
56 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 52.
57 Taruskin, "The Coming of Museum Culture."
58 Jones, "Variation Form."
59 For example: Op. 120 “Diabelli Variations” by Ludwig van Beethoven, S. 180 “Variations on a Theme from *Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen*” (based on BWV 12) by Franz Liszt, Op. 35 “Variations on a Theme of Paganini” by Johannes Brahms, and Op. 42 “Variations on a Theme of Corelli” by Sergei Rachmaninoff, are each seminal works that employ the theme of another composer.
There are significant musical potentialities of theme and variations form which may have contributed to Segovia’s choice. Firstly, it is harmonically stable: constant reference to a theme creates a tendency to reiterate its harmonic structure, and thus with most repetitions to reconfirm the tonic key. This is clear in the Folia Variations, with seventeen of the twenty variations written in the tonic key of D minor. This stability lends the form broad appeal, uncomplicated by distant tonal relationships as may be anticipated in sonata forms. By contrast, many nineteenth-century sonata-form works exhibit greatly expanded tonal relationships. Schubert’s Quartet in G, D. 887 and Sonata in B-flat, D. 960, are two such examples. Caplin explains that “compared with all other full-movement forms [theme and variations form] is the least complex and presents the fewest problems.” The significance of this attribute is reinforced by Segovia, who wrote to Ponce: “do not forget that what I wish is that all of the public, knowledgeable and ignorant, becomes enthusiastic with your work and grants you a clamorous success.” It is important to note, however, that Ponce’s implementation of the theme and variations form does not always conform to these expectations. As Elaine Sisman notes, “variations are inherently paratactic, based on an iteration of items in a linear series ... Composers have thus typically sought to organize sets of variations in ways that seek the advantages of repetition.” Yet, as discussed in more detail below, the structure of the Folia Variations is abstruse, and does not rely on repetition as a unifying device. In this regard, Ponce adapts the form to his own aesthetic aims, to some degree distinct from those for which Segovia chose it.

The second musical rationale for the choice of theme and variations form lies in the sonic juxtapositions it allows. In comparison to the relative tonal stability the form provides, it allows the composer to set contrasting musical ideas in close proximity without the necessity to connect them with any lengthy musical preamble. For example, the juxtaposition of two contrasting instrumental techniques or emotional sentiments can be presented sequentially in a short timespan because the theme acts as a connecting, structural backbone. This is in contrast to the progressive motivic and harmonic development typically associated with sonata form. For the Folia Variations, this is consequential as it allows for the presentation of a

large variety of the technical, sonic, and expressive faculties of the guitar, and made the form an attractive choice for Segovia in his pursuit of a magnum opus. The theme and variations form supports Segovia’s prioritisation of individual, guitar-focused ideas, more than any sense of a larger whole. Finally, the choice of form influenced the way the Folia Variations was collaboratively created. It allowed for a prolonged gestation period, during which several new variations were incorporated into the work. More significantly, perhaps, it allowed for the juxtaposition of Segovia and Ponce’s aesthetics. Without the necessity for continual, progressive development, there was greater possibilities for the inclusion of their discrete aesthetic perspectives within distinct variations.

The Choice of Theme

The choice of the Folia as the theme is also historically grounded. Chapter 1 examined the development of the Folia melody and associated chord progression. Much like the roots of the chaconne as a ground bass pattern and dance, the Folia carried with it a firmly established history and ties to Spanish dance.63 As a Spaniard, the importance of the Spanish roots of the Folia theme to Segovia are evinced by his emphasis in the letter of commission, and are confirmed by his zeal for Spanish flair in Ponce’s music. Segovia wrote:

Take advantage of the opportunity to do something Spanish: each time I play the two or three preludes you wrote in the Spanish “flavour,” it makes me mad that you do not want to write a longer work for me in this style, to blow the head of Turina, Torroba, and even Falla himself. You cannot imagine how happy it would make me to play something of yours with this feeling in Madrid and Barcelona, more so than all other things.64

That Segovia decided to supply Ponce with a theme at all, even though Segovia had confidence in Ponce’s skills as a composer, is an indication of the importance Segovia placed on the theme.65 It shows there was much more to Segovia’s choice of the Folia than its “charming” nature: he specifically chose a theme that would support his goals for the variations. The Folia carried the weight of historical tradition, a Spanish heritage, and most importantly, status within the canon of Western classical music. Segovia’s reference to

64 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 54. [italics in original]
65 Ibid., 7, 8, 52.
Corelli’s *La Follia* in his letter of commission alludes to the historical lineage and demonstrates his reverence of music and composers of the past.

From the outset of the creation of the *Folia Variations*, Segovia’s personal aesthetic vision influenced the overall shape of the work, from the composer to the musical form and the choice of the theme. Understanding this fundamental aesthetic framework lays the foundation for exploring the more detailed permeation of Segovia’s influence.

**Whose Theme is it Anyway?**

There are three versions of the theme in the *Folia Variations* that require consideration. They offer a window into the different aesthetic perspectives at play in the *Folia Variations* as a whole. For the sake of clarity, I have named the three versions for reference in this thesis. Firstly, there is the theme supplied to Ponce by Segovia which he calls the “Berlin Manuscript.” Secondly, there is the theme performed by Segovia in his 1930 recording, which I term “Segovia’s Theme.” Lastly, there is the theme that was published with the complete work, which I refer to as “Ponce’s Theme.” While there are similarities between all three versions, comparison of them reveals “Ponce’s Theme” as a considerable embellishment of the original “Berlin Manuscript.” Chapter 4 includes a detailed examination of the implications of Ponce’s changes to the theme. Each version of the theme is reproduced below, and their brief introduction here provides a foundation for further discussions throughout the thesis.

The “Berlin Manuscript,” written in E minor and published in 1685, is the version of the *Folia* that Segovia sent to Ponce in 1929. While this version of the *Folia* is not included in the Segovia-Ponce Letters, I have reproduced it in Figure 2.2 below. The “Berlin Manuscript” bears a considerable resemblance to the theme recorded by Segovia as part of his partial recording of the *Folia Variations* in December, 1930. The main differences between the “Berlin Manuscript” and “Segovia’s Theme” are the alteration of the key in “Segovia’s Theme” to D minor, and bars 14-16, wherein Segovia performs a slightly altered chord

---

68 Although it cannot be certain that it is the same as the copy Segovia sent to Ponce, the *Folies D’Espagne aus dem handschriftlich Lautenbuch des Grafen Wolkenstein-Rodenegg (Berlin) um 1685* is highly likely to be the manuscript to which Segovia refers due to the similarities between it and the theme Segovia recorded in 1930.
69 “Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue,” performed by Segovia, track 14.
progression in place of the sequence of descending fifths in the “Berlin Manuscript.” A transcription of Segovia’s performance is included below (see Figure 2.3). Given these similarities, and the fact that the “Berlin Manuscript” was the theme supplied to Ponce, the “Berlin Manuscript” can be considered as the original against which “Ponce’s Theme” is compared. “Ponce’s Theme” is altered to create a more active melodic voice (see Figure 2.4 below). Harmonically, “Ponce’s Theme” differs from the “Berlin Manuscript” through use of increased chromaticism and inverted chords. The two are presented with harmonic analysis in Figure 2.2 and Figure 2.4 below. Ponce also significantly re-shaped the theme through the introduction of an animated middle voice, adding an increased level of chromaticism.

Curiously, there seems to be some scholarly contention as to the authorship of the various themes. Dale positions “Segovia’s Theme” as an act of re-composition. He contends that “Ponce’s Theme” was sent to Segovia, who, motivated by dissatisfaction with Ponce’s effort, then recomposed it to a simpler form. Given the similarities between “Segovia’s Theme” and the “Berlin Manuscript” demonstrated by the two transcriptions in Figure 2.2 and Figure 2.3, this seems unlikely. Citing only a conversation with guitarist John Williams, Hall argues the opposite, asserting that “Ponce’s Theme” was actually written by Segovia himself. To the author, however, the published theme exhibits musical characteristics which align it with Ponce’s aesthetic interests, both within the theme itself and through its connection to other variations via compositional alterations, discussed more in Chapter 4. Hence, my assertion that this version was the work of Ponce.

---

Figure 2.2: “Berlin Manuscript” with chord analysis.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{71} Bruger, \textit{Old Lute Music From Three Centuries}, Vol 2: The 17th and 18th Centuries, transcribed by Callum Henshaw.
Figure 2.3: “Segovia’s Theme” transcribed from Segovia’s 1930 performance.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{72} “Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue,” performed by Segovia, track 14.
*This chord eludes conventional categorisation. It appears to be a chord of the diminished third, built around the German sixth chord, with an anticipatory leading note (C-sharp). Aurally, it has a pre-dominant function.

**STRUCTURE**

**Large-Scale Structural Considerations**

The investigation of large-scale considerations here aims to provide the reader with a broad understanding of how each variation may be interpreted as part of the whole work. This section shows how my analyses of individual variations can contribute to understanding the

---

73 Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue*, “Ponce’s Theme,” transcribed by Callum Henshaw.
structure of the *Folia Variations*. It also acts as a point of reference for the reader when approaching the non-linear investigation of the variations in this thesis.

This research applies several approaches to analysis. These consist of the analysis of guitar-focussed techniques; compositional techniques including harmonic, motivic and rhythmic analysis; and the analysis of dramatic tension including the pacing of tempo, emotional sentiment, and dynamics. The understanding of the variations through creative practice also made a contribution of equal importance my understanding of the structure of the *Folia Variations*. Developing from these analyses is the investigation of the manifestations of Ponce and Segovia’s artistic agency, as individuals and in collaboration. These various methods are examined below, highlighting both their utility and their limits, as well as outlining some of the large-scale structural considerations in the *Folia Variations*. Similarly, it introduces the idea that the distribution of creative agency throughout the work is critical to my understanding of its organisation.

It is important to note, however, that my interpretation below is just one reading of the large-scale structure of the *Folia Variations*. Indeed, both Peterson and Poulos have put forth alternate interpretations. Using Schenkerian analysis, Peterson argues that the *Folia Variations* can be interpreted as loosely mimicking sonata form.\(^74\) Peterson explores the tonal centres of the work, something which is also discussed in my own interpretation. He strengthens this analysis with a comparison of the various instrumental textures, drawing parallels between this and orchestral instrumentation.\(^75\) Poulos argues that the minute motivic bonds between each variation and the theme, as well as between some of the variations independent of the theme, are what creates the structural ties of the *Folia Variations*.\(^76\) In this regard, there are similarities between aspects of my interpretation and Poulos’s.

*Guitar Focus*

Almost half of the variations analysed are shown to have aspects that reflect Segovia’s goal to create a work that addresses the full sonic and technical spectrum of the guitar. Segovia’s

---


\(^{75}\) Ibid., 15-20.

\(^{76}\) Poulos, “Towards a Contemporary Style: Manuel’s Ponce’s Neoclassical Compositions for Guitar,” 72, 104, 106.
extensive aesthetic contributions account for various technical, expressive, and textural aspects of the *Folia Variations*.\textsuperscript{77} His influence cannot be linked, however, to every variation.

*Compositional Focus*

Segovia’s aesthetic influence was ultimately mediated through Ponce’s compositional acts. Responsible for an immeasurable number of creative decisions, the variety and type of compositional approaches Ponce brought to the *Folia Variations* can be linked to his particular aesthetics.\textsuperscript{78} Musical characteristics, derived from his compositional perspective, can be seen in the large-scale harmonic tension and release, such as the tonic-dominant-tonic relationship of “Variation V” through “Variation VII,” or the dominant-tonic relationships between “Variation VII” and “Variation VIII,” “Variation XIV” and “Variation VX,” “Variation XVIII” and “Variation XIX,” and “Variation XX” the “Fuga,” an observation echoed by Poulos.\textsuperscript{79} These harmonies mark out significant structural points of the work, drawing the listener through the mid-section, and mildly increasing the harmonic tension towards the end of the work. Characteristic displays of Ponce’s creative voice do not account for every variation, however. For example, “Variation X” contributes in a more significant way to the dynamic and dramatic tension, without greatly expanding the overall compositional complexity or breadth of the work, while “Variation XVI” can be interpreted as contributing to the overall work mainly through its display of a specific instrumental technique, and is hence more indicative of the focus on guitar.

*Dramatic Tension*

Analysis of the dramatic tension and release, generated for example by tempo, emotion, dynamics, and texture, offers insight to the large-scale connections between several successive variations and their contribution to a sense of forward motion through the work. This analysis is heavily influenced by my practice-based research and performance. “Ponce’s Theme,” “Variation I,” and “Variation II,” establish the opening musical parameters, dramatic tension, and pacing.\textsuperscript{80} The middle of the work is given shape through the musical relationship between “Variation VIII,” “Variation IX,” and “Variation X,” which form a

\textsuperscript{77} These aspects are discussed in further detail in Chapter 3, and Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{78} This is discussed in depth in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{79} Poulos, “Towards a Contemporary Style: Manuel's Ponce’s Neoclassical Compositions for Guitar,” 104.

\textsuperscript{80} These variations are discussed in more depth in Chapter 4.
contrasting dynamic block through the disparity of their musical moods. The increase in musical drama and heightened dynamics that characterise “Variation XIX,” “Variation XX,” and the “Fuga” draw together the work’s closing moments. Pacing across the twenty variations demonstrates the difficulties faced not just by the performer, but also the analyst and audience. For example, the stretch from “Variation III” to “Variation VII” presents particular complexity: there is no clear dynamic or dramatic tension and release between these points. These difficulties are exemplified by Segovia’s decision to shorten the work in both live and recorded performance.\textsuperscript{81}

\textit{An Interpretation of the Structure}

By analysing guitar techniques, compositional considerations, and dramatic tension within the variations, an interpretation of the large-scale structures can be formulated:

\textsuperscript{81} Segovia, \textit{The Segovia-Ponce Letters}, 136. The intricacies of Segovia’s abridged performance, and my own adjustments to the variations are discussed in more detail below and in Chapter 5.
The “Theme” and first two variations establish musical parameters: the key of D minor, much of the harmonic language, chordal and melodic textures, motivix material, and the generally introspective mood.

“Variation II” to “Variation IV” forms an exposition of guitar techniques, including long melodic lines with frequent two-note slurs, exploration of the timbral and dialogic possibilities of the guitar, and a demonstration of its powerful, chordal potential.

From “Variation V” to “Variation VIII,” the salient structural force is one of large-scale harmonic tension and resolution: movement from the tonic key of D minor to the dominant of A major occurs between “Variation V” and “Variation VI,” before moving back to the tonic in “Variation VII.” The closing of “Variation VII” creates a dominant-tonic relationship with the opening of “Variation VIII.”

“Variation VIII” to “Variation X” are bound to one another through dramatic tension, dynamic contrast, and exhibitions of technique. The fortissimo arpeggios of “Variation VIII” fall into the subdued, melodic suspensions of “Variation IX.” “Variation X” uses a contrasting style of rapid arpeggios, paired with forte chords, to create a spirited mood.

Large-scale harmonic tension and resolution unites “Variation X” to “Variation XII.” The somewhat ambiguous chord that ends “Variation X” can be interpreted as the relative minor of the C major key that follows in “Variation XI,” which marks the first distinct harmonic departure from the D minor focus of the preceding variations. “Variation XII” returns to D minor.

The contrast in moods, techniques, and expression across “Variation XII,” “Variation XIII,” and “Variation XIV” creates intense interest, tying the variations to one another.

The display of virtuosic guitar techniques is the predominant bond between “Variation XIV” through “Variation XVIII.” These techniques include fast, repeated three-note chords, melodies in pianistic octaves, tremolo, brisk descending scales, and repeated notes.

Large-scale harmonic tension between the dominant function of “Variation XVIII” and tonic function of “Variation XIX” firmly re-establishes the tonal centre of the work. The final variation and the “Fuga” mirror the opening by re-establishing some of the original harmonic, textural, and thematic parameters.

Figure 2.5: An interpretation of the structure of the Folia Variations.
This interpretation of the structure is informed by my engagement with the work from the joint perspectives of a researcher and performer over a prolonged period. Similarly, the patchwork, complex nature of this description of the structures at play the Folia Variations is emblematic of the relationship that created it. It reflects the varied and, at times, conflicting influences and aesthetics of Ponce and Segovia: there is the strong emphasis on the exposition of guitar techniques, and concurrent prominent use of intricate compositional and motivic development. The overall structure and its internal components also reflect the prolonged, multi-year process that created the work, a process that was itself not structured or systematic. Thus, the somewhat organic nature of the work is a product of the composer-performer relationship. Consequently, it can be argued that the inherent attributes of this relationship and its aesthetics are manifested in the constitution of the variations.

My analyses are useful for the performer to envisage one interpretation of the interplay between the various structures, providing a conceptually rich view of the Folia Variations. The performer can use the analyses to guide their focus. The finer nuances of my interpretive response to this approach are detailed in the coming chapters. Nevertheless, this analysis also reveals some of the potential issues with the work’s performance. It exposes the complexity of utilising multiple analytical approaches, yet this is necessary to convey the breadth and interconnectivity of the macro components of the Folia Variations. Communicating this
complexity in performance is a difficult task, especially in a work of this length. While the theme and variations form itself allows for nominal large-scale motivic development, at 26 minutes the *Folia Variations* presents a substantial journey. In Segovia’s letters to Ponce, he discusses his difficulties communicating the work in its unabridged form, writing that “in order not to make it too long I always have to sacrifice many variations and that is a shame.” Concerns about the duration and the overall cohesiveness of the work also resulted in the removal of a “Prelude” originally part of the composition, and which remains excluded from the published edition. The “Fuga” was a further point of discussion in terms of Segovia’s apprehensions about length. He wrote: “it is necessary for you to insert a short ending to the Spanish variation of the Foliás because the fugue prolongs the work too much.” A fugue as the ending of the work also worried Segovia from the aesthetic perspective of popular appeal. Segovia asked: “Do you think it would be better to have something other than a fugue for the finale, so that the audience does not cool-off?” This thread of concerns stretched from the first month of their discussion of the *Folia Variations*, right through to 1932, three years later. It is also reflected in Segovia’s abridged recording of
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**Version One:**

“Ponce’s Theme”

1. Variation I
2. Variation III
3. Variation IV
4. Variation IX
5. Variation XII
6. Variation XIII
7. Variation VIII
8. Variation XVI
9. Variation XIX
10. Variation XX

Fuga

**Version Two:**

“Ponce’s Theme”

1. Variation I
2. Variation II
3. Variation III
4. Variation IV
5. Variation VIII
6. Variation IX
7. Variation XII
8. Variation XI
9. Variation XVI
10. Variation XIV
11. Variation XIX
12. Variation XX

Fuga

---

82 The discussion of the structures at play in the *Folia Variations* provides some insight into these concerns, and can be used as a tool for making informed decisions about alterations to the work. In my performances of the work outside of those for this project, I shortened the work to include variations I interpreted as salient or to function well together. On reflection, and equipped with my analysis, I can see that these decisions were based largely on the exposition of the widest variety of guitar techniques, and informed somewhat by large-scale harmonic progression. These changes were also the product of the awareness of audience reception and experience. My analysis shows the difficulties associated with the *Folia Variation’s* complexity and length. They can hence be useful in making informed decisions that may potentially make the work both easier for an audience to experience and more readily programmable in concerts. I performed two versions over the course of three years in concerts that were not related to this project:

84 Ibid., 65, 66.
85 Ibid., 136.
86 Ibid., 52.
87 Ibid., 176.
the variations (see comments below). Segovia’s statements about the performance and reception of the work are important in understanding aspects of the work’s eventual structure. They show the likely influence that Segovia’s experiences as a performer had on the structure of the published work, particularly his observation of the effect of the piece in concert. They demonstrate his consciousness of the large-scale considerations, the ongoing, iterative discussion of them with Ponce, and his underlying motivation for the work to be well-received by concert-goers.

**Analysing Agency and Communion**

The descriptions above are just one interpretation of how various analytical approaches can coalesce to form a conception of the large-scale structures in the *Folia Variations*. Understanding this complexity contributes to a fuller comprehension of the relationship between Segovia and Ponce and has implications for the work’s performance. Further, these analyses bring clarity to the decision to structure this thesis around the concepts of agentic and communal motivation, underpinned by the investigation of creative agency. Rather than adhering to a chronological discussion of the individual variations as they are presented in the work, the structure of this thesis is instead governed by the investigation of Segovia and Ponce’s artistic agency. As discussed, the *Folia Variations* are difficult to examine from a singular viewpoint, and Segovia and Ponce’s aesthetics had a significant influence on its composition. Consequently, the three chapters that form the main body of this thesis take these aesthetic perspectives as their foundation to explore the details of individual variations, and employ a wide variety of analytical techniques to support this investigation. This structure places the focus on the contributors to the creative process: Segovia in his role as a performer, Ponce in his role composer, and, at some temporal distance, myself as a subsequent interpreter, performer, and analyst.

Chapter 3: Segovia’s Agency is the first of these core chapters. It details Segovia’s influence on the work from his first letter to Ponce about the *Folia Variations* in 1929, through to the work’s publication in 1932. This chapter focusses on those variations where Segovia’s agentic

---

88 “Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue,” performed by Segovia, track 14.
In this 1930 recording, Segovia plays: “Segovia’s Theme,” Variation II, Variation III, “Variation VIII,” “Variation IV,” “Variation V,” “Variation IX,” “Variation X,” “Variation VII,” “Variation XII,” “Variation XX,” and the “Fuga.” Segovia’s abridged performance is also discussed in Chapter 5.
motivations and aesthetic influence are identified as being most apparent. Observed through Segovia’s direct requests to Ponce for variations with specific characteristics, the musical content of these variations reflects his preconceived aesthetic notions for the work. Part of this investigation is an interrogation of my own role as a performer of the work, and how I chose to engage with Segovia’s aesthetic in performance. Within the investigation of these variations, both practice-based engagement and my analytical assessment are expressions of my co-creative role in the evolution of the work. The variations that are considered in this chapter are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIATION</th>
<th>OTHER CHAPTERS THAT MENTION OR DISCUSS THE VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation IV</td>
<td>Also discussed in Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation V</td>
<td>Discussed in depth in Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation VIII</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation IX</td>
<td>Also discussed in Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIV</td>
<td>Discussed in depth in Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XV</td>
<td>Discussed in depth in Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XVI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XVIII</td>
<td>Also discussed in Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XX</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Discussed in depth in Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Variations discussed in Chapter 3

Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency explores the variations where displays of Ponce’s own creative expression are most prominent, and which are comparatively less influenced by Segovia. This chapter explores how aspects of Ponce’s modern-leaning compositional idiom come to the fore as statements of his creative agency. It illuminates the contrasting aesthetic perspectives of Ponce and the creative tension these generate with Segovia’s agency. In this chapter, I examine my role as a mediator of these agencies through my own creative expression. The order in which the variations are presented is curated with the purpose of developing a progressive conception of Ponce’s artistic voice and idiom. The variations that are considered in this chapter are:
Chapter 5: Communion, the last of the three core chapters, builds on the principles and evidence of the previous two to explore the creative consequences of the confluence of Ponce and Segovia’s agencies. In collaboration, the aesthetics that each musician brought to the creation of the work combine through communal motivation in certain variations. Within this investigation, my own co-creative role as a performer and analyst is shaped, in part, by my interpretive consideration of their agencies. The order in which the variations are presented in this chapter develops an understanding of the different outcomes of the communal motivations of Ponce and Segovia.

The first section details the variations that show a combination of their styles, while the second section examines their process of collaborative problem solving. The variations considered in this chapter are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Other Chapters that Mention OR Discuss the Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variation XII</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation II</td>
<td>Also discussed in Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation III</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XVII</td>
<td>Mentioned in Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIII and the Fuga</td>
<td>Fuga mentioned in Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIV and Variation IV</td>
<td>Variation IV mentioned in Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XV</td>
<td>Mentioned in Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIX and Variation XVIII</td>
<td>Variation XVIII also discussed in Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Variations discussed in Chapter 5
For clarity, I have set out below in Table 2.4 the variations in their chronological order, showing in which chapter they are analysed, and where a variation is referred to but is not the main focus of discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIATION</th>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency (and Chapter 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation I</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation II</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation III</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation IV</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation V</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation VI</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation VII</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation VIII</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Segovia’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation IX</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Ponce’s Agency (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation X</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Segovia’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XI</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Segovia’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XII</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIII</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIV</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XV</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XVI</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Segovia’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XVII</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XVIII</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XIX</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation XX</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Segovia’s Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Communion (and Chapter 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Variations in their musical order showing their corresponding chapter

Following this triptych of chapters, Chapter 6: Beyond the Folia broadens the application of the concepts already developed, and applies them to works other than the Folia Variations. These works all involve the input of a guitarist at the time of composition. This chapter expands of the idea of co-creative practice between myself as a performer with composers and other performers. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that the concepts explored in
the prior three chapters can be meaningfully applied in wider musical situations. It demonstrates that understanding the creative agency and interactions between composers and performers is equally relevant to transcriptions of the music of Domenico Scarlatti for guitar, Catalan folk songs, works written by guitarist-composers, and other music written as collaborative efforts between guitarists and composers.
CHAPTER 3: SEGOVIA’S AGENCY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter focusses on aspects of Segovia’s agentic motivation in his interaction with Ponce during the creation of the *Folia Variations*, and explores the manifestations of his creative agency in particular variations. Recalling the discussion of interpersonal orientation in Chapter 2 (see page 37) the first section of this chapter catalogues the instances of Segovia’s agentic motivation, observed in the variations where his creative agency is most overtly expressed. The second section analyses the specific sonic traits, instrumental techniques and musical aesthetics Segovia requested. This provides insights into his artistic and commercial motives, with their origins in the musical and cultural traditions established during the nineteenth century. This second section also studies my own creative mediation of Segovia’s artistic presence in the *Folia Variations*. The third section continues to investigate my co-creative role in the ongoing evolution of the *Folia Variations* by further examining the exploration of my creative voice as it interacts with the expression of Segovia’s, and in some instances, a deeper consideration of the expression of Ponce’s voice.¹

This chapter is therefore an exploration of how my investigation as both a performer and a musicologist demonstrates new understandings about Segovia’s aesthetic presence in the work. It also reveals the iterative cycle of interaction between my interpretive considerations as a creative practitioner and my investigations through analysis. This new understanding, communicated in my analytical and performative interpretation, brings the critical consideration of the composer-performer relationship into dialogue with my modern performance, in a process of diachronic, distributed co-creativity.

¹ A more comprehensive discussion of Ponce’s artistic agency is in Chapter 4.
Power Dynamics

Segovia’s creative agency in the *Folia Variations* stems in no small part from his relative position of power within the creative relationship with Ponce. As discussed in Chapter 1, Segovia occupied a prominent, globally-recognised position as a performer, giving him the ability to bring Ponce’s music to a world-wide audience. Paired with this potential for exposure was Segovia’s control of the publication process. Segovia was in charge of the submission of guitar works to his publisher, Schott Music, from composers with whom he worked. In August 1930, he wrote to Ponce that he had not proposed the publication of the *Folia Variations* to Schott as the publisher wished to space out the release of difficult works. He offers a placating gesture, saying “while this time passes, I can be playing the work, premiering it in well-known places. How is that?”

A year later, Segovia informed Ponce that the *Folia Variations* was fingered and submitted to Schott. At this point, Segovia suggests to Ponce “if he [Schott] still has not sent you the check, complain about it gently … [and if] you do not dare, tell me and I will write to him.” It is clear, therefore, that Segovia also had leverage over the flow of funds from the publisher to the composer. Beyond the control over exposure and publication, Segovia represented aspects of music that Ponce aspired to. Although Ponce had developed a strong Mexican musical identity, he nevertheless moulded his style within the European art music tradition, evinced by his two formative periods of study in Europe. Segovia was a bastion of this tradition, especially its late eighteenth and nineteenth-century ideals, and drove its influence in the development of guitar music during the twentieth century. Lastly, the personalities of the two musicians factored in the balance of power in their relationship. In contrast to Ponce’s reticence of both character and musicality, Segovia had a dominant, self-assured personality. Perhaps crystallised with age, his authoritative and somewhat controlling temperament is quite famously exemplified by his removal of a student, Michael Chapdelaine, from a 1986 masterclass at the University of Southern California for altering Segovia’s fingering of an Isaac Albeniz transcription.

Other investigations into Segovia’s creative presence in the *Folia Variations*, particularly Segal’s, depict it in a negative light. Segal’s assertion, that the “creativity of the one [Ponce] is

---

2 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 78.
3 Ibid., 99.
4 Ibid., 101.
5 Segal, "The Role of Andrés Segovia in Re-Shaping the Repertoire of the Classical Guitar," 58.
6 Ibid., 60.
interfered with by the self-interests of the other [Segovia],” implies that Segovia’s creative role was a hindrance to Ponce’s and had a detrimental impact on the music. This chapter, in contrast, details Segovia’s wealth of enriching contributions that extend to the very fabric of the music, through his direct instructions, musical inspiration, and the musical dialogue he upheld with Ponce.

A Brief Discussion of Fingering Suggestions

The interaction between Segovia and Chapdelaine mentioned above is indicative of the significant and lasting impact that the fingering of a score can have, and the importance of fingering to Segovia. The Schott edition of the *Folia Variations* includes plentiful left-hand and right-hand fingering suggestions, alongside string and fret indications, which Segovia saw as “indispensable for the success of a publication.” Fingering was entirely the responsibility of Segovia, evinced both by his statements in letters and the intricate knowledge of the instrument required to complete the task. As Segal notes, “these fingering provide meaningful insight into Segovia’s approach to phrasing, tone colour, and other technical and musical considerations.”

Indeed, the way in which the music is placed over the fretboard and strings of the guitar has a substantial impact on how the music is performed, how it sounds, and its expressive quality. A detailed exploration of the implications of fingering suggestions on the guitar has been conducted by Bradley Kunda. He states that fingering plays a decisive role in both performance practice and the arrangement and compositional process … [it] affects the music that we hear, from the smallest group of notes to larger-scale structural delineations … [and it is] a powerful tool in shaping the various substantive musical attributes that are effective in musical interpretation and communication through performance.

---

8 Segal, “The Role of Andrés Segovia in Re-Shaping the Repertoire of the Classical Guitar,” 36.
9 Along with this point, I think it is important to acknowledge the substantial positive impact of Segovia’s life work for the modern guitarist. Without his efforts, the guitar would not have the status it holds today. His efforts bestowed guitarists with a sizeable repertoire, and his playing has had a lasting artistic influence on several generations of players. Indeed, his work almost certainly contributed to my opportunity to study guitar in a tertiary setting, and to undertake this project.
10 Segal, “The Role of Andrés Segovia in Re-Shaping the Repertoire of the Classical Guitar,” 35.
12 Segal, “The Role of Andrés Segovia in Re-Shaping the Repertoire of the Classical Guitar,” 35.
13 Bradley Kunda, "A consideration of guitar fingering: implications for the preparation of a musical interpretation for performance and the process of writing music for the guitar" (Doctor of Philosophy (Guitar Performance), Australian National University, 2012), 185, 185, 186.
The technical and musical implications of fingering are also discussed by Eduardo Fernandez, who notes that

> it must be emphasised that fingering on the guitar determines not only the articulation of the passage, but also its very style and sound … [there is] an inseparable relationship between [fingerings] and their musical result … to finger is already to interpret; not simply to find the easiest way of producing the notes.\(^\text{14}\)

That is to say that the fingering of a work has an intrinsic consequence for performance style. Segovia’s position on fingering seems to confirm these statements. For Segovia, “fingering played a critical role in determining the very nature of a work … [defining] the very attitude and character of the work being performed.”\(^\text{15}\) This has implications for the later interpretation and analysis of the music, by influencing in a vast number of ways how the music sounds, is notated, and is performed. An investigation of all the implications of Segovia’s fingerings in the *Folia Variations* is beyond the scope of this thesis. Where relevant, however, the impact of this aspect of Segovia’s creative contribution will be discussed, particularly where it affects how a variation might be analysed and interpreted.\(^\text{16}\)

### Adviser or Deviser?

Guitar fingering can be seen to reside “at the intersection of the performer’s job as interpreter and the composer’s job as writer.”\(^\text{17}\) This leads to the discussion of the different roles that performers can play in collaboration with composers. Torrence explains collaborative situations between composers and performers through her “interpreter-adviser-deviser” model. She describes the “interpreter” as a performer to whom a “score is delivered, [and] the performer and composer never workshop the piece together.”\(^\text{18}\) She articulates an “adviser” as the confluence of two complementary perspectives … [where] as adviser, the performer may experience having a greater impact on the outcome of the piece … In advisory collaboration, the

---


\(^{15}\) Kunda, "A consideration of guitar fingering: implications for the preparation of a musical interpretation for performance and the process of writing music for the guitar," 22, 83.

\(^{16}\) For example, Segovia’s fingering is important in the discussion of “Variation II” in Chapter 5. Similarly, his suggestions are considered in the interpretation of “Variation XVIII,” also discussed in Chapter 5.

\(^{17}\) Kunda, "A consideration of guitar fingering: implications for the preparation of a musical interpretation for performance and the process of writing music for the guitar," 83.

\(^{18}\) Torrence, "Rethinking the Performer: Towards a Devising Performance Practice," 4.
performer and the composer enter into a dialogue where both parties have agency to contribute towards a musical work before the composition’s formal components are set into a final score.19

Lastly, she articulates the “deviser” role, where the performer is a

“co-creator or co-composer … [and] the hierarchy between the performer and composer is dissolved, allowing both parties to contribute to creative and practical decision making … The devising performer thus shares with the composer the decision-making process inherent to creating a new piece.”20

Within this framework, this chapter demonstrates how the creative agency that Segovia exercises from his position of power blurs the lines between the “adviser” and “deviser.” It shows him as taking part in an active dialogue with Ponce, but also contributing significantly to the inherent creative substance of the Folia Variations. Nevertheless, Segovia’s contribution, while significant, still comes from a position secondary to the authorship of Ponce. As the composer, the extent of Ponce’s creative contribution flows into nearly all aspects of the work’s composition.

Segovia’s Specific Suggestions

Segovia’s agentic motivation manifests most explicitly in the directions of his first letter to Ponce, quoted in Chapter 2. Along with contributing the theme and variations form and the basis of theme itself, this letter can also be directly linked to at least ten of the final published variations. With reference to this letter, the following connections can be made: “Variation IV” is comprised almost entirely utilising Segovia’s request for “simultaneous three-note chords,” along with an alternating bass-note figure. Similarly, “Variation XIV” contains two passages of three-note-chords. “Variation XV” employs octave doubling for the melody. “Variation VIII” and “Variation X” both satisfy Segovia’s request for arpeggio techniques. Furthermore, “Variation VIII” makes rapid rises from the low D to the highest A and back, largely addressing the stipulation for “rapid successions that ascend to the high B and then fall to the low D.” Similarly, the “Fuga” reaches a high B-flat before making a descent to the low D. “Variation V,” “Variation IX,” “Variation XIII,” and the “Fuga” contain independent voices that move polyphonically. “Variation XI” contains a cantabile melodic presentation of the thematic material. Lastly, repeated-note techniques are utilised in “Variation XVI” and

19 Ibid., 6.
20 Ibid., 7.
“Variation XVIII.” Excerpts from the variations which are not discussed further in this chapter are given below (see Figure 3.1 to Figure 3.5).

Segovia’s early requests for particular techniques account for the wide scope of techniques, expressive possibilities, and appealing characteristics of the guitar included in the *Folia Variations*. The ten variations plus the “Theme” and “Fuga” almost entirely satisfy the initial request for “twelve or fourteen variations,” and are indicative of Segovia’s presence from the outset as a creative agent in the development of the *Folia Variations*. Segovia’s requests show his highly active and creatively invested contribution, focussed on guitar technique and expression. By taking such an engaged role in defining the shape and content of the work, Segovia established himself not only as a co-creator and collaborator with Ponce, but almost as a primary progenitor of the work.

![Variation XIV bars 1-10](image)

Figure 3.1: “Variation XIV” bars 1-10.\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{21}\) Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue*, “Variation XIV” bars 1-10.
Figure 3.2: “Variation XV” bars 1-10.22

Figure 3.3: “Fuga” bars 73-91.23

22 Ibid., “Variation XV” bars 1-10.
23 Ibid., “Fuga” bars 73-91.
Segovia made further requests as the work evolved. In later letters, Segovia remains prescriptive, even demanding, of Ponce. On May 11, 1931, Segovia wrote:

I have been in my room working. Among the things I have been going over most carefully are the variations on the Folias. And it is necessary, absolutely necessary, that you dedicate all of tomorrow in composing one more variation in tremolo, in minor, very melodic, in triple meter, better long than short, and not very complicated, so I can study it from now until the concert … and with an interesting bass line.26

---

24 Ibid., “Variation V” bars 1-12.
26 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 94. [italics in original]
The final published “Variation XVI” methodically addresses each of the requests specified by Segovia. The variation is in D minor, utilises the tremolo technique exclusively throughout, the melody remains relatively static in the first six bars, after which the upper voice becomes very mobile, spanning beyond the entire octave of the first string. It is the longest variation, and it is of relative technical ease, presenting no particular challenges to the performer (see Recital 3, “Variation XVI”). Curiously, Mark Dale utilises this variation in his thesis as evidence to support his interpretation of a “rift” between Ponce and Segovia. Dale contends that Segovia did not include “Variation XVI” in his only recording of the work due to his dissatisfaction with Ponce’s effort. The recording, however, was made on December 6-7, 1930, while the letter requesting this variation is dated May 11, 1931. Simply, it did not exist at the time of the recording.

Figure 3.6: “Variation XVI” bars 1-6.

---

EXAMINING SEGOVIA’S AGENCY

The discussion above demonstrates the observable links between the directives issued by Segovia in his letters, and the musical results produced by Ponce. They are the most forthright manifestations of Segovia’s agency, and show his agentic motivation through the control he exercised. This highlights these variations as predominantly representing Segovia’s conception of the work, and demonstrates the exchange of creative ideas flowing primarily in one direction, with Ponce actioning Segovia’s specific requests. A component of my interpretation and performance is the creative consideration of the specific technical and sonic traits communicated in Segovia’s letters. The discussion below examines my artistic decisions in “Variation IV,” “Variation X,” and “Variation XX.” An aspect of my co-creative role in these variations focusses attention on Segovia’s creative agency within the balance of the three voices: Segovia’s, Ponce’s, and my own. This uses my temporally distant perspective to make artistic judgements about the influences that I see as important. I do not wish to argue, however, that Ponce’s creative voice is not present in these variations.

Variation IV - Un po agitato

“Variation IV” includes both a harmonised upper voice comprised of three-note chords, and an off-beat bass voice that alternates with these chords.29 It creates a powerful statement of the guitar’s multi-part and chordal capabilities. The three-note chord technique highlights the harmonic potential of the guitar. In performance, the alternating chords with the independent bass-line allow the guitar to speak at full volume, whilst not presenting a great deal of difficulty to the performer (see Recital 1, “Variation IV”).30 Consequentially, the Un po agitato expressive direction can be achieved with relative ease. In all, the effect is a dramatic variation that succinctly demonstrates several aspects of guitar technique. In this regard, Ponce unambiguously implemented Segovia’s suggestion in a manner that is idiomatic to perform.

29 “Variation XIV” also employs a similar technique of repeated three-note chords. In this regard, it also directly satisfies Segovia’s request of Ponce. There are, however, other considerations with this variation, so its discussion is reserved for Chapter 5.
30 Recital 1, “Variation IV”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78yJo4k?t=2157
Variation X - Prestissimo

“Variation X” directly addresses Segovia’s request for arpeggios, and interlaces the melody into the arpeggio figure, implying multiple voices. The first note of each bar creates the melodic outline based on the Folia melody (see bars 5-12 in Figure 3.8 below). Ponce’s implementation of Segovia’s direction showcases the virtuosic potential of the arpeggio techniques on the guitar, whilst also reinforcing the ability to play both the melody and accompaniment simultaneously. Arpeggio techniques and Spanish flair are also present in other variations, such as “Variation I,” and “Variation XII.” These variations, however, are significant for other reasons and are included in Chapter 5. Another variation that utilises arpeggios is “Variation VIII,” discussed later in this chapter.

Further, the inclusion of the bold, forte, six-note rolled chords are highly energetic, and recall the guitar’s Andalusian roots (see Recital 3, “Variation X”). Conscious of Segovia’s desire for a work with Spanish heritage and verve, I made the decision to perform these chords using the rasgueado technique to enhance this Spanish character in a manner reflective of Segovia’s sensibilities.

---

32 Arpeggio techniques and Spanish flair are also present in other variations, such as “Variation I,” and “Variation XII.” These variations, however, are significant for other reasons and are included in Chapter 5.
34 Recital 3, “Variation X”: https://youtu.be/2Vj8zoNhw0?t=3113
Variation XX - Andante

“Variation XX” is first mentioned in a letter from December 22, 1929, in the weeks after Segovia’s initial request: “I asked you before for those instrumental variations with the same ending (among which you should not forget a very melodic one to play in harmonics, with a light accompaniment of a bass and another note).”

---

38 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 57. [parentheses in original]
A letter on February 26, 1930, however, reveals more extensive dialogue that shaped the variation. Segovia expressed his dislike of Ponce’s efforts in relation to a variation with harmonics, for which there is no score. He went as far as to request that Ponce write an entirely new variation in its stead:

I do not even like the one with the harmonics as much as those which precede it. If you have the time and the inclination, write, then, two other complete variations to substitute for the one with three-note chords and the one with harmonics, and put a finer chisel on the one with octaves. Okay? Are you not angry with me for telling you this?

This all comes from the fact that I am very enthusiastic about the work, and I want you to bring it off in a way worthy of your talent. These three variations are essential because they represent different technical aspects of the instrument.39

It can be inferred that Ponce composed “Variation XX” in response to this letter (see Figure 3.10 below). The simplicity of this variation is achieved through the predominately step-wise, diatonic melodic contour. The effect of the melody is enhanced by its octave displacement in artificial harmonics, as Segovia suggested. Additionally, Ponce studiously followed Segovia’s directions for the accompaniment, which consists of mostly three-note chords, creating two clearly demarcated voices: a vocal melody and accompaniment. The artificial harmonics provide an aurally more distant register, but also textural distinction, highlighting the multi-part capacity of the instrument, and the breadth of tone colours at the performer’s disposal. In combination with a melody that has particularly vocal properties, the result is a graceful variation that creates a sense of calm (see Recital 1, “Variation XX”).40 Within the larger structural flow of the work, this tranquillity is particularly important as “Variation XX” is the last point of repose before leading attacca into the “Fuga.”

39 Ibid., 65, 66.
40 Recital 1, “Variation XX”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=3117
The statements in Segovia’s letter on February 26, quoted above, present a perspective of personal encouragement that colours Segovia’s agentic motivation. Despite making a sizeable request for further work from Ponce, Segovia is quick to strengthen Ponce’s creative resolve through encouragement and praise. In comparison to the forthright requests with regards to “Variation XVI” above, this slightly more careful style of interpersonal orientation is certainly part of what allowed for the prolonged and consistent evolution of the work through the maintenance of a fertile creative dialogue. These concepts are explored in detail in Chapter 5.

My initial engagement with this variation was in creative practice as a performer. During this process I arrived at an interpretation that emphasised tenderness and sympathetic expression. The particular technique of artificial right-hand harmonics that dominates the variation tends to constrain the dynamic to not much more than mezzo-piano. This technique, where each note is produced through the use of three fingers, inspires a delicate, precise, and sensitive touch with the right hand. Furthermore, because of the relatively undemanding technical requirements of the accompanying harmonic material, I am afforded the luxury of being able to take extra care with the choreography of each finger. These physical

---

41 Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue*, “Variation XX”.
considerations are reflected in my performance through a more restrained stylistic expression that utilises a subdued dynamic range and tempo (see again, Recital 1, “Variation XX”).

My artistic response to the music, and the resulting expression, mirrors the tenderness observed in Ponce and Segovia’s interactions above. This is an example of how my creative practice offers a window into the subtle emotion of the work. Critically, it shows how my interpretation found confirmation and fortification in my musicological analysis. In a cyclical fashion, these two approaches function in tandem to consolidate and strengthen my understanding of the work.

**MEDIATION OF CREATIVE AGENCY**

The following discussion focusses on the finer nuances of how knowledge of the collaborative relationship at the work’s genesis, and the aesthetics priorities of each party, precipitate interpretive decisions in my performance. In particular, the examination of the variations below shows the contextualisation of my own artistic perspective in the discourse between Segovia and Ponce.

*Variation VIII - Moderato*

Practice-based investigation of “Variation VIII” reveals how Segovia’s artistic agency changed the variation’s expressive nature, inhibiting the expression of Ponce’s artistic voice. The primary indicator of this is the difference between the marked tempo and my intuitive musical response to the variation. The variation is marked *moderato* (see Figure 3.11 below).

My artistic interpretation differs markedly, however, gravitating towards *allegro non troppo*. This decision was formed around the desire to achieve a better sense of connected, sweeping arpeggio gestures, as opposed to smaller, more fragmented triplet figures. A faster tempo also results in a less interrupted progression through the crotchet chords, maintaining a sense of forward momentum (see Recital 1, “Variation VIII”).

---

42 Recital 1, “Variation XX”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=3117
43 Recital 1, “Variation VIII”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=2380
Why then, if the music speaks to be performed quickly, is it marked *moderato*? The answer lies with Segovia’s particular view to the aesthetic purpose of the *Folia Variations*. In a letter to Ponce he wrote that while the variation “comes out admirably on the guitar, I take it a little slower than what you have indicated and it gains in intensity; play it and you will see.” Segovia’s change certainly complements the heavy use of *rubato* in his performance, with each arpeggiated phrase forming a discrete gesture. The marking is therefore less the composer’s own, rather it was heavily influenced by Segovia. My practice-based inquiry also found the variation to present much greater difficulty when performed quickly: the rapid ascents of the fretboard are coupled with multiple position shifts and varied right-hand patterns. While Segovia, without question, had the technical ability to perform it quickly, the difficulty may have been a motivating factor in the tempo change.

Beyond my own aesthetic preferences, assessing the tempo from a structural perspective gives further support to a faster interpretation. “Variation VIII” is placed between two slow, inward-looking variations. If it is played at the faster, non-indicated *allegro non troppo* tempo, “Variation VIII” provides greater emotional and stylistic contrast to the variations on either

---

45 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 57. [parentheses removed from original for clarity]
46 “Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue,” performed by Segovia, track 14.
side. This faster tempo avoids the possibility of the work dragging with sequential slow to moderate variations. This interpretation, therefore, becomes beneficial from a compositional perspective, helping to create a sense of large-scale movement and structure between variations. Discussed further in Chapter 4, this perspective can be connected to Ponce’s aesthetic focus on large-scale structures in the *Folia Variations*.47 Interestingly, however, a faster tempo can also be interpreted as supporting elements of Segovia’s nineteenth-century conception of the work. Chapter 2 established Segovia’s explicit wish for the work that takes some inspiration from Corelli’s *La Follia*.48 The sweeping, three-octave, violin-like ascending and descending arpeggiation resembles, as Ingwerson observes, a variation “composed for the violin in the style of Corelli’s Op. 5 #6 [sic: No 12].”49 This resemblance, however, is far more pronounced at the faster, non-indicated tempo. The figure below shows the similar example from Corelli’s *La Follia*.50

![Figure 3.12: La Follia by Corelli, bars 250-262.](image)
The similarity in this example can be seen in the alternation between arpeggio figures and the off-beat crotchets. This parallels the figures of two-bar arpeggios followed by on-beat crotchets in “Variation VIII.”

In “Variation VIII,” my role is expanded to become one of three agents of musical creation through my actions as a performer and analyst. Firstly, there is my own artistic input and interpretation of the variation in performance. My interpretation acknowledges both Segovia and Ponce’s agency within the work, but also reinforces my own aesthetic position. Beyond this, I act as an artistic mediator between the two creative inputs of Segovia and of Ponce. A large-scale compositional arc is created, whilst maintaining Segovia’s chronocentric conception through the allusions to Corelli. In this example, therefore, the score exhibits the

---

47 Further discussion of Ponce’s use of large-scale structural devices as an expression of his artistic voice can be found in Chapter 4 regarding “Variation XVIII” and “Variation XIX.”
48 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 50.
50 Ingwerson, ”Manuel Ponce’s Variations sur Folia de España et Fugue: A study of compositional procedures and Ponce’s use of the folia theme,” 59.
51 Arcangelo Corelli, “Violin Sonata No. 12 in D Minor, Op. 5 La Folia,” on *Corelli: Violin Sonatas, Op. 5*, performed by Rémy Baudet et al., (Brilliant Classics, 2018), Track 53. The aural similarity is supported by this performance of Corelli’s variations.
strong influence of Segovia's aesthetics, and it is my decision as an interpreter, and a creative mediator, to bring out what I perceive as Ponce's latent, or overshadowed artistic agency, but in a way that does not necessarily diminish some of Segovia's aesthetic intentions.

This has implications for future interpretation and analysis of the work. Firstly, I present a suggested alternative performance interpretation. Secondly, the written explication of this process brings new knowledge and understanding of Segovia and Ponce's relationship, and the ways it is manifest in the music. Lastly, it informs my own interpretive decisions with regards to my performance of the work.

Variation XI - Andantino

“Variation XI” can be seen as Ponce's application of Segovia’s request for a “grand cantabile that makes the beauty of the theme stand out.”52 This request can be tied to Segovia's desire to escape the “folkloric amusements” of the guitar’s past by establishing it as an instrument of the musical foreground, rather than background, through its vocal and melodic capabilities.53 My interpretation of the variation in performance is informed by this knowledge of Segovia’s artistic perspective. The insistent barcarolle can be played to effectively exploit the tone-colour distinctions and difference in string material between the upper three strings of the guitar and the lower three. The melody in bars 1-8 is fingered by Segovia to be played on the nylon treble strings (see Figure 3.13 below). With careful positioning of the right hand in the sul tasto position and judicious use of the nails, the round and open tone-colour of Segovia’s suggested fingering can be enhanced. Bars 9-16 are fingered to be performed on the metal-wound bass strings. Using the right-hand thumb in a position that exploits the full nail, a tenor-like vocal quality can be produced (see Figure 3.13 below). While these notes are more easily reached on the third string, they sing more fully on the fourth. Segovia’s fingerings, therefore, were a source for my further creative input. His contribution to the score precipitated interpretive decisions that enhance the vocal qualities of Ponce’s music, amplifying aspects of Segovia’s creative agency embedded in the work (see Recital 1, “Variation XI”).54 This is an example of

52 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 50.
53 Segovia, “Transcript of Andres Segovia's Acceptance Speech Upon Receiving the Degree of Doctor of Music Honoris Causa at Florida State University,” 1-3.
54 Recital 1, “Variation XI”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=2563
how a knowledge and understanding of Segovia’s agency in the work on an aesthetic level has had meaningful consequences for my decisions as an interpreter and performer.

Figure 3.13: “Variation XI” bars 1-16.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Variation XVIII - Allegro scherzando}

A finding arrived at through practice-based research on “Variation XVIII” was the strong discursive nature of this music. My interpretation focusses on bringing out the conversational relationships of the variation. By playing the repeated notes as one voice and the interspersed chords as another, an argumentative discourse emerges. A third musical idea enters in bars 10-18, and again in bars 29-32, offering yet another, vibrant character (see Figure 3.14 below). To reinforce this discursive nature, I use rapid and extreme tone-colour changes to give each voice a distinct character. The repeated notes are played \emph{sul pont}, the response is played \emph{sul naturale}, while the third is distinguished through the combination of \emph{legato} and \emph{sul tasto} playing (see Recital 3, “Variation XVIII”).\textsuperscript{56} Further, where possible I altered the marked fingering of the score such that the repeated-note motif is performed on the first string to enhance the difference in tone-colour.

\textsuperscript{55} Ponce, \textit{Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue}, “Variation XI” bars 1-16.

\textsuperscript{56} Recital 3, “Variation XVIII”: \url{https://youtu.be/2Vj8lzoNhw0?t=3559}
In this regard, Ponce’s application of Segovia’s instructions in “Variation XVIII” fulfills his desire to demonstrate the guitar’s technical versatility by enacting his request for a variation utilising a repeated-note technique. My artistic interpretation of the variation aims to highlight its musical and expressive qualities, bringing together elements of my own artistic agency with both the expression of Segovia’s conception and purpose of the work, and Ponce’s compositional creativity. My interpretation of “Variation XVIII” therefore presents an interesting case study in the artistic consequences for the later performer that arise from the consideration of Segovia’s creative input. It demonstrates the implications that a dual-oriented approach, utilising both musicological and practice-based inquiry, can have for performance and analysis. This perspective is situated within the creative discourse between Ponce and Segovia, and artistically mediates the impact of their relationship on the music.

Conclusion

This chapter establishes Segovia’s agentic motivation in his relationship with Ponce during the creation of the *Folia Variations*. His many requests and directions led to his creative agency shaping large, defining elements of the work, and also extended to the specific instrumental techniques utilised. Analysing the influence Segovia exerted illuminates his creative relationship with Ponce in a role that can be seen as straddling Torrence’s models of the “adviser” and “deviser.” The letters demonstrate Segovia taking part in the “pre-compositional joint invention, where composer and performer work together before the main compositional work is done.” Further still, these letters, and an examination of their effect on the *Folia Variations*, demonstrate Segovia’s presence as “not only an instrumentalist but also

---

58 Torrence, “Rethinking the Performer: Towards a Devising Performance Practice,” 6, 7.
a contributor to a shared concept.”\textsuperscript{60} It shows him taking part in “the act of creating from scratch … [contributing] critical and creative thinking.”\textsuperscript{61}

My engagement with the work in performance is a source of insight into the rationale behind Segovia’s demands. On one hand, it demonstrates his desires for a work that addresses the sonic, musical, and technical capabilities of the guitar. On the other, this same creative investigation uncovered aspects of Ponce’s latent artistic voice. In identifying Segovia as one of two creative agents at the genesis of the Folia Variations, my interpretation takes on further nuance. I am able to expand my role as a performer, and so co-creator, by engaging in a process of mediation between the creative voices of Segovia and Ponce, as moderated through my own creative voice. At times, I have made the choice to emphasise most prominently the creative agency of Segovia, whereas at others, our three voices intermingle. The understanding of Segovia’s artistic influence and aesthetic priorities established in this chapter is therefore a stimulus for aspects of my own creative expression in performance. The exchange of creative ideas that was the foundation of the Folia Variations is thereby brought into the contemporary discourse, forming part of my interpretive, analytic, and artistic response to the work. My research and performances demonstrate the distribution of creativity among multiple agents, including myself. Recalling Cook’s ideas discussed in Chapter 1 this invokes the concept of diachronic, distributed co-creativity, creating a point in the ever-developing series of interactions that define what the Folia Variations is.\textsuperscript{62}

My position as a performer results in a certain familiarity with the artistic basis of Segovia’s decisions. Consequently, analysing Segovia’s artistic presence can be seen to supplement my insights into the performance-focused aspects of the work’s creation. This perspective is counterbalanced by the understanding of Ponce’s creative voice in my interpretation of the work. Discussed in the next chapter, Ponce’s compositionally-centred creative agency introduces a new facet to my reading of the Folia Variations.

\textsuperscript{60} Torrence, “Rethinking the Performer: Towards a Devising Performance Practice,” 8.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{62} Cook, Beyond the Score: Music as Performance, 7.
CHAPTER 4: PONCE’S AGENCY

INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 2, Bakan’s concept of agentic motivation was established as one of two key modes of interpersonal orientation observable in Ponce and Segovia’s artistic relationship. Chapter 3 explored Segovia’s agentic motivation through the expression of his individual creative agency in the Folia Variations. This chapter continues the exploration of agentic motivation with a focus on Ponce’s actions to demonstrate that Ponce exerted a distinct, independent artistic influence over the Folia Variations. Some of Ponce’s motivations can be understood as agentic: in exerting aesthetic control over certain variations, he fulfils his artistic needs and individual goals for the work.

Unlike for Segovia, there are no records of Ponce’s side of the correspondence regarding the work. To uncover aspects of Ponce’s creative voice in the Folia Variations, therefore, examination of the subter indications of his aesthetics must be conducted.\(^1\) Ponce’s voice is identified by certain musical traits, characteristic of his particular compositional idiom, stated aesthetics, and goals as a musician. Chapter 2 provides an understanding of Ponce’s compositional style and progression as an artist, which shaped his creative decisions in the composition of the Folia Variations. He strove towards a modernisation of his musical idiom, making use of dissonance, chromaticism, tonal instability, and contrapuntal melodic lines. He embraced nationalism, incorporating folk melodies and rhythms into his music. Ultimately though, as the composer Ponce had the most creative agency at almost every, aside from the choice of form and theme. He was responsible for a multitude of the detailed musical, aesthetic, and compositional decisions within each variation. The variations explored in this chapter demonstrate Ponce’s creative agency as manifesting in recognisable expressions of his creative voice. These permeate the work, from some of the finest details to its large-scale

\(^1\) Whittall notes the difficulty of this task with reference to Benjamin Britten and the singer Peter Pears, or Olivier Messiaen and the pianist Yvonne Loriod, stating that “it remains a major challenge to commentators to find convincing ways of establishing exactly how a composition might be shown to be concretely affected by that longstanding partner’s personality and thinking.” Whittall, "Composer–Performer Collaborations in the Long Twentieth Century," ed. Clarke and Doffman, 23.
structure, through Ponce’s use of harmony, rhythm, melodic structure, thematic development, emotional sentiment, and meso and macro-structures.

Ponce’s artistic trajectory has some elements that were at odds with Segovia’s aesthetic priorities, and some that had common origins grounded in a mid-nineteenth-century style. Ponce’s personal character also plays a role in understanding the expression of his agency. It is important to reiterate that, while Ponce was in active pursuit of a musical vocabulary that was progressive but perhaps not avant-garde, this same forward-looking aesthetic was not matched by Segovia. With reference to Schoenberg’s Serenade Op. 24, which includes guitar, Wade and Garno wrote:

[Segovia’s] hatred of avant-garde dissonance and the whole movement it represented may well have originated in this kind of composition [the Serenade] … such atonality would surely have sounded especially horrendous to the young artist, engaged as he was with [a] somewhat more traditional vocabulary.²

Segovia’s preference for this “more traditional” language impacted the overall aesthetic and harmonic language Ponce employed in the Folia Variations. Segovia was not diffident about exercising creative sway over Ponce’s style, extending as far as the active discouragement of Ponce’s musical aesthetics and idiom, even regarding works that Ponce was not composing for Segovia. Concerning commissions from Jascha Heifetz and Gaspar Cassadó, Segovia wrote to Ponce:

Divest yourself of the sacred respect that the extra-modern costume of your Muse inspires in you … She is young and lusty, and you commit a grave mistake, veiling her enchantments all made-up with cosmetics that others less fresh than yours need. Moreover, virtuosos like Cassadó and Heifetz, want works that not only can be played for audiences of experts, but to the Public – including in this not very sophisticated musicians, critics without parti pris, and true music lovers.³

The result of these differing perspectives was the effective segregation of Ponce’s guitar music from the more explicit explorations of the novel musical constructions apparent in his music for piano and chamber ensembles.⁴ While it is not possible to say without doubt that Segovia did not influence these variations, the strength of Ponce’s impact on them suggests itself as predominant. Despite points of apparent aesthetic difference to Segovia, the productive

² Wade and Garno, A New Look at Segovia, His Life, His Music, Vol 1, 50.
³ Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 173-176 [italics in original].
tension between their respective agentic motivations and expressions of creative agency inevitably imparts extra depth and heterogeneity to the music.

A significant facet of Ponce’s agency can be observed in his attention to rigorous motivic development. Despite Segovia’s influence, Ponce makes reference to developments in early twentieth-century musical vocabulary, such as the motivic manipulations of twelve-tone music, and the use of non-tertiary harmonic structures. These are techniques that were in opposition to Segovia’s aesthetic preferences, yet characteristic of Ponce’s idiom. The key expressions of Ponce’s creative voice are therefore much more indicative of contemporary compositional thinking and practice at the time than of Segovia’s conservative musical taste and performance-focused agenda. This observation is supported by the initial letter of commission, in which Segovia refers to the eighteenth and nineteenth-century context for the work, is quick to offer suggestions for variations predominantly focused on guitar technique, and seemingly leaves the deeper compositional thought to Ponce.3

Further informed by the musicological, analytical, and creative research in this chapter, I have taken an interpretive, co-creative role that actively accentuates aspects of Ponce’s creative presence within those variations that exhibit markers of his aesthetic influence. My 2016 and 2018 performances of the Folia Variations are used to demonstrate how my interpretive decisions took shape and were influenced by my investigation. Importantly, some of the differences between the two interpretations demonstrate the progressive nature of this decision-making, interpretive process. These actions place my own artistic vision for the work into dialogue with Ponce’s, and form part of my own expressive contribution to the work as a mediator between these influences.

Theme - Lento

Chapter 2 introduced the three different versions of the theme: the “Berlin Manuscript,” “Segovia’s Theme,” and “Ponce’s Theme” (these three versions can be found in Figure 2.2: “Berlin Manuscript” with chord analysis. Figure 2.2, Figure 2.3, Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2). The comparison below between the “Berlin Manuscript,” the theme preferred by Segovia in his recording of the work, and “Ponce’s Theme,” uncovers the differing aesthetic priorities

3 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 50.
emblematic of the two musicians. As noted in Chapter 2, the “Berlin Manuscript” and “Segovia’s Theme” differ in only minor ways. For this reason, the analysis of the “Berlin Manuscript” below also applies to “Segovia’s Theme.” The theme can be viewed as a point of significant division between Segovia’s aesthetic input and the musical output of Ponce. Segovia’s choice of theme was laced with his nineteenth-century aesthetics through its strong historical lineage, Spanish roots, and established place in the canon of Western art music. Ponce’s creative expansion of the theme may be understood as pointed assertion of his own distinct aesthetic perspective within the Folia Variations.

Analysis of melody, rhythm, and harmony reveals the consequential compositional choices Ponce made in his version of the theme in comparison to the “Berlin Manuscript.” Melodically, the “Berlin Manuscript” follows the Folia “tone-series 7” outlined in Chapter 1.6 Rhythmically, the treble follows a relatively uniform pattern.

Bars 14 and 15 mark the only departure from this melodic structure and harmonic rhythm of dotted minims (see Figure 4.2 below). Harmonically, the “Berlin Manuscript” comprises predominantly diatonic, root position chords. Again, bars 14 and 15 break this pattern, with chord III6 and ii6 included as part of the descending sequence of fifths to the dominant on the second beat of bar 15. The penultimate and antepenultimate bars thereby form a precadential hemiola (see Figure 4.2 below). Apart from the noted exceptions, the “Berlin Manuscript” keeps within conventional formulas established during the sixteenth century for the Folia form, as discussed in Chapter 1.7

Beyond small discrepancies, the melodic structure of the treble voice of “Ponce’s Theme” remains close to the “Berlin Manuscript.” The last quaver in bars 1-3, 5, 7, 9, and 11, in “Ponce’s Theme” is altered to create a more active melodic voice (see Figure 4.3 below). Ponce inserted a lively middle voice, which brings with it more dissonance and chromatic movement. For example, there is chromatic movement through A, A-flat, and G in bars 3 and 4, and through C, C-sharp, and D in bar 5. This inner voice provides additional contrapuntal richness beyond that seen in the “Berlin Manuscript.” This is particularly true in bars 3 and 4 of “Ponce’s Theme,” where the inner voice is melodically active and introduces a new rhythmic pattern. This melodic and rhythmic sequence is then further developed in bars 9 through 16.

Figure 4.3: “Ponce’s Theme” bars 1-11.9

The harmonic language in “Ponce’s Theme,” has the effect of re-framing the theme in the chromatic harmonic vocabulary of the nineteenth century, as compared to the seventeenth-
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century language of the “Berlin Manuscript.” This can be interpreted as Ponce’s assertion of his own, comparatively more modern-leaning aesthetic position. Bars 5, 6, 10, 11, and 14-16 of “Ponce’s Theme,” introduce rhythmically active, chromatic passing notes, and the frequent use of secondary dominants to alter the tonal quality of the theme, whilst not straying too distantly from the harmonic outline of the “Berlin Manuscript” (see Figure 2.7 as compared to Figure 2.5 in Chapter 2). The use of a French-sixth chord on just the second beat is of particular significance. H. K. Andrews calls attention to the distinctly discordant elements created by the major second between tonic and supertonic, and observes that both Schubert and Beethoven used the chord “often with great emotional effect … usually at moments of emotional stress” (see Figure 4.4 below)\(^\text{10}\). The use of an emotionally intense chord, with distinct chromaticism, at the second beat of the entire work and in the context of a theme with archaic origins, is a marker of the extensive alterations Ponce made in his version of the theme. It can be seen as a statement of Ponce’s intent, bringing the theme into a more contemporary context, and demonstrating a willingness to juxtapose aesthetic expectations in a way that perhaps Segovia was not. On a small scale, what Andrews terms the “dual personality” of the French-sixth chord, known as “the chord with two roots,” can be interpreted as symbolic of the conflicting influences and aesthetic perspectives at play in “Ponce’s Theme” and the work as a whole\(^\text{11}\). On a larger scale, “Ponce’s Theme” is indicative of the productive tension exhibited between the two creative forces of Ponce and Segovia, representing how Ponce’s assertion of his creative agency, superimposed over Segovia’s choice of theme, brings a further dimension to the work.

![Figure 4.4: “Ponce’s Theme” bars 1-5.\(^\text{12}\)](image-url)
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\(^\text{11}\) Ibid., 44.

\(^\text{12}\) Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue*, “Theme” bars 1-5.
Several elements of “Ponce’s Theme” relate to bar 14 of the “Berlin Manuscript” (see Figure 4.5 below). The altered melodic sequence, the use of alternate rhythms, and the use of secondary dominants in this bar are augmented throughout “Ponce’s Theme.” Bar 14, therefore, acts as a point of departure from which Ponce draws inspiration.

Figure 4.5: “Berlin Manuscript” bars 13-16.\textsuperscript{13}

Ponce’s particular harmonic and melodic alterations are utilised as the foundation for motivic material in some of the variations, meaning these variations have no direct source in the original theme. Discussed in more detail later in this chapter, a notable harmonic example is “Variation I,” which is centred on the development of the French-sixth chord from bar 1 in “Ponce’s Theme,” while a notable melodic example is “Variation VII,” where the lower melodic motif of the first bar is derived from the inner voice of bars 4 and 5 of “Ponce’s Theme.”\textsuperscript{14}

These alterations coalesce to cast “Ponce’s Theme” as significantly different from the supplied “Berlin Manuscript,” fashioned in a wholly distinct style that also somewhat veils the melody. Although Segovia wrote “if the theme is not agreeable to you, change it to your taste,” the extent and fashion of Ponce’s modifications effectively create a variation in itself.\textsuperscript{15} Ponce’s obfuscation of the theme (discussed below) is an early signifier of his contrasting aesthetic perspective to Segovia, establishing the tension between Segovia’s nineteenth-century sensibilities and Ponce’s more modern-leaning tendencies. Most telling of this tension is Segovia’s decision to not perform “Ponce’s Theme” in his recording of the work. The
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\textsuperscript{13} Bruger, \textit{Old Lute Music From Three Centuries}, Vol 2: The 17th and 18th Centuries, Bars 13-16, transcribed by Callum Henshaw.

\textsuperscript{14} Ingwerson, “Manuel Ponce's Variations sur Folia de España et Fugue: A study of compositional procedures and Ponce's use of the folia theme,” 55.

\textsuperscript{15} Further instances of Ponce deriving motivic or harmonic material from his additions to the theme can be seen in “Variation V,” “Variation VI,” “Variation VII,” “Variation XIII” discussed in this chapter, and “Variation II” and “Variation XVII” discussed in Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{15} Segovia, \textit{The Segovia-Ponce Letters}, 54.
similarity of “Segovia’s Theme” to the “Berlin Manuscript” shows Segovia’s chronocentric perspective that values the *Folia*'s historical roots, and it is symbolic of Segovia’s more conservative aesthetics, establishing the fundamentals of melody and harmony with minimal distraction. “Ponce’s Theme,” conversely is symbolic of Ponce’s aesthetic interests as a composer, allowing him greater developmental scope through his introduction of novel musical material. Ponce’s layering of his own aesthetic characteristics within the theme marks his version as a concerted declaration of his creative agency. Within the context of their musical relationship, this demonstrates that although Segovia may have been an assertive artistic force, Ponce was not shy about establishing his own musical idiom within their dialogue. “Ponce’s Theme,” therefore, provides a window into aspects of the productive tension at play in the musical relationship. As such, I see “Ponce’s Theme” as fundamental in any performance of the work.

Understanding Ponce’s agency in the theme has creative consequences for my performance. “Ponce’s Theme” is a site where the creative tensions between dual artistic visions are embedded, and as part of my creative engagement with it, I made decisions about which artistic voice I see as being of importance and needing emphasis. Intertwined with these decisions is the expression of my own visions for the work. Over the course of my three-year engagement with the music, I made artistic decisions about the performance of the theme, a process informed by my own artistic goals, aesthetics, and musicological research.

Ponce’s version of the theme partially disguises the *Folia* melody, rendering it less discernible to the listener through the use of ornamentation, and the inclusion of more rhythmically and melodically active inner and bass voices. Ponce’s alterations suggest an intention for the melody to have a slightly reduced presence in the overall balance of voices, in favour of emphasising changes to the harmony and the additional voices. This is especially pertinent given the motivic role of these additions in later variations. In response to this understanding, I adjusted my interpretation of “Ponce’s Theme.” In my 2016 performance, I performed “Ponce’s Theme” at 50 beats per minute, and placed significant emphasis on the treble, melodic voice (see Recital 1, “Ponce’s Theme”).¹⁶ This interpretation was guided by my artistic intention to ensure the *Folia* melody was clear and discernible within the respective volumes of the voices so that, for the audience, this was the most accessible and identifiable

¹⁶ Recital 1, “Ponce’s Theme”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk70vJo4k?t=1905
element. In response to my scholarly inquiry and the understanding of the import of Ponce’s alterations, I made changes in my 2018 performance. The first was to increase the tempo from 50 beats per minute to approximately 60 beats per minute (see Recital 3, “Ponce’s Theme”). The increased tempo, while still reflecting the Lento marking, results in a heightened sense of gesture and continuity between the inner voices, and enhances the sense of harmonic drive in the refashioned chords. This is due to the perception of melodic contour and relationships being more discernible when the number of notes per second falls into a median range, neither too fast nor too slow.

Upon critically examining my performances, I observed a second interpretive difference between my 2016 and 2018 performances: there are significantly fewer rolled chords in my later performance compared with my earlier performance. In 2016, no fewer than thirteen chords are rolled (see Recital 1, “Ponce’s Theme”). In 2018, that number is just three (see Recital 3, “Ponce’s Theme”). This alteration emerged intuitively, not as a conscious response to my musicological investigation of the work. Nevertheless, it can be seen as serving a similar purpose to my more analytical assessment of the tempo. The effect of rolling chords in my 2016 interpretation restrains the forward momentum of the rhythm, creating a slower tempo, greater reticence of mood, and places significantly more emphasis on the soprano melody, giving it distinct, aural separation. By contrast, the reduction in rolled chords in my 2018 performance has the effect of maintaining the rhythmic momentum, and gives more equal weight to the inner voices. Reducing the frequency and number of rolled chords therefore achieves the same musical goals as the increase in tempo described above. This demonstrates an interesting confluence of my creative practice and my musicological investigation, where I came to similar creative and analytical conclusions, but via different means.

While these are not dramatic shifts in interpretation, the subtle effect is to enhance elements of the theme that I have argued as important reflections of Ponce’s aesthetics. As suggested by my analysis, Ponce’s expression of creative agency manifests in his changes to harmony, rhythm, and the introduction of additional voices. These changes are salient within the

17 Recital 3, “Ponce’s Theme”; https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhwo?t=2529
19 Recital 1, “Ponce’s Theme”; https://youtu.be/Xjnk78yJo4k?t=1905
20 Recital 3, “Ponce’s Theme”; https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhwo?t=2529
greater context of the work from a compositional perspective, and my interpretation aims to consciously balance their presentation in “Ponce’s Theme,” alongside Segovia’s artistic influences. These observations highlight the changing nature of my engagement with the Folia Variations, one that incorporates a component of critical self-reflection, and that allows for a consideration of how interpretation can change over time. This reflection on my interpretation also shows how practical investigation can reveal details that are significant in my scholarly research. My process of creative and scholarly engagement with the theme highlights the conception of music as a collaborative process. As a co-creator, I take an interpretive position that balances my aesthetics with Ponce and Segovia’s, taking responsibility for their effect on, and interpretation by, an audience. This conscious presentation continues the dialogic genesis of the work in a modern performative and scholarly setting.

**Variation I - Poco vivo**

“Variation I” is possibly the clearest example of Ponce’s compositional voice in the Folia Variations. His aesthetic is embedded within the variation’s rhythmic and harmonic content, musical sentiment, and large-scale structural positioning. Rhythmically, “Variation I” is complex, varied, and frenetic, with three distinct rhythmic motifs. Bars 1-3 establish an alternating figure of triplet and dotted rhythms.

![Figure 4.6: “Variation I” bars 1-8.](image)
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21 Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue,* ”Variation I” bars 1-8.
The latter part of the variation, in bars 13, 14, and 16-21, utilises a simple triplet figure, where the first notes of each triplet form an independent bass voice. This motif is interrupted by the first rhythmic motif in bar 15, and again at bar 22. These rhythmic motifs contribute a sense of agitation to the variation, particularly through how they overlap and interrupt each other.

![Figure 4.7: “Variation I” bars 13-26.](image)

The *Poco vivo* expressive marking intensifies this sentiment. As part of my practice-based inquiry into the variation, I became aware of an increasing tendency to shorten the quaver notes on the first and third beats of the opening rhythmic motif (see Figure 4.6 above). This creates a clipped, *spiccato* rhythmic pattern (see Recital 3, “Variation I”). Consistent aural detachment at two points in the bar after the first and third quaver beats, created by the gaps in sound resulting from my articulation, accentuate what Ingwerson describes as the variation’s “fragmentary, incomplete feeling.”

Harmonically, “Variation I” presents a sudden departure from the historical *Folia* harmony. Ponce derives much of the opening material from the French-sixth chord introduced in bar 1 of “Ponce’s Theme,” a chord that does not exist in any other version of the theme (see Figure 4.8 below). In contrast to its use in “Ponce’s Theme,” this chord is left spectacularly unresolved in “Variation I.” Over the opening three modulatory bars, the French sixth is the focus of development, along with other material from the first bar of the theme, such as the D-D-E melodic movement (see Figure 4.6 above). This is notable as the first instance of Ponce utilising musical material he himself introduced to the theme within another variation, rather than material that was inherent to the “Berlin Manuscript.” This extends the sense of his own creative agency already displayed in the theme. This material is then developed in a highly chromatic fashion. In the words of Ingwerson, in “Variation I,” “Ponce immediately launches into a complex variation whose relationship to the theme may not be obvious to the listener.”

![Guitar](image)

Figure 4.8: “Ponce’s Theme” bars 1-5 with harmonic analysis.

The fact that the French-sixth chord does not necessarily act or resolve how one might expect in a tonal context, places “Variation I” at odds with Segovia’s aesthetic parameters, while aligning it closely with Ponce’s. This is typified by the variation’s similarity to Ponce’s Etude No. II: Allegro non troppo from his *Deux Etudes pour Piano*. The opening sequence of aurally detached couplets calls to mind the similar rhythmic feel in “Variation I” (see Figure 4.9 below). In much the same way as my interpretation was drawn to a more rhythmically disconnected style, so it seems that Etude No. II draws performers to similar interpretations: despite the *legato* direction, performers such as Jorge Federico Osorio and Alvaro Cendoya quickly separate out the semiquavers of the opening bars into discrete rhythm units.
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25 Ibid.

26 Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue*, “Ponce’s Theme” bars 1-5, transcribed by Callum Henshaw.


use of dotted rhythms in bar 4, 12, and prominently in bar 24 of Etude No. II, has similarities to the rhythms present in “Variation I” (see Figure 4.10 below). Further, the ascending bass motif on the first beats of the first three bars in Etude No. II is somewhat reminiscent of the ascending motif in the first three bars of “Variation I,” although one is arpeggiated, while the other is stepwise. The most apparent similarity is the comparably frenetic mood of Etude No. II. Much like “Variation I,” the combination of dissonant harmonic language with *staccato*, energetic rhythms, creates music a feverish atmosphere. Composed on Ponce’s native piano, this music evinces his personal style, and rests outside the consultative influence of other musicians. The connection to Ponce’s piano music strengthens the interpretation of “Variation I” as a self-assertive proclamation of Ponce’s artistic agency.

![Figure 4.9: Etude No. II bars 1-3](image)

![Figure 4.10: Etude No. II bars 23-26](image)

The obscure relationship to the theme, chromatic harmonic material, complex rhythmic motifs, and resulting agitated emotional sentiment, each take on increased significance when “Variation I” is considered in the context of the large-scale structure of the work. Conventionally the first variation is used to ease the listener into the work by providing a clear harmonic relationship to the theme, and a recognisable technical focus. In that regard,

---

31 Jones, ”Variation Form.”
"Variation II" has many of the properties that would seem more appropriate for a first variation. Ingwerson writes:

In many respects, ["Variation II"] is more what one would expect of a typical first variation ... the harmonic element bears the strongest relationship to the Baroque *Folia* harmony in this variation. The harmony [of "Variation II"] is much more diatonic than in Ponce’s theme or in Variation I.\(^{32}\)

Yet in comparison to what surrounds it, "Variation I" creates a distinct rhythmic juxtaposition. The rhythm of “Ponce’s Theme” and of “Variation II” are comparatively uncomplicated, most pronounced in the long, unbroken quaver lines of “Variation II.”\(^{33}\) In my interpretation, I discerned that both variations benefited from a dignified, *legato* performance (see Recital 1, “Variation II”).\(^{34}\) “Variation I” by contrast, contains none of the traits one might expect of a first variation. From a macro-structural perspective, therefore, the position of “Variation I” as the first variation is curious. Segovia’s omission of “Variation I” and use of “Variation II” as the first variation in his recording strengthens this interpretation.\(^{35}\) As a performer, I am aware of the need to guide an audience through a work, especially one as long as the *Folia Variations*. This task is made more difficult by having a variation as unconventional and challenging as “Variation I” so early in the work. In the context of the overall length of the *Folia Variations*, “Ponce’s Theme,” which lasts for less than a minute, is a small foundation for the audience to absorb the theme and settle into the musical parameters of the work before venturing into the complexity of “Variation I.” In one regard, “Ponce’s Theme” is in keeping with the conventions of the theme and variations form, in that “the main theme of a variations movement is invariably constructed as a small ternary or small binary ... Since the theme-and-variations form brings multiple restatements of the initial basic idea, the composer can avoid over exposing it by using the small binary.”\(^{36}\) Caplin goes on to state, however, that in the eighteenth-century style “the return to the basic idea [of the theme] then functions exclusively to mark the beginning of each variation. The variations that follow the main theme normally adhere not only to its overall form (as ternary


\(^{33}\) “Variation II” is the subject of further discussion in Chapter 5.


\(^{35}\) "Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue," performed by Segovia, track 14.

or binary) but also to its specific arrangement of intrathematic functions.” It is at this point, therefore that “Variation I” deviates wildly from convention. One would expect, conventionally, the first variation to be used an opportunity to gently reinforce the familiarity and musical parameters of the theme to the audience. Yet “Variation I” shifts dramatically from the lento theme, and makes no clear reference to either the Folia melody or harmony.

This juxtaposition between “Ponce’s Theme,” “Variation I,” and “Variation II,” establishes early a sense of productive tension: a creative energy resulting from the differing aesthetic perspectives of the two musicians. This tension becomes a factor in the large-scale understanding of the work. The three opening movements establish contrasting artistic viewpoints, which are later developed as more significant periods of tension. Notably, “Variation V,” “Variation VI,” and “Variation VII” create a block that may be understood as representing Ponce’s aesthetics, while the subsequent five variations each strongly display the influence of Segovia’s artistic agency. Towards the end of the work, “Variation XVII,” “Variation XVIII,” and “Variation XIX” show strong elements from both musicians.

Understanding of “Variation I” as subversive of theme and variations form results in particular consequences for my creative engagement with the work as performer. The core corollary is to perform the variation with a certain defiant energy that emphasises the variation’s eccentricity, and brings out aspects of the variation that contain a sense of Ponce’s artistic voice. These decisions affect my choices of dynamic range, tempo, tone-colour, and articulation. The dynamics on the score are confined from piano to forte. My interpretation, however, expands this range considerably, favouring more dramatic increases in volume over shorter spans of music. In the score, the piano marking of bar 1 receives only minor dynamic shaping in bars 2, 5 and 8, and is not countered until bar 14, which contains the first forte marking (see Figure 4.6 and Figure 4.7 above). Using my 2018 performance as an example, my interpretation employs a crescendo quickly from bar 1 to forte/fortissimo by the second quaver of bar 4, before returning to piano by the last quaver of bar 7. Similarly, my interpretation extends the crescendo from bar 13 into bar 14, arriving at fortissimo in bar 15, and remains between mezzo-forte and forte until the decrescendo from bars 18-21 (see Recital 3, “Variation

37 Ibid. [parentheses in original]
38 “Variation V,” “Variation VI,” and “Variation VII” are discussed further below. “Variation VIII,” “Variation IX,” “Variation X,” and “Variation XI” are discussed in Chapter 3.
39 The merging of Ponce and Segovia’s artistic agencies, and “Variation XVII,” “Variation XVIII,” and “Variation XIX” are discussed in Chapter 5.
This does away with Ponce’s piano at bar 16, in favour of a more extended forte gesture. The forte dynamics coincide with the points of most intense dissonance. As a result, I accentuate the chromatic eccentricity of the variation in a more assertive manner than following the dynamics marked on the score.

The interpretations of three prominent performers, Marcin Dylla, Tilman Hoppstock, and John Williams, reveal a preference for slower tempos. Dylla’s performance is the slowest, at 148 quaver beats per minute. Coupled with considerable rubato, he creates a withdrawing sense of pulse. Hoppstock’s performance of the Folia Variations, as a whole, has a tendency towards the extreme. In “Variation I,” however, Hoppstock’s tempo of approximately 152 quaver beats per minute is conventional. The swiftest performance, the 160 quaver beats per minute of John Williams, approaches my interpretation of the poco vivo expressive marking. Yet the overall restraint of Williams’ performance with regards to dynamic contrast and tone-colour variation results in a less vibrant interpretation. My personal aesthetic intention was first conveyed in my 2016 performance, where the tempo of 166 quaver beats per minute is used to portray the liveliness of the poco vivo sentiment (see Recital 1, “Variation I”). Similarly, my 2018 performance reaffirms this interpretation, with tempos between 166 and 176 beats per minute (see Recital 3, “Variation I”). Performing the variation with a faster tempo works in conjunction with the understanding the structural place of “Variation I” as both unexpected and subversive. It accentuates the contrast between “Ponce’s Theme” before, and “Variation II” after. While I do not wish to argue that a faster tempo is by definition better, in the instance of “Variation I” the increased speed of my performances merges my desire to communicate aspects of the energetic expressive marking.
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40 Recital 3, “Variation I”: https://youtu.be/2VjllzoNh0w?t=2581
42 For example, in “Variation XIV,” marked “Allegro non troppo,” Hoppstock plays with much more than a hint of “troppo,” as discussed in Chapter 5. Other examples are “Variation XVI,” in which Hoppstock performs the tremolo with uniquely unorthodox technique; or in “Variation VI,” marked “Allegretto espressivo,” where his choice of tempo boarders larghetto.
44 Manuel M. Ponce, "Variations sur “La folia de espana” et fugue: Var 1, Poco vivo,” on Manuel M. Ponce: The Paris Years (1926-32), performed by Tilman Hoppstock, (Heidelberg: Christophorus, 2020), track 27.
45 Manuel M. Ponce, "Variations on “Folia de Espana” and Fugue,” on Latin American Guitar Music by Barrios and Ponce, performed by John Williams, (Sony Classical: 1979), track 15.
46 Recital 1, “Variation I”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78kJy4k?t=1965
46 Recital 3, “Variation I”: https://youtu.be/2VjllzoNh0w?t=2581
with an understanding of that sentiment’s significance as an expression of Ponce’s artistic agency.

This musicological inquiry also informs my choices of tone-colour, with the aim of accentuating Ponce’s rhythmic motifs. In my 2018 performance, I utilise a brighter tone-colour in bars 4, 5, 10 and 15, achieved either through *sul ponticello* right-hand positioning, or through the sharper angle of attack of the right-hand nails, to help the listener identify the interjection of one rhythmic motif over another. Similarly, this timbre change emphasises the moments of heightened dissonance. To further this effect, I perform the variation with contrasting articulation. The first 12 bars feature a primarily *staccato* style, particularly between downbeat quavers and the following upbeat semiquaver or triplet semiquaver. Bars 13, 14, and 16-21, are differentiated by a *legato* style. In combination, therefore, my interpretive choices of tempo, tone-colour, and articulation strengthen the clarity of the rhythmic motifs, dissonance, and structure of the variation (see Recital 3, “Variation I”).

These interpretive decisions emerge from my aesthetic priorities as a modern performer and support the variation’s idiosyncrasy in the greater context of the work. In taking this interpretive approach, I have also intentionally magnified aspects of Ponce’s creative voice in the variation.

In the absence of written communication from Ponce to Segovia, we rely on his music as evidence of his creative agency in the relationship with Segovia. To this end, “Variation I” is indicative of the strength of Ponce’s creative voice in the relationship. Ponce expressed core aspects of his style with assuredness, exemplified by the variation’s prominent structural place in the final publication.

**Ponce’s Triptych**

“Variation V,” “Variation VI,” and “Variation VII” share many similar musical characteristics that support their interpretation as a coherent block expressing Ponce’s artistic voice. Firstly, they are linked by a reference to the 1-7-1 motif, outlined in the first three bars of “Ponce’s Theme” (annotated in Figure 4.11 below). Secondly, and more significantly, they

---

Recital 3, “Variation I”: [https://youtu.be/2VjIlzoNhW0?t=2581](https://youtu.be/2VjIlzoNhW0?t=2581)
each make use of motifs that can be linked to Ponce’s additions to the theme, and hence are linked to Ponce’s artistic voice in the work. These motivic links are often paired with musical traits that may be understood as connected with Ponce’s compositional idiom, such as an attention to rhythmic vitality, independent melodic lines, and the use of dissonance.

![Figure 4.11: “Theme” bars 1-5 with the \(1\)-\(\hat{7}\)-\(\hat{1}\) motif marked.](image)

The variations are progressively linked by characterises that can be traced to Ponce’s style: “Variation V,” and “Variation VI,” share commonalities in their rhythm, while “Variation VI,” and “Variation VII” both make use of independent melodic lines. Lastly, none of the variations have a conspicuous connection to the technical or musical stipulations made by Segovia in his numerous letters to Ponce. These traits, their conceptual grounding, their connection to Ponce’s aesthetics, and their use in combination, help define these three variations as a cogent display of Ponce’s creative style.

**Variation V - Andantino**

On many fronts, “Variation V” incorporates musical elements that align with characteristics of Ponce’s style. On the surface, however, “Variation V” also appears to obliquely take its lead from Segovia’s request for a variation that included “suspensions in noble polyphonic motion.” On detailed analysis, Ponce’s aesthetics emerge through the compositional construction of the melody, methods of motivic development, the variation’s connection to chromatic material from “Ponce’s Theme,” and Ponce’s distinctive use of rhythm. Comparison to the outwardly similar “Variation IX” provides a further nuance to this interpretation.

---

48 Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue*, “Theme” bars 1-5.
49 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 50.
The melodic construction of “Variation V” is moderately disjointed, and has features that are in line with Ponce’s intentional modernisation of his idiom, such as the use of dissonances, and a motivic focus on the minor second. For historical context, the typical voice-leading parameters for vocal melodic writing that have been employed by composers since around 1650 are that the melody should move within a range of no more than one octave, readily employ stepwise motion, and that intervals larger than a fifth should be used sparingly and be followed with stepwise motion. In combination, these criteria result in a melody that is eminently singable. Analysis of the melodic composition of “Variation V,” show its contravention of these parameters. The melody contains frequent, large intervalic leaps that are often melodically awkward, such as the diminished-fourth from bar 1 to 2, the seventh in bar 6 (see Figure 4.14 below), the major-sixth at bar 28, and the ascending sixth immediately followed by a descending fifth in bars 30 and 31 (see Figure 4.12 below). This creates a disjointed melodic line that is distinctly instrumental in nature, in contrast to a conceptually vocal melody. In this sense, it appeals to Ponce’s more modern musical sensibilities, that are not necessarily focussed on immediate popular appeal, but rather on the more intricate, compositional workings of the melody.

Ponce’s creative agency is also expressed through the compositionally detailed derivation from the theme of the motivic material in “Variation V,” a connection which is not evident to the listener, or for that matter to the performer. Ingwerson observes that, apart from the opening anacrusis’s source in the 1-7-1 of the Folia melody, the origins of the remaining motifs are more obscure. Ingwerson shows that Ponce derived almost all of the material from bar 7 to the end of the variation through motivic manipulation, using inversion, retrograde and retrograde inversion. The transformations effectively obscure what little resemblance the variation might have to the theme. W. J. Dowling observed that, even in studies where participants are “presented melodies in isolation from any confusing background and in a way that make them easier to recognise than they would have been in an actual musical context,” the participants struggled to correctly identify melodic transformations, particularly retrograde inversion. In the context of the melodic transformations in “Variation V” then, it

52 Ibid., 47, 48.
is unlikely that listeners will discern the variation’s connection to the theme. This style of thematic manipulation is commonly associated with composers of twelve-tone music, such as Schoenberg, Webern, and Berg, and their use by Ponce is significant. Although not applied to the same comprehensive extent as these composers, it nevertheless places the variation in a distinct conceptual sphere. The construction of the variation thereby suggests that an acknowledgment of serialist compositional techniques can be interpreted in Ponce’s writing, placing the variation in contrast to Segovia’s aesthetics.

Bars 18-24 offer another example of a motif linked to “Ponce’s Theme.” The figure in “Variation V,” outlined at the downbeat of each bar, starting from the D-sharp in bar 19 and ending with the B-flat at bar 24 (see Figure 4.12 below), can be interpreted as deriving from the descending chromatic line that Ponce added to bar 10 and 15 of “Ponce’s Theme” (see Figure 4.13 below). The significance of this particular motif is twofold. Firstly, it is another instance where Ponce utilised material he composed into the theme as the source of thematic substance for a later variation, hence tying the variation to his artistic voice. Secondly, despite its overall tonal function, the line’s chromatic nature reinforces the air of dissonance prevalent throughout the variation. Particularly notable is the approach to the figure, which is coloured by a tritone leap between the A and D-sharp in bars 18 and 19, and swiftly followed by a tritone leap in the opposite direction between C and F-sharp. In combination, the aural result of the melodic material and the conceptual background of the variation’s derivation align with Ponce’s drive towards tonal instability and his pursuit of modern musical orientations.

The effect of Ponce’s melodic aesthetics is intensified by his use of rhythm. “Variation V” is marked by the feeling of unease it creates for the listener. Metrically, agitation is created through the unceasing quavers, with bar 24 marking the only point of repose. This is compounded by the structure of the phrases with repeated use of cadential elision, particularly apparent in bars 1-5. This melodic layering is later highlighted through the use of quaver rests on the downbeat before the anacrusis figures in bars 25-29, which interrupt the melodic flow, creating a disjointed character to the rhythm (see Recital 3, “Variation V”). The nature of the rhythm in “Variation V” therefore offers the listener little guidance, creating a sense of tension which, in turn, aligns the variation with Ponce’s aesthetic position.

54 Ibid., “Theme” bars 6-11.
The combination of a compositional framework utilising motivic manipulation, an unceasing rhythmic flow, and non-vocal melody construction, crafts a variation that expresses Ponce’s personal voice and his stated direction as a composer, distinct from Segovia’s aesthetic influence. It reflects his growing tendency, after 1910, to avoid conservative harmonic language, and his more frequent use of independent melodic lines. Similar compositional approaches may be observed in works by Ponce outside of Segovia’s sphere of influence; in particular the Preludios Encandenados, composed just before the Folia Variations in 1927. The first in this series of linked preludes, another “Andantino,” presents imitative counterpoint and the opening bars are particularly evocative of “Variation V.”

Figure 4.14: “Variation V” bars 1-6.

---

39 Ponce, Preludios Encadenados.
Comparing these elements of Ponce’s agency to the aesthetic preferences of Segovia suggests that, within their collaborative relationship, the expression of their respective creative voices was a point of productive tension that enriches the Folia Variations. Observing their two perspectives at play through the comparison of “Variation V” to the similar, yet fundamentally different, “Variation IX,” adds further evidence towards interpreting “Variation V” as an example of Ponce’s aesthetic contribution. On the surface, these two variations share similarities: both are marked andantino, both have moments of disjointed rhythm, and both feature prominent melodic voices. Analysis of the musical and conceptual underpinning of “Variation IX,” however, reveals its distinction from “Variation V.” Of “Variation IX,” Segovia wrote: “[it] is a delight, of a delicate and deep musicality, and a quiet passion that is manifested in all the notes that create suspensions and resolutions within the chords.” Indeed, as Ingwerson noted, “Variation IX is sometimes regarded as the signature variation for the entire work … Segovia seems to have immediately appreciated this
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60 Ibid., “Prelude No. I: Andantino espressivo” bars 1-6.
61 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 52.
variation’s musical impact.” Several factors contribute to its appeal from Segovia’s perspective. Melodically, the first four bars readily conform to parameters of vocal melody writing discussed above: it moves within a range of less than one octave, it employs stepwise motion, intervals larger than a fifth are used sparingly and are followed with stepwise motion. In other words, the melody of these bars is conventional and consonant. Further, this melody is not subject to the same complex motivic permutations that are prevalent in “Variation V.” It can therefore be interpreted as comparatively closer to the aesthetic parameters set by Segovia which were rooted in his desire for something with popular appeal. This is exemplified by Segovia’s fondness for the variation.

Figure 4.16: “Variation IX” bars 1-18.

A gestural, non-melodic, arpeggiated figure follows from bars 5-18. Its disjointed nature, characterised by a succession of large intervallic leaps, is tempered in two ways. Firstly, the clearly expressed gestural trajectory draws the listener through the passage: the expressive marking of animando is coupled with an increase in dynamic level from mezzo-piano to fortissimo, before returning to piano. The section ends with the marking poco rit. These dynamics and the use of rubato create a substantial and emotionally intense gesture that guides listeners through

63 Turek, Theory for Today's Musician 214.
64 Ponce, Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue, “Variation IX” bars 1-18.
the fragmented, non-melodic passage (see Recital 3, “Variation IX”). This gestural drive and tempo of “Variation IX” creates an appealing, compelling force, and a distinctly more inviting listening experience than “Variation V,” where Ponce takes no action to temper the agitating effect of the rhythm. Structurally, the disjointed elements of bars 5-18 of “Variation IX” are also balanced by the musical content of the section that follows. The downbeats of the soprano voice in bars 19-24 mirror the opening two thirds of the Folia melodic structure. Similarly, bars 19-27 present an almost pure statement of the Folia harmonic progression, save for the substitution of chord III for chord i as the penultimate chord, before the resolution to the tonic major. This is coupled with a restatement in the minor mode of the “singable” motif from the opening four bars. In combination, this creates a section that is melodically appealing, and importantly, tangibly related to the theme.

Figure 4.17: “Variation IX” bars 19-30.

The purpose of this excursus is to demonstrate that, by comparison, it is Ponce’s artistic voice that is expressed prominently in “Variation V.” Despite “Variation V” and “Variation IX” having passages of music that appear outwardly similar, the different conceptual foundation behind “Variation V” highlights it more specifically as a statement of Ponce’s agency in the Folia Variations.

It is clear that the work is richer for the varied artistic influences of Segovia and Ponce, and the creative tension between their perspectives, exemplified by these two variations, presents an interesting point of consideration for the interpreter-performer. The knowledge gained

---

65 Recital 3, “Variation IX”: https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=3033
from this investigation informs my interpretation of the variation in performance. It illuminates the possibility for a more sophisticated interplay between my artistic vision of the variation and the intentional expression of Ponce and Segovia’s artistic perspectives. My initial reaction was to soften both the rhythmic drive and melodic discomfort in “Variation V.” I made the rhythmic energy more reticent by employing tenuto at key points in the variation: at the C-sharp on the first beat of bar 4, the A on the first beat of bar 6, and the chord of C-sharp and A on the first beat of bar 10. This sets up an internal phrase structure of 2+2+4 bars. Similarly, I performed a tenuto on the C of the first beat of bar 18 to delineate the first long section of music before the fermata at bar 24. To attenuate the disjointed melodic contours, I used portamento, particularly at the end of the three-note anacruses, such as between the F and the C-sharp of the opening gesture. This combination of agogic accenting with an increased sense of melodic connection between large interval leaps creates a more vocal musical effect, and compartmentalises the gestures into more comprehensible phrases (see Figure 4.18 below and Recital 3, “Variation V”).

Reflecting on Ponce’s aesthetic intent described in this chapter, however, an alternative interpretation can be suggested. Rather than softening the features that make “Variation V” uncomfortable, it could instead be played with more of a “strait” style. That is, with a “principal quality [of] predictability and compliance to rules; tempos and phrasings.” This counter approach would therefore emphasise the disjuncture within the variation rather than hiding it, perhaps better expressing Ponce’s stylistic intention with this variation.

Figure 4.18: “Variation V” bars 1-12 with tenuto and portamento marked.

---

67 Recital 3, “Variation V”: https://youtu.be/2Vji8zoNhw0?t=2807
68 Ponce, Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue, “Variation V” bars 1-12.
My two performances of “Variation V” are evidence of the effect my musicological inquiry has on my practice-based inquiry, and a demonstration of my co-creative role in the artistic dialogue of the work’s development over time. My 2016 performance of “Variation V” makes heavy use of *rubato*, breaking the rhythmic drive of the variation almost immediately through a *tenuto* on the C-sharp of the first beat of bar 2. Further, there is a significant *ritenuto* at bars 9 and 10. The second half of the variation’s performance, from bar 25, is marked by a distinct *sul tasto* tone-colour shift and a reduction in tempo (see Recital 1, “Variation V”). By contrast, my 2018 performance is slightly brisker (approximately 112 beats per minute in comparison to 2016’s 108 beats per minute) and employs noticeably less *rubato*. Further, there are changes to articulation with *staccatos* added to bars 15 and 16. Lastly, the second half of the variation, from bar 25, is performed at close to the same tempo as the rest of the variation in 2018 (see Recital 3, “Variation V”).

My performances demonstrate the interconnection between my artistic output and my analysis. My 2016 performance is representative of my initial, intuitive response to temper the rhythmic drive of the variation. In contrast, my 2018 performance takes cues from my reflections on a more “strait” performance style. My artistic sensibility, however, is clearly more at ease with a compromise between the two: my 2018 performance still makes use of *rubato* and *tenuto*, but to a lesser degree. These performances, therefore, show a creative mediation between my own artistic preferences and vision for the variation, and the knowledge and understanding derived from my research and analysis of Ponce’s aesthetic position.

*Variation VI - Allegretto espressivo*

“Variation VI” exhibits similar traits to “Variation V”: it includes a compositionally intricate technique that accentuates its dissonance and obscures its relationship to the theme, while having oblique reference to early twentieth-century developments in non-functional harmony. “Variation VI” also shares the same unceasing rhythmic drive as “Variation V.”

---

70 Recital 1, “Variation V”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78yJo4k?t=2199
71 Recital 3, “Variation V”: https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=2807
Constant quavers fill the 9/8 bars almost without pause, with the only rhythmic break coming in bar 3, which briefly establishes a change in metric accent for bar 4.

Figure 4.19: “Variation VI” bars 1-6.\textsuperscript{72}

For the listener, the unbroken rhythm creates a sense of unease that is compounded by Ponce’s choice of intervallic material. Ingwerson notes:

\begin{quote}
The most characteristic feature of this variation is the pervasive use of the ascending and descending half-step interval. Derived from the opening 1-7-1 melodic movement of the theme … it makes its first appearance in the opening notes of the bass voice and is seldom absent thereafter.\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}

This relationship to “Ponce’s Theme” is not immediately aurally identifiable, nor is it intended to be. This is especially true in comparison to the anacrusis in “Variation V.” Ponce’s use of the 1-7-1 motif’s half-step relationships of semitones and major-sevenths contributes to the non-melodic, disjointed feel of the variation. As an indicative example, Ingwerson draws special attention to bars 3 and 4, in which seven instances of the half-step relationship occur in the space of just two bars (indicated in Figure 4.20 below).

\textsuperscript{72} Ponce, \textit{Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue}, “Variation VI” bars 1-6.

\textsuperscript{73} Ingwerson, "Manuel Ponce's Variations sur Folia de España et Fugue: A study of compositional procedures and Ponce's use of the folia theme," 50.
Fragmented melodic lines, characterised by Dale as “atomised,” were part of Ponce’s musical idiom. Evidence for this can be heard in the aural similarity between the large intervallic leaps and dissonant character of “Variation VI” and the first movement of Ponce’s 1932 Sonatine for Piano, “Semplice, in tempo d’allegretto.” This detailed approach is particularly characteristic of Ponce’s attention to granular musical constructions, as evinced by its presence in his piano music.

Similar to “Variation V,” “Variation VI” again includes examples of Ponce’s experimentation with techniques of melodic manipulation drawn from the processes of serial music. The most pronounced example is in bars 5 and 6. From the downbeat E of bar 5 to the F-sharp at the second quaver of bar 6, Ponce creates an almost complete tone-row, utilising eleven distinct pitches. Further, bars 5 and 6 contain two chromatic lines that move in contrary motion (marked in Figure 4.21 below). While the registers are perhaps not as separate as they might have been had this been composed for piano, it displays Ponce’s liking for melodic lines that move independently of one another. As in “Variation V,” the descending chromatic line in bar 5 of “Variation VI” can be linked to bar 10 of “Ponce’s Theme” (marked in Figure 4.13 above). The chromaticism of these two lines also contributes to the overall dissonant character of the section.

---

Ponce augments this idea in bars 11-12, where whole-tone lines descend before the recapitulation of the opening motif (see Figure 4.22 below). The upper whole-tone line is highlighted through its placement at the second quaver of each dotted crotchet beat, creating a syncopated rhythm. The pairing of dissonant language with syncopations is highly characteristic of Ponce's style. Bars 5, 6, 11, and 12 therefore demonstrate Ponce's acknowledgement of early twentieth-century compositional developments through his experimentation with non-tertian means of pitch organisation. These bars therefore cohere to create a nuanced and compositionally tight-knit display of Ponce’s aesthetics.

Using dissonant melodic intervals in quick succession, an unceasing rhythm, and thematic development that is not clear to the listener, creates a feeling of imbalance within “Variation VI.” This unevenness is intensified by Ponce’s use of four-bar phrasing patterns that occur over five and seven-bar harmonic sections identified by Ingwerson. These features create a variation that stands out within the greater contextual framework of the piece. Recalling the discussions of Segovia’s purposes, and his specific instructions to Ponce regarding the Folia Variations, “Variation VI” appears not to address any of Segovia’s calls for specific guitar techniques, virtuosity, or an approachable popular appeal. It may be therefore understood as
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77 Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue*, “Variation VI” bars 4-6.
a distinct expression of Ponce’s artistic values. A final indication of the variation’s distance from Segovia’s aesthetics is its absence from his recording of the work.¹⁸¹

Ponce’s particular approach in this variation had implications for my interaction with it as a performer. In particular, I found it challenging to bring an emotional depth, or defined musical character to my interpretation of the detailed and fragmentary melodic style. This presumably stems from my instrumental focus as a guitarist. As demonstrated above, however, the guitar is not the musical nor technical priority in this variation. My analysis of this variation can therefore be utilised to inform its performance. For example, in the contrary melodic motion of bars 4 and 5, the performer might choose to use different articulations for each voice: staccato for the upper line, and legato for the lower, bringing greater definition to their independence. Another, broader suggestion, might be to embrace more fully the character of the variation as disconcerting or enigmatic. In practice, this might take the form of a non-legato performance that does not attempt to create melodic connections between the large intervallic leaps in bars 4 and 6.

For the most part, the findings of this analysis were arrived at in the period of critical reflection that followed my performances in 2016 and 2018. Nevertheless, the analysis can be used to add another layer of nuance and understanding to the decisions I made as part of my creative response to the variation. Bar 8 contains an example where alterations to my performance find support in my analysis of Ponce’s creative vision, and have the secondary benefit of more idiomatic execution. My alteration to the fingering in the notation better serves the implied change in accenting, by bringing out the high F-sharp, E, C-natural, and F-sharp (marked in Figure 4.23 below). I use three distinct left-hand position shifts, coinciding with the first three notes of the rhythmic pattern to bring out the brief metric interest and variety of the bar. This interpretation brings to mind Ponce’s development of his idiom to incorporate tauter use of rhythm, and syncopated contrapuntal lines.¹⁸² The fingering indicated in the score, in contrast, disguises the metric diversity of this moment and reinforces the 9/8 feel: the left hand shifts between the E of the second dotted crotchet beat and the subsequent B, followed by a slur onto the C-natural. Despite having more left-hand position

¹⁸¹ "Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue," performed by Segovia, track 14. Again, it must be acknowledged that, without a definitive timeline for when many of the variations were composed, it is possible that “Variation VI” was composed after Segovia recorded of the work.
shifts, my fingering proves more technically achievable in performance, unencumbered by the brief placement of a barré. Uncovering and making accommodations for nuances such as these echoes Ponce’s detailed attention to the compositional intricacies of this variation.

Figure 4.23: “Variation VI” bars 7-9 with the accented notes circled and the authors fingering suggestions.83

This example shows the effect that interpreting “Variation VI” as an expression of Ponce’s artistic agency has on my practice-based inquiry and performance. I incorporate aspects of my own stylistic idiom into my interpretation, whilst creatively negotiating the weave of other artistic influences to bring Ponce’s creative view, as I perceive it, to the foreground. This is in response to the understanding of “Variation VI” as pertaining more to the expressive world of Ponce than Segovia.

Variation VII - Andante

Much like the previous two variations discussed, “Variation VII” does not directly address any of the guitar techniques suggested by Segovia. Loosely, it might be interpreted as addressing his suggestion for a variation with “suspensions in noble polyphonic motion,” similar to “Variation V.”84 The derivation of motivic material and the use of independent melodic lines in “Variation VII,” however, reflect Ponce’s musical sensibilities. Through these features, “Variation VII” is also closely bound to “Variation V,” and “Variation VI.” “Variation VII” therefore forms the last in the trio of variations that may be understood as a concentrated expression Ponce’s musical values.

The initial connection of “Variation VII” to the previous two variations occurs via the opening lower mordent (see Figure 4.24 below). This figure constitutes the third reference to

84 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 50.
the Œ-ŒŒ motif of the *Folia* melody. Like “Variation V” and “Variation VI,” “Variation VII” is linked to material that Ponce added to his version of the theme as the basis for its thematic development. The first of these links is found in the rhythmic and melodic resemblance between the descending E-flat-D-flat-C-B-flat portion of the lower melodic voice in bars 1 and 2 of “Variation VII” (marked in Figure 4.24 below), and the D-C-B-natural-B-flat portion of the inner voice found in bars 4 and 5 of “Ponce’s Theme” (marked in Figure 4.25 below). Further, the bass figure in bars 14-16 of “Ponce’s Theme,” which ascends chromatically through G, G-sharp, and A, before falling to the D (marked in Figure 4.26 below), is mirrored in the bass voice in bar 3 of “Variation VII” (also marked in Figure 4.24 below). By using thematic material from the theme that is entirely his own creation, Ponce effectively bypasses the direct influence of Segovia, and capitalises on his own aesthetic control over the work. This can also be observed in the harmony of the opening bars. Despite beginning and ending in D minor, there is a fluid quality to the harmony of the introductory gestures, signalled by the E-flat minor chord on the second beat.

Figure 4.24: “Variation VII” bars 1-4.\(^{85}\)

Figure 4.25: “Ponce’s Theme” bars 1-5.\(^{86}\)

---


\(^{86}\) Ibid., “Theme” bars 1-5.
Further links to elements of Ponce’s idiom can be observed in the superimposition of two independent melodic lines. As discussed with reference to “Variation VI,” Ponce’s piano music often incorporated discrete lines performed by the left and right hands. The opening four bars of “Variation VII” demonstrate this through the use of elisions. Similarly, bars 5-14 show two lines in contrary motion, each with quite distinct characteristics. The lower is single voice, legato, on the beat, and melodic. The upper is chordal, detached, and syncopated. The individuality of the two lines suggests their characterisation as pianistic.

There is, however, a sense of progression away from Ponce’s idiom in the closing moments of the variation. The earlier chromaticism is exchanged for a strong dominant-tonic relationship between the end of “Variation VII” and the start of “Variation VIII.” This clearer, functional, and tonal language can be characterised as aligning more with Segovia’s aesthetics. Segovia was also responsible for suggesting the three-note chord technique that dominates “Variation IV” which precedes “Ponce’s Triptych.” These bookending
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87 Ibid., “Theme” bars 12-16.
89 Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue,* “Variation VII” bars 5-14.
90 “Variation IV” is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.
variations, rich with Segovia’s influence, serve to enhance the structural function of the excursus into the musical world of Ponce.

As with “Variation VI,” the interpretation of “Variation VII” presented above was the product of research subsequent to the recitals for this project. The understanding my analysis brings to some of the matters at play in the variation, however, can also contribute to the rationalisation of my creative decisions. The central focus in both my 2016 and 2018 performances was to communicate the phrase structure of “Variation VII” (see Recital 1, “Variation VII” and Recital 3, “Variation VII”). The desired expressive effect was to convey a strong sense of the meso-structure of the variation, with the purpose of building towards its climax. With this in mind, in the closing bars of the variation (bars 23-29) I performed a considerable ritardando, and strived for a very sonoro expression. This builds suspense leading to the final A-major chord, which I performed attacca into “Variation VIII,” forsaking the silence of the indicated two crotchet rests. My decision to perform the variation attacca reinforces the large-scale, dominant-tonic relationship between “Variation VII” and “Variation VIII,” and has the effect of highlighting the return to a variation characteristic of the aesthetic world of Segovia. My interpretation thereby reflects the overall structural and aesthetic arc demonstrated in the analysis of variations V, VI, and VII. This effect is most pronounced in my 2018 performance (see Recital 3, end of “Variation VII”). I also made decisions to delineate the smaller phrases of “Variation III.” Four-bar phrases are demarcated through the use of tone-colour: bars 1-4 are performed sul pont, bars 5-8 are performed between naturale and dolce with a considerable rallentando in bars 7 and 8. The change in texture and mood at bars 9-14 is accentuated through a legato, dolce performance of the lower part, accompanied by a poco staccato articulation of the upper voice. In my performances, similar techniques are used to demarcate the beginnings and ends of phrases in bars 14 and 15, 18 and 19, 22 and 23. Each of these decisions are most apparent in my 2018 performance (see Recital 3, “Variation VII”). In addition to accentuating the phrase structure, this interpretation also gives each part its own character, which can be seen to align with Ponce’s musical aesthetics of creating independent melodic lines. Therefore, although my interpretive decisions in the performance of “Variation VII” were made prior to this

92 Recital 3, end of “Variation VII”: https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=2968
analysis, this process shows a convergence of my performative interpretation with my analytical interpretation.

For the most part, my creative decisions as an interpreter and performer of “Variation V,” “Variation VI,” and “Variation VII” have focussed on the expression of Ponce’s aesthetic voice. My analysis of this trio of variations highlights them as a forceful statement of Ponce’s artistic agency. They exhibit a strong compositional focus, which is indicative of his meticulous attention to compositional detail as well as his interest in developing his language using aspects of early twentieth-century vocabulary. This is layered with an attention to rhythm and independent contrapuntal lines that foreground Ponce’s particular style. Lastly, these variations do not overtly contribute to the exposition of guitar techniques, a pursuit that was a particular priority of Segovia. These variations are therefore indicative of Ponce’s distinct aesthetics in the *Folia Variations*.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter illuminates Ponce’s agentic motivation as a creative actor within the collaborative relationship with Segovia. Ponce’s creative presence acts as a counterpoint to Segovia’s agency. This is shown through the analysis of Ponce’s artistic presence in specific variations. Through the recognition of Ponce’s agency in the *Folia Variations*, this chapter carves out a place for the attention to, and intentional expression of, his particular musical values: dissonant harmonic language, crisp rhythmic drive, and an attention to larger-scale structural flow. The investigation illustrates that the creative relationship between the two musicians throughout the work’s conception brings a depth, diversity, and richness in its aesthetic influences. Simultaneously, this results in a certain degree of productive tension with Segovia’s perspective embedded in the work. This duality of perspectives forms part of my avenue into the discourse of the work.

This chapter articulates my interpretation, which aims to strike a balance between my own artistic vision and the artistic perspectives of Ponce and Segovia. This has consequences for the fine details of my performances and the macro-expression of the overall work. In addition to the influence of Segovia’s viewpoint outlined in Chapter 3, the analysis of Ponce’s input as
a composer spurred creative action on my part as an interpreter. As a performer, I am comparatively less conversant with Ponce’s viewpoint than that of Segovia’s. Engaging with Ponce’s artistic agency therefore brought a distinctly new dimension to my interpretation. Informed by the investigations in this chapter, my performance of the *Folia Variations* intentionally brings aspects of Ponce’s musical aesthetics to the fore, such as in “Ponce’s Theme,” and “Variation I.”

This chapter, therefore, demonstrates how an understanding of creative relationships affects how the music is created, performed, and understood, not only during the work’s conception, but diachronically.⁹⁴ By analysing and responding to the creative interaction between Ponce and Segovia, I inhabit the role of a co-creator of the *Folia Variations*. In creating new understandings of the work through my engagement with the dialogue between those who created it, I continue parts of that collaborative process in my own present-day creative practice, both performatively and musicologically. Through my interpretations as an analyst and performer I contribute new understandings of both the work and the discourse, adding my own artistic layer created in partnership with musicians from the past.⁹⁵

---

INTRODUCTION

This chapter develops on the preceding chapters by exploring the concept of communal orientation, where the artistic visions of both actors came together in the creation of the work. The following study analyses the intersection of their agencies, and the musical results of the dialogic aspects of their relationship. It uncovers collaborative problem-solving that occurred during the creation of specific variations. Further, the significant creative exchange between the two musicians is examined, and the musical consequences of this collaboration both in the score and in performance are explored. This chapter furthers the idea that the combination of Ponce and Segovia’s creative agencies, and their problem-solving processes, lent the Folia Variations a complexity and richness of musical concepts, expressivity, and style. As discussed by Buckley, problem-solving between composers and performers includes a component of aesthetic responsibility. He argues that in this process, the creative agency of the performer encompasses responsibility for the musical outcome as well as technical execution.¹ The variations explored in this chapter are a testament to the concept of distributed creativity, explored by Cook, Clarke and Doffman, wherein the creative life of a work is not the sole preserve of an individual, but rather may be shared between several creators, sometimes over centuries.² This distribution of work and roles may result in something greater than that which might otherwise have been possible.

In Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, Bakan’s theory of interpersonal orientation provided a framework that enabled me to define Segovia and Ponce’s agentic motivations in the creation of the Folia Variations.³ This chapter explores instances of their communal motivation. To reiterate, communal motivation characterises actions centred around the provision of support

¹ Buckley, "Creative Performer Agency in the Collaborative Compositional Process," 73.
² Cook, Music as Creative Practice: Studies in Musical Performance as Creative Practice, 65, 66; Clarke and Doffman, "Introduction and Overview," 1, 2.
to others and contribution to a common goal. The literature surrounding composer-performer relationships is rich in examples based on communion. For example, in Chapter 1 I outlined four interactions between composers and performers that exhibit communal motives: Mozart and Fischer, Beethoven and Manker, Brahms and Joachim, and Fitch and Heyde. The communal motivation in Ponce and Segovia’s interactions derived from a close personal and musical relationship which enabled a creative exchange of musical ideas and a collaborative process of problem-solving. The development of such a relationship is easily observed in the spirit of Segovia’s writing to Ponce: the tenderness is already evident, even in the early stages of their correspondence. In his very first letter to Ponce in 1923, not long after their first meeting, Segovia ended his letter with, “Adios, an affectionate hug from your good friend, who loves and admires you, Andrés.” The tenor of their relationship remained kind throughout the early years: Segovia often addressed Ponce “My dear Manuel,” and offered reassurances of Ponce’s compositional prowess and character. Otero observes that Ponce’s stay in Paris from 1925 “laid the basis of his great friendship with Andres Segovia, a friendship that grew to be a close relationship.” Despite the fact that the “elaborate theatre of formal greeting and farewell” was perhaps not unusual during this period, the nature of these communications nevertheless demonstrates the fondness, built on respect but with perhaps a touch of flattery, that was the foundation for the evolution of the Folia Variations.

The first section of this chapter explores the communal collaboration between Segovia and Ponce as observed in the combination of elements from their aesthetic priorities in several variations. “Variation XII” exhibits this aesthetic intersection most clearly. The analyses of “Variation II” and “Variation III” interpret historical allusion to the music of Corelli as a signifier of historical ties in the work. The examination of similarities to historical works is paired with the interpretation of a dialogue-like interplay between Ponce and Segovia’s musical influences, a feature which becomes increasingly apparent in the analyses of “Variation III” and “Variation XVII.” Finally, the combining of Ponce and Segovia’s respective influences is demonstrated through the comparative analysis of “Variation XIII” and the “Fuga,” which powerfully demonstrate their communal collaboration through the

---

4 Colvin and Bundick, “In Search of the Good Judge of Personality: Some Methodological and Theoretical Concerns,” ed. Hall and Bernieri, 60.
5 Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 3.
6 Ibid., 52, 63, 66, 78, 99.
7 Otero, Manuel M. Ponce and the Guitar, 22.
simultaneous exposition of both musicians’ aesthetics. The second section of this chapter explores the collaborative problem-solving undertaken by Ponce and Segovia in the creation of the *Folia Variations*. “Variation XIV” acts as a half-way point between the discussion of stylistic amalgamation and problem-solving, exhibiting characteristics of both. The investigations of “Variation XV” and “Variation XIX” explore the dialogue between the pair regarding matters of technical execution, structural imbalances within a variation, and large-scale structural issues. The study highlights the communal nature of this problem-solving process in each variation, and explores the consequences in performance.

**COMBINING STYLES**

*Variation XII - Animato*

“Variation XII” exhibits musical elements that pertain to both Ponce’s compositional aesthetics and Segovia’s style. Analysis of its instrumental techniques, expressive content, rhythm, melody, harmony, motivic development, and large-scale structural placement, reveals the roles of both Segovia and Ponce in its genesis. In a brief package, this variation merges the popular appeal and Spanish character specified by Segovia with Ponce’s intricate, motivically-driven compositional connection to the *Folia* theme.

Segovia asked emphatically in 1929 for Ponce to write something Spanish in flavour that would “blow the head” of Ponce’s Spanish contemporaries Turina, Torroba and de Falla.\(^9\) One striking feature of “Variation XII,” particularly apparent during practice-based investigation, is the numerous and juxtaposed instrumental techniques. This diversity can be seen as part of Ponce’s realisation of Segovia’s enthusiasm for something with extroverted, virtuosic, and Spanish panache. It includes rapid, right-hand arpeggios on static chords in bars 1 and 2; sweeping arpeggios up the neck of the guitar in bars 5 and 6 and again in bars 9 and 10; *pizzicato* in bars 5 and 6; long, single-note scale runs in bars 13 through 16; and three-note chord passages in bars 20, 24, and 25 (see Figure 5.1 below). The *rasgueado* strumming employed in bars 21 to 23, long associated with the guitar’s flamenco heritage, is the only

---

\(^9\) Segovia, *The Segovia–Ponce Letters*, 54. [italics in original]
marked instance of the technique in the entire work. Incorporating such a variety into a variation that lasts less than a minute captures the listener’s attention, with every moment imbued with energetic movement (see Recital 3, “Variation XII”). The extremes in dynamics of “Variation XII” achieve a similar effect. The markings range from pianissimo to fortissimo, but also make frequent leaps between dynamic extremes. For example, in bars 1 to 3, and in bars 27 and 28, the dynamic shifts rapidly from fortissimo to piano. Similarly, the dynamic jumps from pianissimo to forte at the junction of bars 10 and 11. Such dramatic shifts in dynamic enhance the variation’s captivating appeal. In the same way, bars 1, 2, 26, and 29 are pointedly composed to capitalise on the more powerful and resonant aspects of the guitar by utilising the lower three strings, which are open and full-bodied. Further, the arpeggio pattern in these bars allows the performer to take full advantage of the strongest fingers of the right hand, p, i, and m, to amplify the immediate appeal of the variation. The variety of techniques presented in “Variation XII” is made more notable by its proximity to “Variation XIII,” which focusses purely on the linear development of the canon form.

10 Katz, "Flamenco."
12 “Variation XIII” is discussed later in this chapter.
The variation’s rhythm, melody, and harmony contribute to its Spanish quality. The opening bars allude to the fandango rhythm, an association made stronger by the triple meter, and lively animato and ritmico directions. The fandango is “considered one of the most widespread of Spain’s traditional dances.” The descending melodic line in bars 3-5 outlines the

---

13 Ponce, Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue, “Variation XII”.
Phrygian mode, long associated with flamenco music. Harmonically, the chord progression in bars 17-24 outlines a slightly modified version of the romanescas melodic form over a D pedal (see Figure 5.2 below).

Figure 5.2: Romanescas melodic form.

What is clear from this analysis is that the musical sentiment of this variation represents Ponce’s incorporation of Segovia’s indirect aesthetic priorities over his own interests in Mexican musical styles. Identifying this subtlety of communication establishes a more communal dimension to their relationship. Rather than simply accommodating the most overt musical requests, there is here a discerning touch to Ponce’s interpretation and exchange of musical ideas with Segovia.

Understanding of this nuance is strengthened when combined with a consideration of Ponce’s aesthetic voice within the variation. In contrast to the immediate appeal of the instrumental techniques, the compositional link to the Folia theme is more abstruse. As Ingwerson observes, “the melody in mm. 3-5 and mm. 7-9 is based on an inversion (1-2-1-7-8) of the folia melody (1-7-1-2-3)… [and] the sequential pattern used in mm. 17-19 and mm. 21-23 is based on the 1-2-3-2-1 portion of the folia melody.” To the listener, these intricacies are not readily identifiable. Firstly, they are abstracted fragments of the complete melody, but secondly, they are temporally distant, occurring approximately twelve minutes after the main theme. Moreover, they are overshadowed by the variation’s virtuosic fireworks. Nevertheless, these motivic derivations are a distinct statement of Ponce’s own aesthetic voice: by including these compositional devices, he marks the variation with an academic, sophisticated aspect that adds an additional conceptual element beyond showmanship.

---

16 Katz, “Flamenco.”
19 The subtle incorporation of motivic material into the weave of various instrumental techniques of this variation recalls the discussion in Chapter 1 and Chapter 4 of Ponce’s stylistic development.
“Variation XII” also has a large-scale structural function that is indicative of the compositional perspective Ponce brought to the work. The two variations which surround “Variation XII” contrast it markedly: “Variation XI” has a strong focus on melody (discussed in Chapter 3), while “Variation XIII” is concentrated solely on the development of a canon (explored below). Both of these variations are slower in tempo than “Variation XII,” and noticeably less exuberant in mood (see Recital 1, variations XI through XIII). Consequently, placed between these two variations, “Variation XII” functions as a point of contrast within the macro-structure of the work. This interpretation of its function is further strengthened by the structural function of “Variation XIII.”

This analysis therefore demonstrates that “Variation XII” includes Ponce’s stylistic derivation of thematic material and attention to the large-scale structure of the work, presented alongside a popular, Spanish approach to its execution on the instrument, thereby blending aspects of the expression of Ponce’s own artistic voice with those of Segovia. In contrast to the variations discussed in Chapter 3, which predominantly utilise a singular, specific instrumental technique, here Segovia’s agency is presented as an aesthetic “flavour.” As such, “Variation XII” demonstrates Ponce’s attentiveness to the inferred details of their communication, and forms a significant, artistic contribution to their dialogue. It shows the exchange of musical ideas, beyond the explicit directives discussed in previous chapters, and highlights the presence of a combination of aesthetic perspectives within the Folia Variations that enriches its technical, musical, and emotional constitution.

A Brief Discussion of Intertextuality

The analyses below explore how communal collaboration can be interpreted in the historical intertextuality of Ponce’s compositional idiom. “Intertextuality” describes “a text’s relations to other texts in the larger ‘mosaic’ of cultural practices and their expression … a text’s ‘intertextual’ potential and status are derived from its relations with other texts past, present, and future.” Michael Klein argues that the intertext of musical works changes with time,

20 Recital 1, variations XI through XIII: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=2564
21 Where Segovia made an explicit stipulation for an instrumental technique, the corresponding variations seemingly only include that one. For example, only one technique is used in each of “Variation IV,” “Variation VIII,” “Variation X,” “Variation XVI,” “Variation XIX,” and “Variation XX.” With this in mind, the variety of techniques becomes a notable factor.
and that music that was perhaps not known at the time of composition may be relevant to our hearing today.\textsuperscript{23} With this in mind, intertextuality is, to some extent, is in the ears of the listener (or performer, or analyst, or reader). As Klein notes, it is part of the “cultural net of musical texts that we bring to music as we struggle to make sense of it … [a] constellation of texts speaking both with us and among themselves.”\textsuperscript{24}

As discussed in Chapter 3, Segovia wished for the \textit{Folia Variations} to demonstrate a historical lineage, principally through his choice of the \textit{Folia}, a theme with a rich history. Segovia requested Ponce to familiarise himself with Corelli’s \textit{La Follia} variations from his 12 Violin Sonatas, Op. 5, stating he wished for the \textit{Folia Variations} to be the “counterpart of those of Corelli for violin on the same theme.”\textsuperscript{25} In Chapter 3 this was demonstrated as influential in the composition of “Variation VIII.” Recalling his initial letter of commission, quoted in Chapter 2, Segovia cites Corelli’s variations as a source of historical and aesthetic inspiration:

> You already know that this petition of mine is an old one. Go back to those first days of your stay in Paris. Remember? Three or four years ago, and actually, a violin performance of the Corelli variations, profoundly stirred my desire to play some variations of equal or superior importance, written by you.\textsuperscript{26}

Segovia’s comments draw attention to Corelli’s \textit{La Follia} as a significant historical source, and an inspiration for the \textit{Folia Variations}. Moreover, Corelli’s works were a point of connection between the pair from the early stages of their artistic relationship, and hence part of their creative dialogue both leading up to, and at the genesis of the \textit{Folia Variations}.

This exchange invites deeper exploration of Corelli’s \textit{La Follia} in the work. While there is no direct evidence in support of Ponce’s consultation of Corelli’s music, tantalising musical similarities in the motivic relationships between three of the \textit{Folia Variations} and \textit{La Follia} suggest Ponce may have taken Segovia’s advice. These motivic parallels point to Ponce’s awareness of the historical lineage within which Segovia was seeking to position the work. My interpretation of the following two variations, through the prism of their likeness to Corelli’s music, contributes to a deeper exploration of Ponce and Segovia’s combined aesthetic perspectives. Unlike the variations discussed in Chapter 3, the variations discussed below are not as directly connected to Segovia’s specific technical or musical stipulations. Interpreting

\textsuperscript{23} Michael L. Klein, \textit{Intertextuality in Western Art Music} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 1.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., ix.
\textsuperscript{25} Segovia, \textit{The Segovia-Ponce Letters}, 50.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
the parallels with Corelli’s *La Follia*, therefore, helps to expand the interpretation of the intellectual and musical aesthetic perimeter established by their correspondence. It demonstrates how an understanding of the aesthetic influences of, and dialogue between, Ponce and Segovia can have interpretive and analytical consequences for the later performer.

**Variation II - Allegretto mosso**

Ponce's historical awareness can be interpreted in “Variation II” through intertextual allusions to Corelli’s *La Follia*, but also to works of the guitar canon. The frequent two-note slurs present instant technical familiarity to the performer.

![Variation II bars 1-8](image)

Figure 5.3: “Variation II” bars 1-8.

In the example above, the long, legato lines resemble the accompaniment in the *Andante* variation of *La Follia* from bars 177-184. The two sections of music make comparable use of extended, consecutive, mostly stepwise motion, and melodic contour.

---

The similarities between “Variation II” and La Follia suggest something of the historical awareness composed into the work. This awareness is matched by Segovia through his fingering of the score, which creates a connection to works from the guitar canon. As a result of Segovia’s fingering suggestions, the opening 8 bars of “Variation II” are study-like in nature. This slur technique suggested by Segovia produces a series of strong and weak notes that are the result of the associated left-hand action: using the left-hand fingers to “hammer-on” or “pull-off” the string creates a note with a less resonance than its plucked counterpart.29 Further, the attack of the note that is slurred is comparatively diminished. Consequently, music written with this technique can have a distinct sonic quality: a series of fast, uneven, pulsing notes (see Recital 1, “Variation II”).30 Segovia’s slur fingering is conducive to generating a flowing musical effect, idiomatic to the guitar. In this case, it results in a greater sense of two dotted minim beats per 6/4 bar. This positions “Variation II” in the context of other guitar studies which also aim to achieve a similar musical flow. For example, Mauro Giuliani’s 1812 Etude No. 4, Op 48 features similar long, melodic lines of slurs.

---

Similarly, Miguel Llobet’s Variations Sobre un Tema de Sor, Op. 15, which also takes the Folia theme as its starting point, provides a demonstration of long-line slur technique on the guitar.\textsuperscript{32} The two-note slurs that form the main technical device of “Variación 7” resemble Ponce’s variation, although Llobet makes much more frequent use of chromatic, stepwise melodic motion to introduce more frequent opportunities for slurs.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Etude No. 4, Op. 48 by Mauro Giuliani, bars 1-4.\textsuperscript{31}}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{32} Llobet, \textit{Variaciones Sobre un Tema de Sor, Op. 15}.
The notable commonality between the two examples of this comparison is their didactic nature: both are studiously devoted to the development of slur technique. Segovia’s implementation of slurs in bars 1-8 of “Variation II” therefore mirrors this étude-like character, a fact that is readily apparent to the later performer. Segovia’s fingering of the variation in this way, whether conscious or not, demonstrates his possible layering of historical awareness into the work. Through their dialogue and collaboration, Segovia’s input merges with Ponce’s similar allusion to Corelli to form a variation with interesting historical connections.

The second half of “Variation II” presents a curious change in character. Ponce introduces elements of his own style in bars 9-17 in a distinct stylistic departure from the opening section (see Figure 5.7 below). They are demarcated by an absence of slurs, the first of several features of aural separation.

33 Ibid., “Variación 7”.
Ponce introduces syncopation not seen earlier in the variation. The accented notes create a novel rhythmic interest that is best brought out using the thumb of the right hand as indicated. This syncopated rhythm is used to imply three-voices (see Recital 1, “Variation II”). In bars 12 and 13, this implied third voice, with its new rhythmic interest, is utilised to accent a chromatic line based on the inner voice in bar 10 of “Ponce’s Theme” (see Figure 5.8 below). As discussed in Chapter 2, syncopated rhythm, polyphony, and chromaticism are hallmarks of Ponce’s style. These features are effectively combined with the 6/4 time-signature in an augmentation of the 3/4 time-signature of the theme. This section of “Variation II” can therefore be interpreted as an expression of Ponce’s artistic voice, nested within elements of Segovia’s aesthetic paradigm. This establishes the idea that different parts of the variation are representative of the creative voices of the two musicians, and that the music can function to depict their creative dialogue. The extension of this concept is explored further through “Variation III” and “Variation XVII” below.

Evidence of Ponce and Segovia’s communal relationship is observable in “Variation III.” Historical allusions can again be interpreted in similarities to Corelli’s *La Follia*, and through Ponce’s prominent use of the descending minor second *pianto* motif. The subtle incorporation of these aspects reflects the influence of Segovia’s sensibilities, and is paired with other manifestations Ponce’s expressive voice. Further, the structure of the variation can be interpreted as having parallels to both Ponce and Segovia’s aesthetic priorities: it juxtaposes diatonic harmony with more chromatic harmony as the variation develops.

During my practical investigation of “Variation III,” I became aware of the distinctly tactile sensation of dialogue between upper and lower voices. The perception of this dialogue shaped both my artistic and analytic response to the variation. The opening bars establish a call and response between the two voices. This is further elaborated through their distinct characters: the voices are placed in different registers, exhibit contrary motion, and have contrasting rhythmic motifs. The different registers of the two voices place them on different string materials on the guitar (see Recital 3, “Variation III”). The contrast in timbre this produces contributes to the conversation-like nature of the variation. The two voices also have different melodic and rhythmic characteristics. The upper voice is distinguished through its pattern of predominantly thirds and sixths in quavers. The lower part uses a distinct pattern of ascending, stepwise, triplet semiquavers and a non-chordal texture (see Figure 5.9 below).

---

37 Recital 3, “Variation III”: [https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=2673](https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=2673)
Spurred once again by the evidence of Corelli as a potential historical source, the melodic technique of parallel thirds utilised in “Variation III” can be interpreted as reminiscent of the use of thirds in the upper voice of the “Andante” at bars 177-184 in La Follia.39

38 Ponce, Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue, “Variation III”.
This recording highlights the aural similarity between Corelli’s use of thirds and Ponce’s use of thirds.
The intriguing similarities interpreted between Corelli’s *La Follia* and “Variation III” suggest the conscious historical positioning of the *Folia Variations*. Their presence also draws attention to the recurrent, double-descending-appoggiatura motif. This motif includes minor seconds, particularly in the opening anacrusis, bars 2, 4-6, and 8-10. The descending minor second is an example of the *piano* motif which “has represented a lament since the sixteenth century … [and,] during the eighteenth century, the related idea of the *sigh*.“\(^{41}\) Ponce’s use of an iconic motif with a long history, is indicative of his imbuing the work with a deeper historical awareness, along the same aesthetic lines as sought by Segovia.

The ascending-triplet motif in the bass, contrastingly, shows a deliberate, auto-intertextual reference to the similar motif in the opening bar of “Variation I” (see Figure 4.6).\(^{42}\) The use of this particular motif functions as a response, in Ponce’s voice, to the opening statement which was influenced by Segovia. Ponce’s own creative voice is also cohesively intermingled in “Variation III” through the inclusion of more dissonant language. This is discernible in bars 9-11, where both the lower and upper voices of the musical dialogue contain stepwise, chromatic movement. The increasingly frequent use of chromaticism in the variation is perceived in the tactile experience of performance due to the guitar’s construction and tuning: playing consecutive, chromatic harmonies requires the player to simply move the same pattern of left-hand fingers up or down the neck of the instrument. This is demonstrated particularly in bars 9 and 10. This contrasts with the physical sensation of the inconsistent left-hand movements that are required to perform the diatonic thirds and sixths, such as in bars 3 and 4. These physical experiences mirror the musical dialogue between the diatonic

---


\(^{42}\) Intertextuality, but referring to oneself.
and chromatic language. The final statement in this dialogue, at the end of the variation, is unmistakably Ponce’s. Alternating couplets of major seconds between F-sharp and G-sharp that resolve outward to the diminished fourths between E-sharp and A in bars 15-17 of “Variation III,” mimic a remarkably similar passage composed by Ponce on his native instrument, the piano, in bars 41 and 42 of Etude No. II. Both passages are paired with a reduction in tempo: in “Variation III” due to the resolution to the end of the variation, and in Etude No. II in accordance with the marked *poco rit.* This strengthens the connection of the more colourful harmonic moments in “Variation III” to the compositional style of Ponce.

![Figure 5.11: Etude No. II bars 41-44.](image)

The combination of compositional devices reminiscent of baroque conventions with an increasingly chromatic harmonic development, creates a compelling narrative for the variation. Where the intricacies of the voices give the variation a sense of immediate dialogue, the changes in harmonic emphasis are symbolic of the aesthetic dialogue between Segovia and Ponce. “Variation III” may be understood to musically embody the influences that Segovia and Ponce brought to the collaboration, and places them in conversation over the course of the variation. The variation therefore shows the communal component of Segovia and Ponce’s creative relationship through the blending of their respective styles.

When performing “Variation III,” an awareness of the greater conceptual and aesthetic dialogue at play during the composition of the *Folia Variations* results in two points of focus. The first is to perform the chromatic elements of the variation with equal importance and attention as the diatonic elements. The second is to remain aware of the development in concurrent musical and conceptual narratives as the variation progresses. Adhering to the marked dynamic arc, as well as purposeful and assiduous use of tone-colour to accent developments within each voice, assists this greatly. A warm tone-colour, achieved with the

---

43 Ponce, *Deux Études pour Piano*, bars 41-44.
right-hand in the *sul tasto* position, brings out the diatonic harmony of the melodic voice through bars 1-7. To enhance the contrast of the progressively chromatic harmony in bars 9-11, I employed the sharper sound with the right hand in the *sul ponticello* position. Bars 8 and 12 present the opportunity for a third colour choice that acts to bridge between two opposing harmonic worlds. By using the flesh of the right-hand thumb to create a mellow timbre in these bars, I create a brief reprieve from the dialogue. These performance suggestions are best observed in my 2018 performance (see Recital 3, “Variation III”).

“Variation III” is therefore a tangible example of the creative dialogue between the two musicians embodied within music. This analysis demonstrates how Segovia and Ponce’s creative collaboration results in an aesthetic confluence, and that this confluence is exhibited directly in the music. Creative practice was a vital tool in uncovering the discursive nature of the music, and the understanding this produced is shown to have direct consequences for performance.

Variation XVII - Allegro ma non troppo

The analyses of “Variation II” and “Variation III” above demonstrate the interpretation of musically symbolic motifs woven into the *Folia Variations* that resemble the characters of Ponce and Segovia themselves. The study below of “Variation XVII” continues this symbolic interpretation through the examination of the variation’s motivic, expressive, and harmonic attributes.

Similar to “Variation III,” “Variation XVII” has a dialogue-like quality to its construction: the descending scale-motif used in bar 1, 5, 9, 13, and 39, can be interpreted as emblematic of Segovia (the full variation is reproduced below in Figure 5.12). It exhibits a virtuosic flair, especially given the semiquaver runs are paired with the *Allegro ma non troppo* tempo indication, and introduces an overtly technical aspect. Contrastingly, bars 2-4, and the development of this motif through bars 6-8, 10-12, and 14-17, can be seen as representative of Ponce’s introverted and contemplative character. This is particularly apparent in bars 15 and 16, where Ponce recalls the French-sixth chord, a harmony introduced through his re-
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44 Recital 3, “Variation III”: https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=2673
45 Otero, Manuel M. *Ponce and the Guitar*, 21.
A pattern of alternating exchanges between these two motifs develops the conversational essence of the variation. Initially, they interrupt one another, for example at the junction of bars 1 and 2, or bars 5 and 6, where an intervallic leap of an octave or more separates the two voices. Later, however, there is a sense of exchange, such as at the junction of bars 9 and 10, or bars 13 and 14, where the end of one motif seems to flow into the beginning of the next. The more insistent and virtuosic force of Segovia’s character emerges from bars 17-27, matched with fortissimo dynamics and quadruple D chords that are an inspired use of the guitar’s resonance. This is balanced by the section of comparative tranquillity from bar 29-38 that aligns with Ponce’s character. Marked calmo, it is mostly monophonic in texture. Segovia, rather fittingly, has the last word in bars 39 and 40 (see Recital 1, “Variation XVII”).

46 Recital 1, “Variation XVII”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=2984
Figure 5.12: “Variation XVII” bars 1-17.  

Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue, “Variation XVII”*. 
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Despite the seeming dominance of Segovia’s character in this variation, especially in dynamic level, a sense of balance in the presentation of each voice emerges through closer analysis. The number of bars encompassed by Ponce’s motif and the section from bars 29-38, account for 22 of the 40 total bars, compared to the 18 bars for Segovia’s motif. Rather cunningly, moreover, Ponce layers the sections that are associated with Segovia with his own compositional perspective. For example, the first note of the descending scale motif in bars 1, 5, 9, and 13 outlines the progression i-v-VII-iii, a subtly modified version of the original *Folia* chord progression. Further, the exuberant chords in bars 19 and 21, which utilise the note D in four octaves (and which are later developed in bars 23 and 25), are a clever vertical realignment and expansion of the first two notes of the theme.

Building on the foundation of the analysis of the previous two variations, this example further develops the notion that, intentionally or not, the musical characters of Segovia and Ponce are symbolically embedded in the music. Further, it shows that the dialogue-like presentation of these characters mirrors aspects of the communal, collaborative process that created the work. The meso-structural and harmonic considerations combine Ponce’s musical aesthetics with Segovia’s nineteenth-century desires for a virtuosic work. It is therefore another example of the musical consequences of Ponce and Segovia’s communal collaborative process: their exchange of creative ideas results in a fusion of personalities within the variation.

While this understanding of the variations was the outcome of research in the period following the performances for this project, it seems that I was more in touch with the dialogic nature of the variation in my first recital (see Recital 1, “Variation XVII” in comparison to Recital 3, “Variation XVII”). There are, nevertheless, meaningful performance suggestions that can be gleaned from the investigation above. Inspired by the different characters interpreted in this work, the performer may choose to imbue the two voices with different sonic traits. For example, the scale motif could be performed *sul pont*, while the intervening bars could be performed *sul tasto* or simply *sul naturale*, by way of more brooding contrast. Similarly, this separation of the voices could be accentuated with phrasing: where the voices interrupt one another early on in the variation, the performer could separate out each phrase at the bar line. Contrastingly, where the voices overlap, like in bars 9 and 10, or 13 and 14, a
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49 Recital 1, “Variation XVII”: https://youtu.be/Xjk7sYJo4k?t=2981; Recital 3, “Variation XVII”: https://youtu.be/2vgl8zoNh0w0?t=3521
phrase that ends on the downbeat would be more appropriate. A final suggestion would be to perform bars 29-38 with a true sense of *calmo*. This is something that is better communicated in my 2016 performance than my 2018 performance. The comparison of these aspects of my performances demonstrates the meaningful awareness of my interpretation that analytical reflexivity can bring about. It shows how musicological inquiry can be used to refine the understanding of my own creative practice, not only in the moment, but also retrospectively.

*Variation XIII - Sostenuto, and the Fuga*

Taken as a pair, “Variation XIII” and the “Fuga” in many ways create an apex when considering the communal intersection of Ponce and Segovia’s aesthetics in the *Folia Variations*. The two sections of music, in subtly variegated ways, demonstrate the stylistic and aesthetic influence of both musicians to great musical effect.

The compositional form of a two-voice canon is the defining and dominant feature of “Variation XIII.” The canon is a long-established form, with oral traditions dating back earlier than the fourteenth century. There are descriptions in treatises of imitative canonic writing as early as Ramis de Pareia’s 1482 *Musica Practica*, although the term “fuga” was used to describe this strict imitative texture.50 The first mentions of it in the modern sense are attributed to Silvero Picerli in his *Sprecchio di musica* in 1650, after which it was codified as a compositional technique during the baroque.51 As such, “Variation XIII” can be seen as establishing a musico-historical position for the work, a factor which with which Segovia was concerned. Similarly, Segovia wished for the *Folia Variations* to exploit the full extent of the guitar as an instrument that could perform more complex musical forms than chordal accompaniment in a bid to escape the folk-music associations of the guitar’s history. Ponce’s use of contrapuntal intricacy through canon is a testament to the instrument’s polyphonic capabilities.

“Variation XIII” also exhibits a number of features that have already been discussed as aligning with Ponce’s compositional idiom: chromaticism, motivic links to his embellishments of “Ponce Theme,” and a consideration of macro-structure. As such, “Variation XIII” is also

permeated with Ponce’s creative voice. Harmonically, the construction of the canon’s opening motif introduces immediate chromaticism, which is then carried through the variation. The descending, chromatic, D-D-flat-C motif is derived from the similar chromatic embellishment Ponce composed into bar 10 “Ponce’s Theme” (marked in Figure 5.14 below).52 This is another example of Ponce utilising original material from his theme as the source for compositional development in a later variation. Moreover, the choice of a chromatic line recalls the earlier discussion of Ponce’s tendency to embellish diatonic, tonal harmony with more contemporary language, and hence suggests an interpretation of “Variation XIII” as conveying aspects of Ponce’s musical vocabulary.

Figure 5.13: “Variation XIII” bars 1-3.53

Similarly, the emotional sentiment of “Variation XIII” can be interpreted as a demonstration of Ponce’s artistic agency. It has a notably lament-like character: the opening, chromatic motif is followed by two ascending gestures that end with sigh-like, downward, stepwise motion. These motifs strongly convey a mournful and poignant emotional sentiment (see

54 Ibid., “Theme” bars 1-11.
Recital 1, “Variation XIII”). Similar to the discussion of the pianto motif above, the idea of a descending motif conveying emotions of lament has its roots in seventeenth-century expressive vocal music and the lament schema. The melancholy with which Ponce wrote to his wife, Clema, during his periods away in 1917 suggest a man with a heaviness of heart. “In my solitary room … my ashen head, grown grey on the long road of my suffering. Your hands give me new life … Your lips know how to pour out the miraculous wine that makes my heart drink with joy and kills all ancient sorrows.” Further aligning Ponce’s character with the sentiment of “Variation XIII,” his general character has been variously described as modest, reserved, and contemplative. The expressive quality of the variation marks it as having a compositional purpose within a larger scheme, acting as a point of contrast between the multi-dimensional rhythmic drive and exuberance of “Variation XII,” marked Allegro ritmico (see Recital 3, “Variation XII”), and the brisk, animated drama of “Variation XIV,” marked Allegro non-troppo (see Recital 3, “Variation XIV”). Acting almost as a structural sotto voce, “Variation XIII” serves a large-scale structural function, amplified by its position between these two energetic variations.

The canon thus projects a strong sense of Ponce’s aesthetics: it highlights his inclination as a composer towards chromaticism, it aligns with his attested reticent temperament, and it demonstrates his attention to the large-scale role of each variation within the work. These factors are combined with a musical form that positions the variation firmly within the Western musical canon, and hence aligns with Segovia’s chronocentric priorities, to create a powerful convergence of Ponce and Segovia’s aesthetics.

The “Fuga” functions almost as the culmination of Ponce’s interpretation of Segovia’s aesthetic, technical, and historical demands, in a rich fulfilment of his brief. On an overt level, the “Fuga” addresses several of Segovia’s initial stipulations for the work. The longest, most intricate and compositionally complex section of the entire work, it unequivocally
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57 Otero, Manuel M. Ponce and the Guitar, 15.
58 Ibid., 5, 17, 20.
59 Recital 3, “Variation XII”: [https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=3251](https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=3251); Recital 3, “Variation XIV”: [https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=3365](https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=3365)
demonstrates elaborate polyphony on the guitar, whilst employing a historically significant, intellectual musical form. It utilises almost the full range of the guitar, and addresses Segovia’s desire for the work to return to the theme in the finale, including a finish with large chords. The closing bars of the “Fuga” are the most grand and vigorous moment of the whole work, doing away with the fugal texture in favour of five and four-note, fortississimo, rolled chords (see Recital 3, “Fuga,” finale).

![Figure 5.15: “Fuga” bars 92-96.](image)

The fugal form in particular exhibits a strong alignment with Segovia’s sensibilities, having been set apart as one that represents a high point in the Western art music canon.

The term fugue holds a particular fascination for the student of music. It suggests the essence of polyphony, the most intricate expression of the complex language of Western music … As a rule, we associate this concept with the music of Bach, and we are apt to assume several generations prepared the ground for what in his work became a final form not essentially changed since.

The grandeur of the “Fuga” therefore acts as a salute to the fugal form, its historical representation, and Ponce’s interpretation of Segovia’s influence. The weight of the historical perception of the fugal form, and the numerous inclusions by Ponce of Segovia’s suggestions, render the “Fuga” central to Segovia’s aesthetic (discussed in Chapter 3). This is in contrast to the understated yet commanding implementation of the canon, permeated with the melancholy aspect of Ponce’s musical character.

The three-voice fugue aids significantly in creating a more vertical, less horizontal texture, in contrast to the two-voice canon. Ponce’s detailed compositional focus can be observed in the fugal subject. The subject marks the return to the theme and “follows strictly the 1-7-1-2-3-2-
1-7-1 melodic outline of the *Folia* theme.”

It is the most unadorned statement of the *Folia* tone-series in the whole work (see Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1).

![Figure 5.16: “Fuga” bars 1-6.](image)

Further, Ponce artfully implies three voices to increase the compositional complexity and rhythmic vitality of the “Fuga.” For example, bars 64-71 shows an extended gesture with an implied third voice, creating polyphony in the upper part (see Recital 3, “Fuga,” implied third voice).

![Figure 5.17: “Fuga” bars 68-72.](image)

The comparison of “Variation XIII” with the “Fuga” reveals the differing ways that the artistic agency of Ponce and Segovia are manifest in the *Folia Variations*. They both, to varying degrees, present expressions of Ponce’s artistic voice, and his creative response to Segovia’s aesthetic input. It uncovers the nuanced distinction between the two sections of music which have outward similarities: in the canon, Ponce’s voice is more prominent, while in the “Fuga,” it is Segovia’s stylistic concerns that come to the fore. My musicological inquiry

---

65 Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue*, “Fuga” bars 1-6.
therefore brings an understanding to the negotiations between Ponce and Segovia, demonstrating a certain equilibrium to their creative process. More importantly, it advances the understanding of the complex ways their relationship affected, and is expressed in, the work. These findings demonstrate that an understanding of the dialogic process that occurred at the genesis of the work is central to its interpretation. This strengthens the argument that the work is in a process of layered, ongoing development, and that I take an active role in the continuation of this progression.

**COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM-SOLVING**

*Variation XIV - Allegro non troppo*

“Variation XIV” exhibits aspects of the two primary manifestations of Ponce and Segovia’s communal relationship: it shows a blend of elements from their respective styles, and introduces the concept of collaborative problem-solving. An understanding of how their styles intermingle is revealed through an interrogation of the ways in which challenges with the variation were addressed by the pair.

The correspondence between Ponce and Segovia reveals their extensive discussion of technical issues with the execution of “Variation XIV” on the guitar. The variation’s possible origins can first be traced to the original request in December 1929, wherein Segovia asks for a variation that employs “three-note chords.”

In a letter later that month, however, Segovia wrote:

The 3rd or, following the numerical order, the 9th, presents an insurmountable difficulty of execution: the chords superimposed on a rapid melodic line [see Figure 5.18 below]. Couldn’t you include linearly in the melodic outline the notes that give each chord its character? Or make use of an arpeggio that follows the rhythm of the variation?
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68 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 50.
69 Ibid., 57.
Faced with these difficulties, Ponce followed Segovia’s earlier suggestion to use chords with three notes plucked simultaneously as a solution, rather than Segovia’s direct suggestions for the variation. This, alas, brought about further problems. In February 1930, Segovia appeared happy with the character and harmony of the variation. He admired the musical intent of “Variation XIV,” yet once again found that he was not able to overcome the technical challenges it presented, and requested the variation be completely rewritten:

A harmonic imagination as poetic and rich as yours, should be able to find a way to overcome what you have written; equally in the one with three-note chords [Variation XIV], which sound marvellously on the guitar (and which lends itself to dropping a note here and picking up another there, so that it passes through very fine modulations that seem like a dusting of modulations) … if you have the time and inclination, write, then, two other complete variations to substitute for the one with three-note chords and the one with harmonics [Variation XX].

The result of Segovia’s request can be seen the opening bars of “Variation XIV” below. The variation therefore received at least two re-workings, and demonstrates Ponce and Segovia’s problem-solving process. It shows the exchange of creative ideas, with Segovia’s creative voice observed in his letters to Ponce, and Ponce’s creative voice manifested in the music.

---

70 Ibid., 58.
71 Ibid., 65. [parentheses in original]. See translation note in “Appendix A.”
Despite the attention to resolving technical difficulties, from my perspective as a later performer of the work, the published variation is one that is still extremely difficult. There are three central factors that make “Variation XIV” difficult, and which present physical challenges that impact my ability to achieve its musical demands. The first lies in the fundamental technique: repeated three-note chords. This technique is, in and of itself, not problematic. For instance, “Variation IV” employs a similar approach. In “Variation IV,” however, each chord is separated by a bass-note. The alternating pattern of bass-notes and chords allows the player to create the effect of a fluid melody through the added rhythmic space (see Recital 1, “Variation IV”). This pattern also affords technical security through sequential right-hand planting.

Figure 5.20: “Variation IV” bars 1-5.
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72 Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue*, “Variation XIV” bars 1-16.
75 Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue*, “Variation IV” bars 1-5.
Lacking this, “Variation XIV” requires extreme precision when replacing the right-hand fingers. Without this precision, the performer risks playing incorrect chords, or excessive nail noise upon replacement. Secondly, the piano dynamic necessitates a delicate and deft right-hand touch which in turn makes the execution of the rhythmic vitality of the 6/8 time signature, and clear voice-leading, especially demanding. With decreased volume comes greater difficulty in the subtle differentiation of volumes that create the metric accenting necessary to perform 6/8 with liveliness. Similarly, at lower volumes the control between the individual fingers of the right hand required to correctly balance a chord is rendered more difficult. Thirdly, these demands are intensified in the context of Allegro non troppo marking. The technical and expressive challenges are such that in his performance, Hoppstock chose to use a metal tuning fork to repeatedly and percussively strike the strings in the molto sul pont right-hand position in order to achieve the desired combination of lightness of sound and brisk tempo. With these considerations in mind, and with the highly effective “Variation IV” already performed, “Variation XIV” could be interpreted, to some extent, as repeating a very similar aspect of the guitar’s sonic and technical capabilities, whilst simultaneously presenting many difficulties for the performer.

The fast and repeated chord technique as applied in “Variation XIV,” while not conducive to idiomatic guitar playing, necessarily dictates aspects of the way in which it is interpreted and performed. This has a powerful effect on the shape of the expressive arc of the variation, and is meaningful when considering the importance of the variation within the greater context of the work. When investigating “Variation XIV” with the instrument in hand, its emotional impact is immediately apparent. The repeated, three-note figure does not project well from the guitar as discussed above, but it does allow the “decorated harmonic movement that is reminiscent of Chopin’s well-known Prelude in E minor, Op. 28 No. 4,” to come through. For instance, in bars 1-7, each voice moves independently, creating harmonic tension as the melodic movement is staggered throughout the bars without a discernible pattern. The harmonic rhythm is variously dotted crotchets or dotted minims, but the metric placement of the harmonic changes is inconsistent. In contrast, the passage that follows from bars 8-13 practically leaps from the instrument due to the strong register of the treble and bass, as well

as the secure technique for both left and right hands. Despite the absence of dynamic markings for this section, my interpretation was that music and instrument both indicate a *forte* or *fortissimo* dynamic. The same effect is achieved in bars 22-27. By adopting a more “front-on” position, where the nails of the right hand pluck the string near-to-perpendicular, and moving towards the bridge in a *poco sul pont* position, I found I could effectively enhance these dramatic, emotive shifts through contrasting tone-colour and attack (see Recital 1, “Variation XIV”).²⁹ The closing moments, from bar 27-33, see an increase in suspense through the stopped bass pedal with sparse chordal accompaniment. Despite the absence of dynamic markings, as the performer-interpreter I am able to enhance the drama of the variation with either a suspenseful *crescendo* or *diminuendo* to the abrupt concluding chord.

![Figure 5.21: “Variation XIV” bars 1-16.](image)

The combination of both subtle and animated moods, irregular harmonic movement, and large dynamic and textural contrasts, creates a variation with a striking impact. In turn, it acts as a harmonic and emotional bridge between the sombre canon of “Variation XIII” and the animated “Variation XV,” discussed below. These bookending variations each achieve clear, uncomplicated expressive goals, while the delicate complexity and intensity of “Variation XIV” acts as a point of contrast. With these considerations in mind, Ponce’s composition of “Variation XIV” helps the performer interpret and communicate its emotional and expressive force. This suggests that the variation’s importance, in relation to the work as whole lies, in the expression of Ponce’s creative voice.

There were notable concessions made by both Segovia and Ponce in the creation of “Variation XIV.” The implementation of the three-note chord technique is overshadowed by its more effective application in “Variation IV,” while the technical execution of the variation is problematic. Likewise, Ponce committed considerable work to the writing and revisions of the variation at the behest of Segovia. Despite the variation’s considerable technical demands,

---
³⁰ Ponce, *Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue*, “Variation XIV” bars 29-34.
its presence in the published edition of the work is an acknowledgement by Segovia that the importance of emotional content of the variation outweighs its technical difficulty. Segovia acknowledged, with reference to “Variation XIV,” “Variation XV,” and “Variation XX,” that he wished for Ponce’s “free and fertile” imagination to be expressed in the work alongside more technical considerations.\(^\text{81}\) Taken in combination, these factors show the creative agencies of Ponce and Segovia combining to enhance the potency of “Variation XIV.” Segovia and Ponce therefore each made acknowledgements of the priorities of the other in a way that benefitted the variation. “Variation XIV” hence shows two sides of the collaborative process. Firstly, it shows the two musicians working together in an iterative process to address issues with performance, a creative procedure that occurred on both a technical as well as an emotional level. Secondly, it shows the intermingling of their styles in a manner that strengthens the emotional and musical intensity of the variation.\(^\text{82}\)

Informed by the investigation into the acute emotional significance of this variation, the desire to communicate its emotive content shaped my performance, affecting the technical demands. I paid particular attention to achieving gossamer chord transitions that highlight the voice-leading in bars 1-7, chose to give a bold dynamic and timbre contrast to the following bars (8-14), and maintained the rhythmic vitality and intensity throughout the closing seven bars, (27-33), with precisely articulated A bass notes (see Recital 3, “Variation XIV”).\(^\text{83}\) Knowing the variation’s emotional significance required me to devote particular attention to achieving its technical demands. It would be simple, and tempting enough, to perform the variation at a slower tempo, and with reduced dynamic contrast. This would result in the variation no longer carrying the same impact, and hence would significantly reduce the justification for its place in the work. These considerations are indicative, therefore, of the internal exchange of creative ideas that occurs when considering a work both musicologically and as a performer.

\(^{81}\) Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 65, 66.

\(^{82}\) In Chapter 4, “Variation V” and “Variation IX” were compared to demonstrate how variations with similar instrumental techniques may have substantially different conceptual groundings. In much the same way, understanding the musical significance of “Variation IV” reveals the crucial conceptual distinction from “Variation XIV.”

\(^{83}\) Recital 3, “Variation XIV”: [https://youtu.be/2Vj8zoNhw0?t=3365](https://youtu.be/2Vj8zoNhw0?t=3365)
Variation XV - Allegro moderato energico

Problem-solving as part of Ponce and Segovia’s communal process can be observed through the analysis of imbalances in “Variation XV.” It was my engagement with the variation as a performer that first brought these imbalances to my attention and spurred my own artistic problem-solving process. Later analysis of the dialogue between Segovia and Ponce corroborated my creative response.

The imbalance in “Variation XV” is experienced through the marked differences between its three sections. The eight-bar A section, bars 1-8, is characterised by fortissimo octave pairs which are reminiscent of piano repertoire such as in Chopin’s Nocturne in B-flat minor, Op. 9 No. 1, or Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 2 in A Major, Op. 2 No. 2. These octaves are interspersed with rolled chords. The A section is twice the length of the subsequent four-bar B section (bars 9-12). The concluding A’ section is similarly long at nine bars (see Figure 5.22 below). The original phrase structure of the Folia melody is a symmetrical 2+2+4, but this proportionality, where the 2+2 is balanced by the 4, is not echoed in “Variation XV.” Rather, the sections of “Variation XV” have roughly proportional ratios in terms of the numbers of bars, but significant difference in length when played at a constant tempo: the B section is dwarfed by the outer A and A’ sections, and hence can be perceived as abbreviated. This, in turn, creates a sense of instability between the sections.

As a consequence of my perception of this imbalance, both via performance and through analysis, my interpretation aims to equalise the durations of the sections by changing the tempo of the B section. Both performances exhibit similar changes to the tempo of the B section in relation to the A. In 2016 I performed the A section at approximately 128 beats per minute with relatively strict timing, but then modulated to approximately 84 beats per minute with rubato in the B section (see Recital 1, “Variation XV”). In 2018, my interpretation is similar, but the overall tempo is higher: the A section is approximately 140 beats per minute and B is 108 beats per minute (see Recital 3, “Variation XV”). This marks a significant departure from the written score: the changes I made to the tempo actively alter the structural proportions of the music. Several factors in the music support this interpretation.
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84 Ponce, Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue, 14.
86 Recital 1, “Variation XV”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=2849
87 Recital 3, “Variation XV”: https://youtu.be/2Vtj0zoNh0w?t=3398
Firstly, the change in register of the \textit{B} section increases its technical difficulty: when playing above the twelfth fret, the upper bout of the guitar interferes with the movement of the left hand. The result is increased difficulty performing \textit{legato} melody lines in high registers, which can be mitigated with a slower tempo. The fuller harmony of the \textit{B} section also lends itself to an interpretation that conveys a greater sense of breadth in the passage. This is due to the melody being harmonised on the first and third beats in the \textit{B} section, as opposed to bare octaves in the \textit{A} section. The \textit{B} section’s vocal, \textit{rubato} nature, allows the harmony to be more acutely perceived by the listener. Again, this is aspect of the music is magnified by my utilisation of a slower tempo.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{``Variation XV.''
\textsuperscript{88}}
\end{figure}

With this initial creative response in mind, investigation of Segovia’s letters to Ponce reveals a parallel process of problem-solving that adds a second rationale for a slower performance of the \textit{B} section. The first mention of the material that would become part of this variation is in

\textsuperscript{88} Ponce, \textit{Variations sur 'Folia de España' et Fugue}, “Variation XV”.
Segovia’s 1929 letter of commission, where he asks for the use of octave doubling. In his letter of February 26, 1930, however, Segovia wrote:

The modification to the one with the octaves, [is] inferior, in my judgement, to all the ones you have done until now … A harmonic imagination so poetic and rich as you have, should find a way to overcome what you have written … it finds itself in great imbalance, in which it curiously drops again to pick up happily upon moving to the Da Capo.

Although there is no direct evidence as to the specific problem, “Variation XV” was the subject of at least three revisions before being published. In much the same way as observed in “Variation XIV,” Segovia and Ponce’s problem-solving shows the communal aspects of their creative relationship: they worked collaboratively in an ongoing discourse to find mutually agreeable solutions. There is a supportive tenor to Segovia’s comments, in that he made critical observations, but also provided encouragement. Curiously, it seems that their collaborative procedure did not, in spite of the multiple revisions, fully address the imbalance within the variation. The knowledge that Segovia also perceived an imbalance is consistent with my own interpretation.

Lastly, an understanding Segovia and Ponce’s creative relationship creates a third argument in support of performing the $A$ and $B$ sections at different tempi. The two sections have similarities to the personalities of Segovia and Ponce. The $A$ section is loud, dominant, and prominently placed, whereas the $B$ section, while it has no marked change in dynamic, is quiet of mood and reserved in comparison. As in the analysis of “Variation III,” “Variation XVII,” and “Variation XVIII” (discussed later), these attributes can be interpreted as manifestations of their respective creative characters: Segovia’s in section $A$, and Ponce in section $B$. By altering the tempi of my performance, I convey greater time and presence to Ponce’s creative voice, thereby going some way to equalising its representation within the variation.

Having performed the variation according to intuitive interpretation for several years, my analytical and historical understanding adds a fresh layer of refinement. This suggests a process of convergent evolution, whereby my intuitive, artistic engagement with the variation
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89 Segovia, *The Segovia-Ponce Letters*, 50. [This letter also contains recommendations for “Variation XIV” and is hence partially quoted earlier.] See translation note in “Appendix A.”

90 Ibid., 65.
as a performer, and my analytical investigation of the variation, each arrive at the same interpretation. Further, my engagement with the variation in this way shows that the process of creative problem-solving, conducted between the two initial creators of the work, is one that continues beyond that point of conception. My actions extend that process, and bring it into the new circumstances of my own practice, producing another step in the constant development of the work.

Variation XVIII - Allegro scherzando, and Variation XIX - Vivo e marcato

The final example of communal problem-solving by Ponce and Segovia can be observed in the rhythm and large-scale structural considerations in “Variation XVIII” and “Variation XIX.” The correspondence between Segovia and Ponce uncovers a complex tension between Segovia’s wish for a work with popular appeal, and his enthusiasm for it to address the expressive and technical resources of the guitar. Chapter 2 details Segovia’s concerns regarding the length of the work. Further, Segovia mentions a desire for something other than a fugue as the closing variation. In response to these concerns, rather than leaving out the “Fuga,” Ponce asserted his own artistic voice by composing the final variations so as to guide the audience through the closing minutes of the work. Two factors contribute to this: the large-scale, inter-variation dominant-tonic relationship between “Variation XVIII” and “Variation XIX,” and the particular rhythmic motif employed in Variation “XIX.” Ingwerson notes that in “Variation XVIII” “the note A accounts for virtually half of the notated pitches, emphasising the dominant.” This is particularly apparent in the opening and closing bars of the variation (see Recital 3, “Variation XVIII,” and Figure 5.23 and Figure 5.24 below).

91 Ibid., 136.
92 “Variation XVIII” is also discussed in Chapter 3 where it is shown to reflect Segovia’s aesthetic influence. Ingwerson, “Manuel Ponce’s Variations sur Folia de España et Fugue: A study of compositional procedures and Ponce’s use of the folia theme,” 91.
93 Recital 3, “Variation XVIII”: https://youtu.be/2Vlj8zoNhw0?t=3559
Similarly, “Variation XIX” has its tonic function reinforced through the emphasis on the pedal note D. Again, this is particularly noticeable in the opening and closing moments (see Recital 1, “Variation XIX,” and Figure 5.25 and Figure 5.26 below).97

Figure 5.25: “Variation XIX” bars 1-3.98

94 Ibid., “Variation XVIII” bars 44-51.
95 Recital 1, “Variation XIX”: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78ylo4k?t=3075
96 Ponce, *Variations sur 'Folía de España' et Fugue*, “Variation XIX” bars 1-3.
The driving, dotted melodic figure, employed ubiquitously throughout “Variation XIX,” creates rhythmic intensity. Paired with the Vivo e marcato direction, it draws the listener through the work’s closing stages, where it can be challenging to maintain attention after already hearing 21 minutes of music. By drawing these two variations together harmonically, Ponce develops an over-arching musical thread connecting their disparate motifs. Ponce’s solution, in this instance, was entirely independent, and expressive of his own creative voice: there is no recorded suggestion by Segovia for large-scale dominant-tonic relationships, or the inclusion of a variation with dotted rhythms. Rather, these can be seen as Ponce’s creative decisions, partly in response to the ongoing collaborative problem-solving with Segovia. Ponce addressed Segovia’s concerns about the length of the work, accommodated his requirement for popular appeal, high-art recognition, and comprehensive instrumental techniques, not by reducing the work’s overall duration, but rather by increasing the sense of musical momentum, and creating macro-structural connections. This demonstrates Ponce’s attention to the details of the less explicit, more subtle aesthetic implications that emerged during his collaboration with Segovia, whilst preserving the expression of his own agency through attentiveness to structural function in the music.

The difficulty that the work’s length presents to the performer is evident from the very beginning of the learning process, right through to its presentation in concert. Even after multiple concert performances, presenting the work in its entirety is challenging. Cognisance of the analysis above, in performance terms, translates to maintaining a heightened awareness of the harmonic relationship between these two variations. The performer must convey a sense of celebration and resolution when transitioning from “Variation XVIII” into
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“Variation XIX” to accompany the dominant-tonic harmonic movement (see Recital 3, “Variation XVIII” into “Variation XIX”). Secondly, the performer can place unabashed emphasis on the repeated A in “Variation XVIII” and similarly, the pedal D in “Variation XIX.”

Another interpretive solution I found effective, and which was also employed by Segovia in his only recording of the work, is to only perform a selection of the variations to create a more digestible, accessible musical experience. These shortened versions were performed in recitals not part of this project. Informed by the scholarly understanding of “Variation XIX,” yet in contrast to Segovia (who does not perform “Variation XIX”), I included it in my choice of variations to retain musical momentum. This decision again demonstrates how my scholarly understanding of the work and its conception has been brought to bear in performance to address the difficulty of a work that appears to pull in several directions simultaneously.

An understanding of the presence of Ponce and Segovia’s creative dialogue, embedded as it is in the *Folia Variations*, gives the modern performer artistic justification and a sense of permission to make changes to the order and number of variations performed. This represents a form of creative evolution, where the performer takes on the role of editor and co-creator, inspired by the actions of those that created the work, but contributing in a way that differs from them. Understanding the discourse surrounding the structural considerations, and Ponce and Segovia’s approaches to addressing them, offers potential performance solutions to the challenges of the music. My actions here, as an analyst, interpreter, and performer, constitute my own input into the process of communal problem-solving initiated by Segovia and Ponce.

---

100 Recital 3, “Variation XVIII” into “Variation XIX”: [https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=3589](https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=3589)
101 There is also discussion in Chapter 3 regarding my other interpretive decisions concerning “Variation XVIII.”
102 “Variations sur ‘Folia de España’ et Fugue,” performed by Segovia, track 14.
103 Reducing the work’s length is also briefly touched on in Chapter 2, which outlines some of my other considerations when altering the number of variations performed.
104 Hoppstock also makes similar changes in his performance, choosing to only play 14 variations. “Variations sur ‘La folia de España’ et fugue,” performed by Hoppstock, tracks 26-41.
CONCLUSION

The variations examined in this chapter reveal the communal aspects of Ponce and Segovia’s creative collaboration, as distinct from the variations that are more indicative of the expression of each individual’s creative agency. This is demonstrated through the identification of two core communal facets of their relationship: the combining of their respective styles, and their process of collaborative problem-solving. This process enriched the work, expanding its historical influences, instrumental techniques, compositional subtlety, and large-scale structural integration. In this regard, the *Folia Variations* is an example of what Torrence’s describes in her own collaboration, where “the process of working together yielded an independent and third entity: the relationship that produces a new musical work … [one that] could not have been made by the composer alone, or by [the performer] alone.”

These observations present opportunities to examine my own role as a creative contributor to the musical evolution of the *Folia Variations*. My contributions encompass interpretation, both analytical and performative, placing my own artistic voice into dialogue with those of Segovia and Ponce. This is particularly evident in my extension of problem-solving. As a later performer and analyst, I assume a co-creative role through my engagement with this collaborative process. This occurs through the identification, categorisation, and interpretation of the various aesthetic strata present in the variations, and the interaction of this knowledge with my own idiom in creative practice. This process seeks to find a balance between the expression of my own artistic voice, the expression of the artistic collaboration between Ponce and Segovia, and the potential solutions to interpretive questions.

In a manner that differs from other research into Segovia and Ponce’s relationship and the *Folia Variations*, my research uncovers diachronic connections that enrich the understanding of the creative history of the work. My research contributes to the knowledge surrounding its origins, influences, and construction. This therefore has broadened the artistic scope of my research and performance. It contributes to ever-evolving interpretive horizons, Gadamer’s

---

105 Torrence, “Rethinking the Performer: Towards a Devising Performance Practice,” 13.
Horizontverschmelzung, whilst informing and contributing to both the work’s performative and musicological interpretations.\textsuperscript{106}

Illuminates the artistic perspective that Segovia brought to the \textit{Folia Variations}, and discusses how an understanding of his performance-focused agenda can be used to enrich my own interpretation. Chapter 4 focuses on Ponce’s distinctive style, linked to his perspective as a composer, and demonstrates how it informed my creative practice by adding a layer of understanding that was previously outside of my scope of expertise. This chapter elucidates the collaborative aspects of the genesis of work, built on the foundation of these previous two chapters. It establishes a connection between the collaborative processes of Ponce and Segovia and my own creative process as a later performer. In this way, these three chapters cohere to articulate the progressive, multifaceted development of my interpretation, taking into account how investigation into the history and interactions that shaped a work functions as a gateway to discovering my place in the work’s evolution. Each chapter brings a different artistic perspective, and through my output as a performer and musicologist, I synthesise and unite those perspectives with my own.

\textsuperscript{106} Malpas, "Hans-Georg Gadamer."
CHAPTER 6: BEYOND THE FOLIA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter expands the field of view of this thesis beyond the confines of the *Folia Variations* to other musical works that I investigated concurrently during this project. Each of the works formed a part of the three recital programs in which I strived to create aesthetically cogent and logically curated musical performances. These small studies are grouped into three categories that explore the various roles that performers have taken in the creation of music for the guitar: transcriptions and arrangements, works by composer-guitarists, and works composed as part of a collaboration between a guitarist and a composer. The extension of the analytical and practice-based investigations to other repertoire demonstrates the broader applicability of my research. Building on the ideas of Leech-Wilkinson, Cook, and Clarke and Doffman, the studies in this chapter continue to develop the notion that the act of performance is co-creative, and forms an indispensable facet of the vitality and identity of a work of music.¹ This concept forms the link between the investigations in this chapter, and the study of the *Folia Variations*. A second connection is the involvement of a performer, other than myself, at some point in each work’s creation. This research supplements the central discussion of the *Folia Variations*, providing alternate perspectives on the role of performers in the development of music for the guitar. In addition, each work allows for the further examination of my role as a co-creator, through performance and analysis in the evolution of these works. This chapter illuminates aspects of my co-creative role rooted in the parallels between my own actions as a performer and those of other creative actors.

In the first category of works discussed below, the artistic agency of the performer manifests in transcription and arrangement. Guitarists have long taken music that was originally composed for other instruments and used their practical knowledge of their instrument to bring that music to life. The transcriber or arranger thereby exercises a distinct creative

agency in the reimagining of the music of other instruments for the guitar. The works in this category are firstly three sonatas composed by Italian composer Domenico Scarlatti (1685-1757): Sonata K. 380 arranged by John Williams (b. 1941), Sonata K. 77 arranged by Claudio Giuliani (n.d.), and Sonata K. 14 arranged by Leo Brouwer (b. 1939). Secondly, this category contains a selection of four Cançons Populars Catalanes (Catalan Folk Songs) transcribed for guitar and harmonised by Miguel Llobet (1878-1938) from Catalonia in the early twentieth century: “Canço del Lladre” (1927), “El Mestre” (1910), “L’Hereu Riera” (1900), and “El Noi de la Mare” (n.d.).

The second category consists of works in which the composer is a guitarist whose intimate knowledge of the instrument is integral to their approach to composition. These works provide a perspective where the consideration of the compositional and instrumental factors are contained within one person’s creative vision. Here, the discussion of agency shifts to trace these two perspectives in each composer’s idiom. For differing reasons, however, the composers were not the performers of the works. The works are: Le Départ, composed by French composer-guitarist Napoléon Coste (1805-1883) in 1856, Cuban composer Leo Brouwer’s 2012 Sonata del Decamerón Negro, and Stélé composed in 1989 by Australian, Phillip Houghton (1954-2017).

In the third category, the performer’s agency is examined as part of a collaborative process with a composer. The creative interactions in these works stem from the familiar perspective discussed in the rest of the thesis. The works in this section are: the Guitar Concerto, Op. 67 composed in 1959 by British composer Malcolm Arnold (1921-2006) in collaboration with guitarist Julian Bream (1933-2020); A Closed World of Fine Feelings composed in 1997 by Australian composer Graeme Koehne (b. 1956) in collaboration with guitarist Timothy Kain; and Mosstrooper Peak: Sonata for Solo Guitar composed by Australian Nigel Westlake (b.1958) in 2010 and revised in 2018, also in collaboration with Kain.

This research into the creative agency of guitarists collaborating with composers in a contemporary context has parallels with Buckley’s research. These studies expand on Buckley’s work by investigating different composers and performers, and more crucially in the creative outcomes of the research. My interaction as a performer and analyst with each of

---

2 Buckley, "Creative Performer Agency in the Collaborative Compositional Process."
these works places me in a creative dialogue with the performers and composers of their initial creation. The variety of different ways performance influenced the compositions presents different opportunities to exercise my own artistic agency in their continuing development. The artistic knowledge generated through practice-based performance provides a contrasting perspective to complement the analytical knowledge gained through musicological research. These two forms of investigation function together to inform my understanding of the creative interactions that shaped the works, whilst also being reflected in performance.³

**TRANSCRIPTION AND ARRANGEMENT**

Three Scarlatti sonata arrangements.................................................... Sonata K.380
Sonata K.77
Sonata K.14

Four Catalan Folk Songs arranged by Miguel Llobet......................... Canço del Lladre
El Mestre
L’Hereu Riera
El Noi de la Mare

Transcriptions and arrangements are a core component of the performed repertoire of the modern classical guitarist.⁴ Due to the instrument’s comparatively brief history, guitarists turned to the music of other instruments to broaden their repertoire. Transcriptions have been made predominantly by guitarists rather than composers as the technical knowledge guitarists hold is vital for the idiomatic realisation of music on the instrument. Their creative agency is exerted over the work through their adoptions.

³ Smith and Dean, *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts*, 19, 20.
By examining transcriptions, it is possible to observe the interaction between two creative roles: the composer’s creative role as embodied by the music on the original instrument, and the performer’s creative role as embodied firstly by the guitarist who made the transcriptions, and subsequently by the interpreter-performer. The relationship between these creative actors exists through the transcriber’s considerations of the source material, their translation of its aesthetic content to the guitar, and the performer’s realisation of it on the guitar. The arranger faces various tensions in their role, and their management of these tensions defines their artistic agency and influence on the music. There is tension in the incongruities between the sonic properties of the source instrument and the guitar, the potential inability to realise all of the original work, or in the desire to have a greater compositional contribution in the process of arrangement. The way these tensions are managed has consequences that determine the qualities of the final transcription, while also having implications for later performers. The works chosen in this section exhibit a range of creative input by guitarists.

The Scarlatti sonata transcriptions demonstrate the literal translation from one instrument to another, with minimal changes to the music, aligning with Carlos Barbosa-Lima’s definition of transcription that, “essentially, the art of transcription can be defined as the adaption of a composition for a medium different from that for which it was origin ally written — but in such a way that the essence of the music remains unchanged.” On the other hand, Llobet had a great deal more original compositional input into the Catalan Folk Songs. Consequently, the discussion of Llobet represents an intermediate point between the transcriptions and works written by guitarist-composers.

*Three Scarlatti Sonatas: K. 380, K. 77, and K. 14*

The three transcriptions of Scarlatti sonatas demonstrate how technical and idiomatic changes, resulting from the transcription process, contribute to the expression of the artistic agency of the transcriber. Scarlatti’s 555 sonatas were all written for the harpsichord, and a primary concern in transcribing them for guitar is therefore the differences between the instruments. In some respects, the harpsichord differs markedly from the guitar, with the keyboard allowing the player to perform up to ten simultaneous notes and achieve a marked musical independence between the left and right hands. Further, there is a difference in the ranges of the instruments: the standard range of the guitar is three and a half octaves, from
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E₂-B₃, whereas (although variable) the harpsichords typically available to Scarlatti had a range of four octaves from C₂-C₆.⁶ The sonic qualities of the guitar and the harpsichord, however, have much in common. Much like the guitar, the harpsichord is a plucked string instrument, producing a decaying sound of modest volume and sustain. While the guitar has less overall volume, it has a wider dynamic range and the ability to perform crescendo and decrescendo, unlike the harpsichord. Both instruments are capable of performing simultaneous melody and accompaniment.⁷

Scarlatti’s compositions, consequently, are eminently suitable for transcription to guitar. The transcriber need not be so concerned with creatively accounting for the differences in sonic traits between the two instruments. Giuliani notes that “there are indeed Sonatas which, because of their limited range or owing to their rarefied texture, may be played on the guitar with hardly any modification.”⁸ The transcriptions discussed here consequently remain relatively close to the original sonatas. The transcriptions made by three different performers include modest and relatively uniform alterations. Predominantly, the changes are practical, including octave displacements and textural thinning.

In his transcription of Sonata K. 380, Williams maintains the original key of E major. The first significant alteration can be seen in bar 10, where he transposes the melody and accompaniment up one octave (see Figure 6.1 compared to Figure 6.2 below). This maintains a separation of register between the melody and bass, and keeps within the range of the guitar, allowing the scale to continue over the bar line to resolve by step on the D on the downbeat of bar 11. It has a peripheral function of making the passage more idiomatic to perform, by not requiring the brief, brisk scale to be performed on the lower strings of the guitar.

---


In fact, Scarlatti had the guitar in mind when composing some of the sonatas, as Giuliani notes: “[Scarlatti’s] was a harmonic pursuit dedicated to echoing the unusual sound combinations of folk guitarists, whose creations were more the result of their playing around with their left hand over the fingerboard than studying the guitar’s harmonic possibilities.”

⁸ Ibid.
Figure 6.1: Sonata K. 380, Williams transcription, bars 10-17.\(^9\)

Figure 6.2: Sonata K. 380 (harpsichord), bars 10-18.\(^{10}\)

Similarly, Williams chose to transpose bars 54-56 down an octave, allowing for more frequent use of both open E strings, the open G from bar 56, and less frequent use of barrés (see Figure 6.3 as compared to Figure 6.4 below). For comparison, I have included a transcription by Jan-Olof Eriksson which demonstrates the frequent use of barré and lack of open strings when performed up the octave (see Figure 6.5 below). This figure also includes my own fingering


suggestions and slight note changes for the passage. This left-hand difficulty is compounded by the upper bout of the guitar interfering with ease of movement, especially in bar 56.

Figure 6.3: Sonata K. 380, Williams transcription, bars 51-58.11

Figure 6.4: Sonata K. 380 (harpsichord), bars 50-58.12

Elsewhere, Williams ensured the playability of Sonata K. 380 in ways that have a more significant musical consequence. In bars 10-17, Williams thins the texture, eliminating octave doubling in chords, and using only two voices after the first beat (see Figure 6.1 in comparison to Figure 6.2 above). This reduction in the number of simultaneous notes and their repetition frees the left hand to perform the remainder of the bar unencumbered by the necessity to hold a full chord. Giuliani explains: “chords made up of more voices than the guitar can handle were ‘reconstructed’, dropping some redoubled notes, preserving the highest and lowest parts, and of course the status of the chord.” More significantly, however, are the instances where the alterations reduce the richness of the functional harmony, such as the absence of the fifth in the chords of bars 12-17. This harmonic thinning occurs where performing the full harmony is either not possible or creates extreme difficulty for the left hand. There is also an aural reason for reduction in the number of notes


performed: the closely spaced notes in the original lose clarity when transferred to the guitar as they sit low in its tessitura.

Giuliani’s transcription of Sonata K. 77 stays remarkably true to the original, aided by the change of key to E minor from the original D minor. Giuliani eliminates the octave leaps in the bass in bars 4-6, 11, 13, as the notes lie beyond the guitar’s range (see below: Figure 6.6 in comparison to Figure 6.7), while in bars 15 and 33, a register change would cause conflict with the melody (see below: Figure 6.6 and Figure 6.8 in comparison to Figure 6.7 and Figure 6.9 respectively). Similarly, in the “Minuet” the octaves leaps in the bass (bars 55-64 and 79-83) are not possible within the range of the guitar, and are kept in the same octave.

Figure 6.6: Sonata K. 77, Giuliani transcription, bars 4-15.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., bars 4-15.
In Sonata K. 14, Brouwer carried out similar adjustments, leaving out the octave doubling in bars 12-16, 26, 27, and 36-40, whilst maintaining the original key of G major (see below: Figure 6.10 and Figure 6.12 in comparison to Figure 6.11 and Figure 6.13 respectively). To
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deal with the smaller range of the guitar, Brouwer transposed the bass up an octave from the third beat of bar 12, before dropping to match the original octave separation at the last beat of bar 13. This also occurs in bar 16 and 17, so that the bass line does not conflict with the upper pedal note A (see below: Figure 6.10 compared to Figure 6.11). Brouwer also adds an additional, accented D in bar 13, highlighting the altered melodic trajectory. He is similarly forced to re-write the second beat of bar 38, as in bar 13, due to the convergence of the bass and treble voices, which remain a further octave apart in the original. When this constraint is no longer necessary, such as at bar 37, Brouwer remains true to the original (see below: Figure 6.14 compared to Figure 6.15).

Figure 6.10: K. 14, Brouwer transcription, bars 11-19.\(^\text{19}\)

Figure 6.11: K. 14 (harpsichord), bars 12-19.\textsuperscript{20}

Figure 6.12: K. 14, Brouwer transcription, bars 25-28.\textsuperscript{21}

Figure 6.13: K. 14 (harpsichord), bars 26-28.\textsuperscript{22}


In these examples, the act of transcription as a creative interaction between a performer and composer resulted in alterations to the original scores to create performable versions from music that would otherwise not be possible on the guitar. In each of these three

---

transcriptions, the piece is given new life whilst remaining true to the content and spirit of the original. Where textural or harmonic thinning occurs, particularly in Sonata K. 380, the result allows for technically fluid and instrumentally idiomatic communication of the overall musical intent in performance. The transcribers’ actions are indicative of their roles as creative agents in the ongoing development of the work through time. All three performers exercise their creative agency in a manner that is unobtrusive, functioning more as translators who adapt the original music to a form that is readable by a guitarist.

As a later performer of these transcriptions, I have found my own creative agency and decision-making to be shaped by both my awareness of the original material and my understanding of the actions of the transcribers. Two pertinent examples are in Sonata K. 380 and Sonata K. 77. As discussed regarding Sonata K. 380, Williams transposed bars 54-56 down an octave, as compared to the original. In my performance, however, I chose to maintain the same register. Despite the noted technical challenges that this poses, the higher octave contributes significantly to the musical drama and intensity before the recapitulation. Firstly, the combination of the higher register with a forte dynamic imbues the passage with animation. This energy is particularly noticeable where it resolves over the bar from bar 56 to 57, with the leading note of A-sharp rising to the B in the same octave, rather than leaping up a minor ninth (see Recital 3, Sonata K. 380 from bar 54). Similarly, in Sonata K. 77, Giuliani chose to retain the octave leap in the G bass notes at bar 7, 14 and 27 (partially illustrated in Figure 6.6 above). While this remains more faithful to the original material, it disrupts the consistency of the bass progression, as this octave leap is not always possible due to the guitar’s range constraints. The inconsistency in Giuliani’s decision changes the perception of the phrasing, making the second note of the motif variously feel like the end or beginning of a new phrase. In the original, however, the motif is consistently reinforced as the end of the phrase. My decision in response is to always perform these bass notes in the same octave, so that the music retains a similar sense of phrase symmetry to the original material, if not the same intervallic relationship. This decision came as the result of my reflection on the transcription in the period after my recitals for this project, and is therefore not reflected in my performance.

25 Recital 3, Sonata K. 380 from bar 54: https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhw0?t=275
These evolutionary changes to my interpretation demonstrate my own agency in the creative journey of the work, a journey that begins with the composition, then moves through the hands of the transcriber, and subsequently through mine as an interpreter-performer. Further, these examples of my interpretive decisions demonstrate the interaction between the knowledge gained through practical investigation on the instrument and analytical knowledge from research. My conscious decisions to alter the music required creative intervention by me as a performer, briefly taking the role of the transcriber, and making an intentional contribution to the continuing development of the music.

Expanding the field of view of this thesis to encompass transcriptions for guitar serves as an additional opportunity to observe the interactions between composers and performers in the creation of music for the guitar, and offers another perspective on the artistic agency that performers may exercise. The examples discussed demonstrate the artistic dialogue between the transcriber and the composer, the creative agency of performers, and the co-creative action of interpretation and performance. Even when these processes are separated by significant time and space, an understanding of this discourse is meaningful to my later engagement with the music. As a performer and analyst, my actions situate me as another of the creative agents in the production of the work, forming part of the progression of its creative life.

Four Catalan Folk Songs
This selection of four Catalan Folk Songs, transcribed and arranged for guitar by Llobet, offer a different illustration of the performer as an artistic agent in the creation of music for the guitar to that of the transcribers of Scarlatti’s music. Llobet’s creative considerations are in response to the music’s vocal origins as single-line, unaccompanied melodies.26 The folk songs on which the arrangements are based had been passed through generations in oral traditions, but were published in pamphlets and collections known as “Cançoner” during Llobet’s youth in the early twentieth century. These publications consisted of the single-line melody and the accompanying text.27

26 Miguel Llobet, Works Volume 1: Cançons Populars Catalanes, ed. Stefano Grondona (Heidelberg: Chanterelle Verlag, 2009), 8.
27 Ibid.
Vocal melodies pose musical challenges when transferred to the guitar, and require creative solutions from the arranger. The sustaining nature of the voice is not replicable on the guitar, and due to the guitar’s nature as an instrument, the songs’ texts are lost. Further, as single lines, they require harmonic elaboration on the guitar.

Llobet’s role as transcriber and arranger of the four Catalan Folk Songs was highly creative and elaborate, involving significant compositional input. Yet the preservation of the music’s vocal melodies was a paramount consideration. As Stefan Grondona writes, “Llobet’s treatment of the thematic material never distorts the original cast of the melody.”28 The composition of accompaniment demonstrates Llobet’s extensive artistic input, and reveals the creative tensions arising from the source material. An example of Llobet’s compositional contribution can be seen in the creation of an accompaniment for the Christmas lullaby melody of “El Noi de la Mare.”29 Llobet introduces interest to the repetitions of the melody through colourful shifts in harmony. For example, he changes from chord I at bar 1 to a more colourful and tender I7 with the restatement at bar 5. Similarly, at bar 9, the melody begins on vi6, but on the restatement is re-harmonised in bar 11 as IV (see Figure 6.16 below and Recital 2, “El Noi de la Mare”).30

28 Ibid., 11.
29 Ibid., 18.
The subtle nature of these harmonic shifts is rooted in Llobet’s interpretation of the character of the original music. He preserves the berceuse-like nature of the lullaby through the simple accompaniment. Importantly, by choosing to keep changes in harmony subtle, Llobet does not distract from the melodic line.

In the remaining three songs, Llobet is less restrained. In the absence of the accompanying text, the strophic nature of the songs requires inventive treatment when performed on the guitar. Llobet’s solution is consistent throughout the three: to exploit and extend the sonic capabilities of the guitar. The two main melodies in “L’Hereu Riera” are repeated four times each in just thirty seconds of music. Without the narrative text of the original songs, Llobet sustains interest through changes in register and timbre. The most pronounced register change occurs at bar 34 with the fourth statement of the second theme, where the melody is in the lower register of the guitar with the harmony superimposed above it (see Figure 6.17

---

Llobet employs *pizzicato* as a tone-colour modifier in bars 21-34, creating a distinct point of aural contrast where the musical material stays virtually the same (see Recital 2, “L’Hereu Riera” pizzicato).32

Figure 6.17: “L’Hereu Riera” bars 18-34.33

Understanding Llobet’s decisions as an arranger in this context has implications for my performance of the work. Inspired by Llobet’s creative expansion of the music, I chose to perform the piece twice through. This decision allowed me to take greater expressive liberties. Firstly, instead of only using *pizzicato* where indicated in bars 21-34, I use those bars to display a range of timbres, variously employing the suggested *pizzicato*, as well as *sul tasto* and *sul ponticello* (see Recital 2, “L’Hereu Riera,” timbre variety).34 At several points, I altered the rhythms of the work to create a more lively and varied rhythmic interest, such as the use of significant *ritardando* into bar 17 and bar 38, or the change to dotted rhythms in the upbeat to bar 18 and the penultimate bar (see Recital 2, “L’Hereu Riera,” altered rhythms).35 Played once, the work lasts just 45 seconds. My decision to repeat it aims to bring a sense of stability and balance to its place within a full recital program. This interpretation therefore expresses
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35 Recital 2, “L’Hereu Riera” altered rhythms:
From bar 13 with *ritardando* and dotted rhythms - [https://youtu.be/XI3-L2dhJqY?t=2661](https://youtu.be/XI3-L2dhJqY?t=2661);
From bar 34 with *ritardando* - [https://youtu.be/XI3-L2dhJqY?t=2639](https://youtu.be/XI3-L2dhJqY?t=2639);
my own creative response and evolution of the ideas embedded in the music, informed by my understanding of Llobet’s decisions as an arranger.

Both “Canço del Lladre” and “El Mestre” are examples of Llobet’s extensive creative input in his arrangements. His aesthetic was grounded in “varying the implied harmony, through the use of the six strings of the guitar and through those stimulating instrumental insights that most define his musical identity ... [He] sought to discover the full sonic potential of the instrument.”\[36\] That is, the folk songs are a vehicle to explore the harmonic and sonic possibilities of the guitar. Llobet brings this “sonic potential” to the fore most creatively in “Canço del Lladre.” The use of natural harmonics to produce both the melody and accompaniment at bars 11, 12, and 24-27, shows his understanding of the expressive capabilities of the guitar (see Figure 6.18 and Figure 6.19 below). Similarly, the subtle, chromatic inner voice, in a combination of fretted notes and harmonics at bars 13 and 22, showcases the harmonic and timbre potential of the instrument (see Recital 2, “Canço del Lladre”).\[37\]

Figure 6.18: “Canço del Lladre” bars 10-15.\[38\]

---

\[36\] Llobet, Works Volume 1: Cançons Populares Catalanes, 11, 12.
The dense chords that accompany the melodies of “El Mestre,” particularly at bars 7, 21, and 22, highlight Llobet’s keen awareness of the natural voicing of harmonies on the guitar (see Figure 6.20 and Figure 6.21 below). They also demonstrate his understanding of how, within the range-constraints of the guitar, it is possible to compose a colourful and inventive harmonic accompaniment whilst maintaining the melodic line. In his arrangement, Llobet generates interest through changes in register, texture, and tone-colour. For example, he uses pizzicato, natural harmonics, portamento, the separation of accompaniment and melody using split plucking with the thumb, notated rolled chords, rasgueado chords, and contrasting textures in the accompaniment (see Recital 2, “El Mestre”). The music lasts four minutes, but is a miniature masterclass in the sonic possibilities of the guitar.

Figure 6.19: “Canço de Lladre” bars 22-27.

Figure 6.20: “El Mestre” bars 6-10.

---

39 Ibid., “Canço de Lladre” bars 22-27.
Llobet’s arrangements of these Catalan Folk Songs provide another example of the artistic interaction between the performer and composer roles. In order to reconcile the tensions between the original form of the music and its realisation on the guitar, Llobet created a series of small works that display an enormous variety of guitar techniques, showing the breadth of the instrument. Llobet’s actions can also be interpreted as didactic, providing the later interpreter with a document of interpretive, expressive, and technical possibilities on the guitar. I found that his creative agency had instructive consequences for my engagement with the works. His methods for disguising the strophic repetition of the source material force the performer to pay particular attention to the clear presentation of melody in different registers, the use of harmonics, choice of tone-colour, and the subtle voicing of chords.

Llobet’s arrangements, therefore, demonstrate part of the changing nature of musical works, and show how creativity can be distributed through multiple actors and time periods. My interpretation, performance and analysis of Llobet’s settings continues this developmental process, forming my own creative contribution to their progression.

---

The concept of the performer’s creative agency is different when the composer is themselves a guitarist. When an instrumentalist is a proficient composer, they may create new repertoire for their instrument without needing external input, or transcribing and arranging existing works. The studies below explore the creative processes of guitarist-composers, focusing on their simultaneous consideration of both composition and aspects of performance. Interestingly, for each of the examples, the guitarist-composers did not publicly perform their works. This fact continues the need for the involvement of other performers, despite each composer coming from a strong instrumental grounding. My engagement with these works examines the instrumentally informed composers’ consideration of the act of performance in the compositional process, and forms a creative dialogue with these composers that has its grounding in the mutual understanding of the specifics of guitar technique and performance.

*Le Départ*

Exploration of *Le Départ* reveals Coste’s attention to both compositional and performative considerations as part of his compositional process. Coste was a prominent guitarist in France, and performed extensive solo recitals that included his own works alongside those of others. His career as a performer was curtailed by a broken arm, after which he devoted his time to composition. *Le Départ*, composed in 1856, during this later period, exhibits Coste’s detailed knowledge of the instrument, and includes a significant programmatic narrative. Both of these factors influenced my engagement with the work as a later performer, and shaped the form of my creative agency.

---

43 Ari Cornelis van Vliet, "Napoléon Coste: componist en gitarist in het muziekleven van het 19e-eeuwse Parijs" (Doctorate, Universiteit Utrecht, 2015), 66.

44 Ibid., 204.
Coste’s knowledge of the guitar, its idiomatic techniques, sonic properties, and expressive capabilities is evident from the opening of *Le Départ*. Bars 8-19 make frequent use of the *p-i-m-i* right-hand pattern, with the *a* finger responsible for the melody (see annotated Figure 6.22 below).

![Figure 6.22: Le Départ bars 8-11 with the author’s right-hand fingering marked.](image)

Similar patterns can be seen in many nineteenth century guitar pieces and instructional manuals, as for instance in Mauro Giuliani’s right-hand exercises. Number 83 below is a good example. Giuliani’s 120 exercises have been the foundation of right-hand technical development since their creation in 1812.

![Figure 6.23: Giuliani right-hand exercise No. 83.](image)

Such techniques, which enable the performer to arpeggiate a chord rapidly, are an effective way of filling out the body of sound the guitar can create, idiomatically addressing the guitar’s limitation as a non-sustaining, inherently quiet instrument (see Recital 1, *Le Départ*, from bar 8). Other parts of the work, however, are more challenging. An indicative example

---

45 Mauro Giuliani, ”No. 4: Moderato,” in *Studio per la Chitarra* (Leipzig, Germany: Chez A. Kühnel Bureau de Musique, 1812), 9.
47 Similar instances of idiomatic implementation of right-hand technique can be seen at bars 28-30 and 57-60, which use rapid, alternating *p-i* or *p-i+m* technique; or in the cadenza from, bars 121 to 136, which uses a varied combination of techniques.
is the opening of the second section of the work, titled “Le Retour.” This includes six left-hand position shifts in just three bars, the precise execution of which complicates the expression of a distinctly “triomphale” gesture. Further, these position shifts hinder the performance of a connected phrase across the passage, despite the quaver rests at the shift points (see Figure 6.24 below and Recital 1, Le Départ, “Le Retour”). While certainly not easy, the technical challenges posed in Le Départ are nevertheless idiomatic, presenting ultimately surmountable hurdles as a direct consequence of Coste’s intimate knowledge of the guitar.

![Figure 6.24: Le Départ bars 67-69 with left-hand shift points marked.](https://example.com/figure624)

The effect of Coste’s knowledge of the instrument for my engagement with the work can be observed in my reflection on the learning process and my interpretive decisions. Learning the work to concert standard took approximately seven months. From experience, this is a relatively brief period for nearly 10 minutes of music. This is due, in part, to some of the technical problem-solving processes normally conducted during the course of learning a work having already been carried out by Coste, alongside his use of familiar, idiomatic guitar techniques. In tandem, these factors afforded me significantly more cognitive capacity and technical resources to devote to realising my own vision for the work, taking into account its programmatic elements. Briefly, Le Départ is in two sections: “Le Départ” (The Departure), and “Le Retour” (The Return). It depicts the march of the French army to the Siege of Sebastopol, and their victorious return to Paris in 1855. In my interpretation, I chose to

---

It should be noted that Coste would have been composing for a romantic guitar. These instruments were significantly smaller instrument than the modern classical guitar, which would render this passage more achievable.


51 Graham Wade, in Florian Larousse: Guitar Recital (Tennessee Naxos Rights International Ltd., 2009), Liner Notes, 4.

make liberal use of the guitar’s tone-colour palette to achieve the effect of orchestration in service of the programmatic narrative. This approach has long been part of the guitarist’s interpretive method, being described in the 1830s in Fernando Sor’s guitar method.\textsuperscript{53} For example, the \textit{allegro assai} at bar 22 becomes very compelling when performed \textit{sul pont}, mimicking the sharp call of trumpets (see Recital 1, \textit{Le Départ, allegro assai}).\textsuperscript{54} Similarly, the strident chords of the “Marche Triomphale” from bar 67 require an almost marching band-like treatment: powerful and abrupt, best played in the \textit{naturale} right-hand position to obtain the greatest body of sound (see Recital 1, \textit{Le Départ, “Le Retour”}).\textsuperscript{55} The quasi-duet at bar 87 is similarly orchestral, mimicking bright, celebratory woodwinds and bassoon. My performance accentuates this through the use of \textit{staccato} in the lower voice, and contrasts a \textit{sul pont} interpretation with \textit{dolce} on the repeat (see Recital 1, \textit{Le Départ, from bar 87}).\textsuperscript{56}

In summary, Coste’s work provides a good example of the beneficial consequences that a composer’s consideration of performance can have on the technical and expressive agency of a subsequent performer. His awareness of the later performer during composition, and my subsequent analysis, interpretation, and performance of the work, exemplify a creative interaction through \textit{Le Départ}. Examining Coste’s creative agency both colours and gives context to my own actions, framing them as a contribution to the developing understanding and substance of the work.

\textit{Stélé}

An example that illustrates the consideration of performance as part of the compositional process with particular clarity is Houghton’s \textit{Stélé}. Houghton was an adept guitarist, but from 1980 onwards he devoted his time to composition and no longer performed.\textsuperscript{57} A consequence of his knowledge of the guitar is the inclusion of extensive indications for the performer, including left and right-hand fingering, musical directions, and detailed technical

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{54}Recital 1, \textit{Le Départ, allegro assai}: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78yo4k?t=277
\item \textsuperscript{55}Recital 1, \textit{Le Départ, “Le Retour”}: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78yo4k?t=388
\item \textsuperscript{56}Recital 1, \textit{Le Départ, from bar 87}: https://youtu.be/Xjnk78yo4k?t=452
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
instructions. There are numerous instances of Houghton’s fastidious annotations throughout the score, and two indicative examples can be found in bar 64 of “Stélé” and bars 1-7 of “Bronze Apollo.” In bar 64 of “Stélé,” Houghton directs the passage to be performed “Sub molto tasto (RH [Right hand] is positioning over finger-board, abt. the 17th fret, so as to obtain an almost “bassoon-like” tone).” In bars 1-7 of “Bronze Apollo,” there are seven dynamic markings, seven tone-colour directions, five tempo or agogic accent markings, seven individual note accents, three right-hand fingering suggestions, and multiple left-hand fingering suggestions (see Figure 6.25 below). For just seven bars of music, this totals over thirty directions for the performer (see Recital 2, “Bronze Apollo”).

Figure 6.25: “Bronze Apollo” bars 1-8.

Houghton’s markings communicate a deep care for the particular sonic and expressive result, with a detailed and exacting understanding of the physical requirements of the performer. There are frequent passages that are both wholly original, yet idiomatic on the guitar. For example, the use of the rapid $p-m-i$ right-hand pattern at bars 1-8 in “Dervish,” the flamboyant left-hand only passage of bars 57-60 in “Dervish,” or the high-speed $p-a-m-i$ right-hand pattern of bars 115-118 and 123-126 in “Web” (see Recital 2, Stélé, idiomatic
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58 Phillip Houghton, Stélé (Brunswick, Victoria: Moonstone Music, 1989), 2. For example, before the notated music begins, Houghton clarifies his use of sostenuto markings: “A sostenuto (sustain) effect [not to be confused with either ties, hammers, or slurs — written larger] and indicates note/s to be left sounding for as long as fingering/tempo allows [i.e. … bar 27 of Stélé, the C crotchet sounds for the full bar … and into the next if possible/desired].” [All brackets and parentheses are original]

59 Ibid., “Stélé” bar 64 [parentheses in original]

60 Ibid., “Stélé” bar 64 [parentheses in original]

The sheer number and frequency of suggestions throughout the work, however, indicate the desire to control almost every aspect of its execution and interpretation, significantly impacting the interpretive agency of the individual performer. Houghton’s process has both merits and drawbacks. The performer is never in doubt as to the desired sonic and musical outcome: uncritically following the directions will approximate the skeleton of a satisfactory performance. Yet such detailed suggestions can be too particular for the performer’s own technical idiosyncrasies. For example, in bars 31-34 of “Dervish,” Houghton’s indication to use m and i on the treble strings at the beginning of each bar and the continuation of the m-i pattern throughout the treble voice is technically untenable for me at the desired tempo. Instead, my solution, which also reinforces the marked accent, is to use a to pluck both notes simultaneously at the downbeat, followed by m-i, then to use p-m-i for the remaining notes of the bar (see annotations in Figure 6.26 below). This pattern continues until bar 35 (see Recital 2, “Dervish,” from bar 30).

Considering the left hand, bars 64-67 of “Stélé” present a similar problem: Houghton’s specific technical prescriptions are incompatible with my particular technique. Houghton’s indicated left-hand fingerings require significant extension of the left hand, and an awkward, phrase-interrupting shift across the bar line between bars 64-65. My solution, indicated in Figure 6.27 below, relieves the extensions and also creates greater resonance at the end of the

---

62 Recital 2, Stélé, idiomatic passages:
64 Houghton, Stélé, “Dervish” bars 31-36.
gesture (see Recital 2, “Stélé,” *andantino*). Houghton’s left-hand fingering for the entirety of the *Allegro non troppo* section in bars 24-79 of “Bronze Apollo,” by comparison, offers clear and effective guidance to achieve the resonant *trancillo* mood.

![Fingering notation](image)

Figure 6.27: “Stélé” bars 62-65 with the author's fingering changes marked.

These few examples highlight the advantages and limitations of Houghton’s technical directions as a guitarist-composer for future performers of his music. On the one hand, the process of learning and interpreting the music is significantly shortened through plentiful guidance. On the other, performers can be tempted to futilely persevere with fingerings that are unsuitable for their particular physiologies and techniques. Most significantly, the performer-interpreter is given minimal artistic licence with which to engage in a creative decision-making process. The extent and depth of the composer’s suggestions leaves the performer scope for only minor discretionary changes. Furthermore, if the performer wishes to make more significant creative decisions, they can feel in opposition to the desire of the composer. Somewhat conflictingly, therefore, Houghton acknowledges the role of the later performer, but also impinges on their artistic agency within the same act. In this example, consequently, my co-creative contribution is constrained to subtle expressive and technical modifications.

*Sonata del Decamerón Negro*

Brouwer’s *Sonata del Decamerón Negro* presents an altogether different perspective regarding the relationship between the guitarist-composer and the later performer. In contrast to Houghton’s approach, Brouwer places a great deal of trust in the interpretive agency of the performer. This study develops an understanding of this trust by examining Brouwer’s

---


intricate use of intertextuality, auto-intertextuality, and layered storytelling throughout the work.67

On the surface, the sonata’s musical material reflects the Afro-Caribbean folk tales and mythology that has driven much of Brouwer’s musical output.68 The first movement, “Güijes y Gnomos,” presents two characters reflected in juxtaposing moods: the Güije which is a wild and ugly elf-like creature, and the Gnomo which is comparable to the Western gnome.69 The second movement, “Treno por Oyá,” is a lament for the spirit of winds, tempests, warriorhood, and motherhood.70 “Burlesca del Aire,” the third movement, is a scherzo for the spirit of the air. The final movement, “La Risa de los Griots,” recapitulates much of the work through the voice of the Griot, who Brouwer describes as a storyteller in Africa who sings tales accompanied by a Kora, a type of harp-lute. Brouwer solidifies the story-telling theme through thematic reiterations in this movement, which give the sense of the storyteller reinterpreting the tales with their own personal inflections.

This programmatic storytelling is a unifying device, providing both compositional structure and pictorial scenes which the performer may leverage to draw the listener’s attention through the long work. Beyond this, this device is a signifier of a deeper level of storytelling, directed specifically at the performer. The explicit narrative alerts the performer to the work’s more subtle technical and autobiographical themes. As an accomplished classical guitarist, Brouwer has an intimate knowledge of the instrument, its history and repertoire, and therefore shares a common history with later performers of the work. Using this common history, Brouwer makes numerous intertextual and auto-intertextual musical references to figures of the classical guitar canon.

The intertextual references draw on the works of Luys de Milán, Francisco Tárrega, and Heitor Villa-Llobos. Bars 90-107 of the first movement are subtitled “Tientos. ‘Luys de Milán con sus duendes’” (Luys de Milán with his elves), in reference to the sixteenth-century

67 A brief discussion of intertextuality can be found in Chapter 5 on page 151.
vihuelist (see Figure 6.28 below). The passage mimics the opening of Milán’s Fantasia VIII (see Figure 6.29 below), which Brouwer then elaborates upon.

Figure 6.28: “Gúijes y Gnomos” bars 89-96 with a quotation and elaboration on Fantasia VIII by Luys de Milán.72

Figure 6.29: Fantasia VIII by Luys de Milan, bars 1-12.73

In bars 49-55 of “Burlesca del Aire,” Brouwer inserts an augmented quotation of Tárrega’s Adelita (see Figure 6.30 and Figure 6.31 below). The music of Tárrega, in particular his miniatures, is staple amongst guitarists, especially as didactic exercises.74

---

More subtly, bars 131-132 of “Güijes y Gnomos” make an intertextual allusion the right-hand fingerings of Heitor Villa-Lobos’ Etude 1 (see Figure 6.32 and Figure 6.33 below). Villa-Lobos’s études are seminal works in the guitar repertoire and form a core part of the developing guitarist’s learning. This same passage is also auto-intertextually imitative of the opening of “La Toccata de Pasquini,” the third movement from Brouwer’s influential first sonata (see Figure 6.34 below).

---

Further auto-intertextual references occur with the harmonics at the opening of the second movement, “Treno por Oyá,” which are highly evocative of Brouwer’s own work, Hika, to the point of including the same expressive direction *come campane*, “like bells” (see Figure 6.35 and Figure 6.36 below). In bar 3 of “Treno por Oyá,” the gesture finishes on A-sharp, the enharmonic equivalent of the final note, B-flat, of the opening gestures of *Hika*.81

---

78 Brouwer, *Sonata del Decamerón Negro*, “Güijes y Gnomos” bars 128-134.
“La Risa de los Griots” makes another clear reference to Brouwer’s extremely popular first Sonata. The closing gestures of both works have a strong resemblance, and each finish on the same chord (see Figure 6.37 and Figure 6.38 below).

Figure 6.37: “La Risa de los Griots” bars 97-99.

84 Brouwer, *Sonata I: Para Guitarra Solo*.
85 On a more elusive level, the chord gestures of bars 2-5 of “La Risa de los Griots” recall Brouwer’s Etude 2 from his *Estudios Sencillos* which are staple repertoire for the developing guitarist.
Through these intertextual and auto-intertextual references, Brouwer creates a fusion of influences within *Sonata del Decamerón Negro*, placing references to historically significant composers of guitar repertoire in parallel with references to his own works. Brouwer thereby acknowledges his own place within the history of the guitar. The sonata therefore presents two parallel influences that are personal to Brouwer’s narrative and define the part-programmatic, part-autobiographical nature of the work: the story telling, programmatic structure based on Afro-Caribbean mythology, and the intertextual, technical, and musical references to the history of the classical guitar.

A performer of this work who is equipped with a knowledge of the guitar canon, including Brouwer’s previous works, is well placed to notice these intertextual references and their significance for interpretation and performance. While not all performers will necessarily have this experience, Brouwer’s inclusion of allusions to well-known guitar works encourages the performer to be alert to references to less prominent music, guiding them through the influences that coalesce to create his idiom. In doing so, he invests a creative responsibility in the performer to understand, interpret, and communicate the musical and programmatic content. In this regard, Brouwer’s actions encourage the creative agency and input of the later performer. They demonstrate his regard for the performer, and his faith that they will recognise and interpret the symbolism and meanings embedded in the music.

This understanding of the work and Brouwer’s motivations has meaningful implications for my artistic agency. The program of the sonata gave me a structure around which to shape the direction of my performance. For example, I evoke the two contrasting characters of the Güije and the Gnomo through my use of timbre and articulation. I characterised bars 1-14 as representing the Güije, and made the interpretive decision to perform this section with a bright attack, sharp rhythm, and high energy, to conjure images of the sprightly elf figure (see Figure 6.38: “La Toccata de Pasquini” by Brouwer, bars 122 and 123.87

---

87 Brouwer, *Sonata I: Para Guitarrsola*, “La Toccata de Pasquini” bars 122 and 123.
Recital 2, “Güijes y Gnomos,” Güije). Contrasting, I performed bars 15-22 at a slower tempo, with a rounder tone, and a more pesante rhythm to represent the Gnomo (see Recital 2, “Güijes y Gnomos,” Gnojo). Envisaging the tempestuous storm of “Treno por Oyá,” I focussed on a lengthy crescendo from bars 56-72, and followed that with a very delicate, pianissimo performance of the closing bars (77-79) to call to mind a sense of rebirth (see Recital 2, “Treno por Oyá” from bar 56). In inhabiting the narrative re-telling of the Griot in the final movement, part of my interpretation was to focus on the frequent shifts in mood where different movements and characters are recalled. For example, the delicate harmonics in bar 5 recall the character of Oyá, while the intense, almost vicious gesture that follows it through bar 7, recalls the Güije (see Recital 2, “La Risa de los Griots”). The intertextual references therefore provide ephemeral musical waypoints in the course of live performance. By way of slight digression, whether intended by Brouwer or not, these references also aid the learning process. Identifying and cross referencing the quotations and allusions significantly assists the memorisation of the work. This functions in two ways. Firstly, the referenced music is already stylistically and expressively familiar to the performer, thereby aiding recollection and fine-motoric execution. Secondly, the historic guitar references contribute a personal, quasi-autobiographical counterpoint to the multi-layered meanings and images conjured by the Afro-Caribbean narrative. Brouwer’s communication of these multifaceted narratives, and the additional context provided by the intertextuality, contributed considerably to the strength and depth of my emotional response to the work.

The analysis above demonstrates the centrality of performance to Brouwer’s compositional process. This is shown in Brouwer’s intertextual and extra-musical ideas that hinge on the common knowledge and experiences between him as composer and the later performers of his work. My interpretation and performance utilises this understanding to present the programmatic narrative. My analysis of Brouwer’s narratives and references helped me to create an emotionally rich interpretation, and one that demonstrates an awareness of the layers of creativity embedded in the work.

90 Recital 2, “Treno por Oyá” from bar 56: https://youtu.be/XI3-L2dtJqY?t=1531
COMPOSERS AND PERFORMERS

Malcolm Arnold................................................................. Guitar Concerto, Op. 67
Graeme Koehne................................................................. A Closed World of Fine Feelings
Nigel Westlake................................................................. Mosstrooper Peak

The works in this last section are the closest in terms of creative process to those of the central study of this thesis, the Folia Variations. Each work was composed by a non-guitarist with the assistance of a guitarist. In different ways, each work demonstrates the interaction between composer and performer. They reveal how the nuances of different combinations of personalities, musical goals, and collaborative approaches influence the final musical result. With myself as a third actor in the process, these works provide fertile ground from which to shape an understanding of my own creative role in their evolution. The study of these works widens the scope of this research, allowing me to draw further conclusions about my role in the creative process of guitar repertoire more broadly.

Guitar Concerto, Op. 67
Arnold’s Guitar Concerto, Op. 67 (hereafter referred to as the Concerto) was the product of Bream’s undertaking to create a new guitar repertoire with a focus on modern British composers. This also included Reginald Smith-Brindle, Benjamin Britten, William Walton, Richard Rodney Bennett, and Peter Maxwell Davies. Although, in this role, Bream was often promoted as the heir apparent to Segovia, he stated, “I’m interested in different aspects of the guitar, and of music [to Segovia]. And while I think it would have worried Segovia that certain works might not go down too well, as often happens with modern music, that doesn’t worry me.”\footnote{Kozinn, "Julian Bream Stretches with Contemporary Music," 2.} The music of Arnold balances an interesting blend of aesthetic influences. As Rhoderick McNeill observes: “[Arnold] was not afraid to write music that appealed to audiences. Arnold mastered a wide ranging style from accessible tonal idioms to more consistently dissonant writing … He also included popular elements derived from jazz and ‘light’ music.”\footnote{Rhoderick McNeill, "Malcolm Arnold — A Composer of Real Music: Symphonic Writing, Style and Aesthetic," Musicology Australia 30, no. 1 (2008): 115, https://doi.org/10.1080/08145857.2008.10416745.}
Analysis of Arnold and Bream’s collaboration, drawing on both the published score of the Concerto and Bream’s recorded performance, reveals interesting consequences for the later performer’s interaction with the music. The published edition is free from many of the conventional hallmarks of a performer’s involvement, such as right and left-hand fingerings, or technical directions to the performer. There are, however, important differences between the score and Bream’s performance of the work. Both of these facts affected my engagement with the music as a performer and analyst.

Examining firstly Bream’s agency in the collaboration, a fundamental contribution was his decision to choose Arnold as the composer of the Concerto. In his biography *A Life on the Road*, Bream is quoted saying that:

> When I first met Malcolm Arnold, I thought his musical style was in many ways the most suitable of any composer at that time for the guitar … He also had an original quality of wit and the greatest gift for writing good tunes. The combination of these factors made his music ideally suited to the guitar. There’s also a kind of simplicity, I don’t mean naiveness, but a directness about his music and the forms he uses, a directness I find that especially suits the character of the instrument no less than myself.\(^{96}\)

Bream’s attitude was mirrored by Arnold, who stated in 1963 that “the reason I wrote for the guitar, for Julian in particular, is that I admire him, I should think, almost more than any other musician living … to put it mildly.”\(^{97}\) This mutual appreciation was a significant factor in the shape of the work. Bream served as the inspiration for Arnold’s stylistic imagination in the Concerto.

> When Malcolm wrote concertos to commission, he’d create a musical portrait of the dedicatee. He knew I was interested in jazz and Django Reinhardt in particular, so the slow movement has that lovely blues atmosphere. The last movement relates to my lute playing.\(^{98}\)

In this way, Bream had an indirect, yet significant influence on the shape of the music through his musical preferences and performances. This type of musical influence has been observed in other collaborations by Buckley.\(^{99}\) Bream’s impact on the work in this regard is perhaps exemplified best by the second movement. By far the lengthiest at almost twelve
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\(^{97}\) Petroc Trelawney, *Julian Bream at the BBC* (BBC Four, 2014).


minutes, it is characterised by long, lento, rubato-filled, single-voice lines for the guitar. This movement naturally includes a multitude of creative decisions that Arnold would have made as the composer, but it also exhibits Arnold’s interpretation of Bream’s aesthetics, shown through the “lovely blues atmosphere.”

This musical influence of Bream’s style on the Concerto has particular consequences for my creative engagement with the work. The lento tempo of around 60 dotted crotchet beats per minute presents an expressive challenge. The performance of connected, legato gestures, at a mezzo-forte dynamic, and in a sufficiently languid mood is hampered significantly by the need to simultaneously be heard over an orchestra. This is particularly evident at bar 28, where the longest note of the phrase, the F-sharp dotted semibreve, is never actually plucked, but rather slid onto with a glissando slur from the A above (see Figure 6.39 below and Recital 2, Movement II, “Lento,” bar 28).

100 Bream, “Julian Bream Interview,” Interviewed by Baker.
101 My performance of the work was with piano accompaniment.
Figure 6.39: Movement II, “Lento” bars 24-29.\textsuperscript{103}

Yet Bream maintained that “the guitar dominates throughout the whole concerto, without amplification.” In my experience performing with piano accompaniment, however, being heard whilst maintaining a full dynamic range was challenging. A creative step, and one that fundamentally changes the performance of the work, was my decision to perform it with moderate amplification throughout. This allowed me to utilise my guitar’s full dynamic and tonal range, without the necessity to project forcefully over another instrument. Within contemporary guitar performance practice and with modern technology, amplification in concerto contexts has become much more standard. Nevertheless, this demonstrates a contribution to the changing development of the work over time. It is an example of my creative agency effecting the overall impact of the piece, both how it is performed and received. This action extends the creative dialogue between Arnold and Bream into the contemporary context of my own engagement with the work, although in this case my position is in disagreement.

It is clear that Bream’s aesthetics were of stylistic consequence to the Concerto, yet his contribution from an instrumental standpoint is less evident in the score. The notation does not include any fingering suggestions from Bream, which might indicate a desire to distance his own interpretational creative agency from the published edition. For the subsequent interpreter-performer, this has the consequence of leaving open a broader palette of interpretive possibilities. While Bream may not have left many clues in the text, his recorded performance offers insight into his expressive and technical agency in the collaboration external to the published score, and offers the subsequent performer some useful interpretive solutions to musical problems in the work.

Examples where the notation is not performable as it is published suggest Bream’s input regarding the idiomatic execution on the guitar was not translated to the score. From bar 160 in the first movement, large left-hand position shifts of up to eleven frets render the last semiquaver of each figure unplayable.

104 Palmer, Julian Bream: A Life on the Road, 81.
105 Josina Nina Fourie-Gouws, "The solo classical guitar concerto: A soloist’s preparatory guide to selected works" (Master of Music (Performing Art), University of Pretoria, 2017), ii; Youngjoon (François) Koh, "A Conductor’s Guide to Joaquín Rodrigo’s Concierto de Aranjuez" (Doctor of Musical Arts, University of Toronto, 2020), 99, 100.
This passage prompts the performer to question what they interpret as the focal point of the gesture, and to make performance decisions accordingly. In this instance, my interpretation was that the successful execution of the chords was of most importance, and that the subsequent semiquavers were of lesser consequence. My solution, therefore, was to cut the fourth semiquaver of each beat (see Figure 6.41 below). This has the benefit of allowing more time with which to accomplish the large left-hand position shifts (see Recital 2, Movement I, “Allegro,” from bar 159).107

![Figure 6.40: Movement I, “Allegro” bars 159-163.](image)

This choice is similar to Bream’s in his performance. Bream, however, performs a chord with the first semiquaver and the third semiquaver, and cuts the last semiquaver (see Figure 6.42 below).108 From a technical standpoint, Bream’s solution is similar to mine in that it provides more time to perform the position shifts. From an expressive standpoint, it enhances the rhythmic vitality and volume of the passage. With these qualities in mind, and having only analysed Bream’s performance more thoroughly after giving my own, his solution offers much to recommend it. Nevertheless, the difference between our two solutions is indicative of the way in which the presentation of the score necessitates creative agency from the performer. It also highlights the creative ways in which a later performer can engage in the collaborative discourse after the composition of the work.

---

In Arnold’s Concerto, the creative relationship between composer and performer has tangible consequences for my creative agency as a contemporary interpreter and performer. While my analysis of their relationship highlights Bream’s impact as a performer on the work, it also shows the space created for the artistic input of the later performer.

This examination uncovers avenues for co-creative expression, both in the interpretation of Arnold’s music, but also in the creative engagement with Bream’s performances. It shows how creative decision-making and input can be distributed among many actors. My engagement with these musical interactions, through the score, recordings, and interviews, allows for the critical examination and contextualisation of my own agency as an interpreter and performer of the music.

_A Closed World of Fine Feelings_

_A Closed World of Fine Feelings_ (hereafter referred to as _Closed World_) was influenced by the interesting collaborative circumstances between Kain and Koehne. In an interview with the author, Kain stated that his artistic relationship with Koehne was shaped by the composer being “completely open to me changing almost anything I wanted, and [Koehne] didn't necessarily need to hear what I'd done to have to approve it. [Koehne] is very unusual in that regard among composers, at least in my experience.” Buckley notes a similarly relaxed attitude to changes made by the performer in the collaboration between composer David Knotts and guitarist Craig Ogden, observing that when dealing with the difficulties of idiomatically composing using harmonics on the guitar, Knotts “simply put a comment into the score requesting Ogden to devise a suitable chord for each point.” There are changes

---

109 Timothy Kain, “Working with Koehne and Westlake,” Interviewed by Callum Henshaw, 2019. A complete transcript of this interview is included in Appendix B

present Kain’s 2004 recording which are not represented in the published edition, such as octave transpositions, altered pitches, the changed use of harmonics, and tempo modifications. Kain’s discussion of his agency and these discrepancies provide insights into his approach to collaboration with Koehne, and the creative agency of the performer when working with a composer who is not familiar with the instrument, but who is open to the input from a guitarist on matters of performance. Further, these differences have an impact for other performers on the process of learning, interpreting, and performing the work.

Kain shed light the values he brought to his collaborations with composers from his perspective as a guitarist, stating that a core consideration is

to make the guitar writing as idiomatic and comfortable to play as possible whilst maintaining the composer’s original intention. The first thing is to fix any passages that are impossible to play and then to make suggestions regarding possible, but very awkward passages. I almost always work with the composer on this, either in person or on the phone, presenting them with the various alternatives and allowing them to choose which they like best.111

This shows Kain’s utilisation of his specialist knowledge as an instrumentalist to shape works towards natural expression on the instrument, guided by his interpretation of the music and in combination with the direct input of the composer. With regards to Closed World specifically, he states that “the changes I made were principally to allow increased resonance and flow. At times, the original choice of notes didn’t fully allow that on the guitar, as it did on the piano.”112 A performer exercising their agency in this vein is not uncommon. As Leech-Wilkinson notes, “there are any number of examples on record of performers changing pitches deliberately — for instance doubling them at the octave to produce a richer or more brilliant effect, or filling in a diatonic scale with semitones to make it chromatic, or even making it a glissando.”113 Discrepancies between three sources, Kain’s handwritten amendments to the score, his realisation of them in his 2004 performance, and the published edition of Closed World (which does not reflect some of Kain’s input), provide insights into the exact nature of Kain’s changes. In interview, Kain stated that his revisions were eventually sent to Koehne, but that by that time the edition without some of his revisions had been sent to the Australian Music Centre for dissemination.

112 Ibid.
Below is a selection of these changes that Kain performs but are not present in the published edition. In some instances, Kain made alterations to pitches. In bars 11 and 12, the F-sharps are altered to A to retain fuller resonance and easier left-hand execution (see Figure 6.43 below and Recital 1, *Closed World*).

![Figure 6.43: A Closed World of Fine Feelings bars 11-15 with Kain's note alterations marked.](image)

In bars 45 and 46, and similarly in bars 53-65, the As on the second dotted crotchet beat of each bar are eminently more playable as natural harmonics at the twelfth fret (see Figure 6.44 below). Utilising natural harmonics results in greater resonance, as the string may continue to vibrate without the necessity of a left-hand finger on the fretboard. This effect enhances the spaciousness of the passage, complementing the *teneroso* and *dolcissimo* expressive markings, and is achieved with less physical effort (see Recital 1, *Closed World*, from bar 45).

![Figure 6.44: A Closed World of Fine Feelings bars 45-65 with Kain's note alterations marked.](image)

A comprehensive list of the discrepancies between the published score and Kain’s performance can be found in Appendix C.


It should be noted that these bars are performed successfully as notated by Aleksandr Tsiboulski. However, for the reasons stated, I chose to perform the harmonics, counter to the notated score.

In bars 102-108, the As on the second dotted crotchet beat of each bar are played an octave down on the open fifth string (see Figure 6.45 below). This results in greater resonance with less physical effort, and allows for increased dynamic control of the gesture (see Recital 1, *Closed World*, from bar 102).\(^{119}\)

**Figure 6.45: A Closed World of Fine Feelings bars 100-109 with Kain’s note alterations marked.**\(^{120}\)

In Kain’s alterations above, the key aim is to either reduce technical difficulty, or to allow the performer a greater degree of expressive control. They are examples therefore of Kain’s artistic agency, utilising his knowledge of the physical and sonic workings of the instrument to inform alterations to the music in the service of idiomatic expression.

---

\(^{118}\) Koehne, *A Closed World of Fine Feelings*, bars 45-54.

\(^{119}\) Recital 1, *Closed World*, from bar 102: [https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=1014](https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=1014)

In other instances, the changes to the music were informed by Kain’s interpretation of the expressive elements of the music rather than concerns of instrumental technique. The recapitulation of the A section in the published edition of *Closed World* is abridged as part of the *A-B-A’* ternary form. In Kain’s amendments, however, bars 117-127 are omitted from the *A’* section, further shortening the recapitulation. From my understanding as a performer, I interpret the central function of this action as retaining sufficient musical time and space with which to achieve the dynamic and emotive arc of the passage without elongating the closing moments of the work through lengthy repetition. A second rationalisation for this alteration can be found by examining Koehne’s suggested work duration of six minutes and thirty seconds. In its published form, performances of *Closed World* take longer, evinced by the performances of both Aleksandr Tsiboulski and Williams. One solution to the discrepancy between the composer’s indication and the performance is to perform the work at a faster tempo. Performing the entire notated work within the indicated time whilst maintaining the marked *andante tenero* and *rubato espressivo* tempo and expressive qualities is not possible: the tempo, especially of the outer sections, would be too hurried. Kain’s alteration, therefore, is an example of prioritised, interpretive decision-making. His omission suggests his prioritisation of Koehne’s duration marking, without sacrificing the expressive qualities that make *Closed World* such an impactful work.

None of the alterations described above, however, are included in the score. This therefore invites the agency of later performers to engage in a similar process to Kain of prioritised, creative decision-making in order to address these same hurdles. Calling on their own aesthetic preferences and musical sensibilities to establish a resolution, the performer may choose to perform the pitches as notated and contend with the expressive result, or to seek out their own solutions. In the instance of structural changes, the performer may choose to disregard the suggested timing, the tempo, and emotive markings, or make alterations to the structure of the work. In this regard, Kain’s impact on *Closed World* is not fully represented in the published edition. Reflecting upon this, Kain says, “I thought that wasn’t a bad thing in this case, as Graeme has such a liberal attitude to changes being made, and that gave every player a chance to do it their own way, as has happened.”

---

121 Section A is from bars 1-40. Section B is from bars 41-109. Section A’ is from bars 110-145


*Closed World* therefore shows quite directly the impact of Koehne and Kain’s composer-performer relationship for the creative agency of future performers. It engenders active, artistic decision-making on the part of performer-interpreter, and demonstrates their trust in this process. In my own interaction with the work, my creative agency is best observed through interpretive decisions surrounding the work’s length and emotional expression. Kain’s shortening of the A’ section alerted me that concise expression was a salient performance consideration. I found that this could be addressed, in addition to the adoption of Kain’s suggested truncation, through my interpretation of the B section. My performance shows a marked distinction in the tempo, and consequent emotional sentiment, of the B section. I perform it at a tempo where a dotted crotchet equals approximately 108-112 beats per minute (see Recital 1, *Closed World*, from bar 45). The outer A and A’ sections are performed so that a minim equals approximately 38 beats per minute (see Recital 1, *Closed World*). While this is certainly a more pronounced than the marked *poco piu mosso* and the indicated tempo change, it was enacted with a distinct purpose (see Figure 6.46 below). Firstly, the tempo shift reduces the overall length of the performance by moving more quickly through the B section. Secondly, performing with a brisker, livelier tempo creates a greater sense of movement, hopefulness, and contrast. This, in turn, gives more definition to the ternary structure through the expressive difference between the outer and inner sections, particularly on the return to the A’ section.

![Figure 6.46: A Closed World of Fine Feelings bars 35-44.](https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=942)

![Figure 6.46: A Closed World of Fine Feelings bars 35-44.](https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=763)

![Figure 6.46: A Closed World of Fine Feelings bars 35-44.](https://youtu.be/Xjnk78vJo4k?t=629)

---

This change in the performed tempo has its roots in Kain’s handwritten revisions to the score, which indicate the tempo change as a crotchet equalling the dotted crotchet, rather than a minim equalling the dotted crotchet. This effectively doubles the increase in tempo. A marker of my brisker interpretation of the B section as novel can be seen through the comparison of tempos from other performers. Kain performs it at 104 dotted crotchet beats per minute, Williams performs at approximately 76 beats per minute, and Tsiboulski performs at approximately 90 beats per minute.

This examination of creative interaction between Kain and Koehne demonstrates the impact of an understanding of the artistic genesis and circumstances of a work on my creative decisions and interpretation as a subsequent performer. Cognisance of their creative dialogue acts as a stimulus for aspects of my own interpretation. Extending some of their artistic processes into my own presentation of the work contextualises my actions and output as an expansion of its creative life.

**Mosstrooper Peak**

The long-standing collaboration between Kain and Westlake was one based on a close professional and personal relationship. Kain says, “I had known Nigel for about 20 years by the time I commissioned Mosstrooper. We had played together in Attacca [Westlake is a clarinettist], and I had commissioned 6 other pieces before this, but no solos. Added to this professional collaboration we had become close personal friends.”

Composed in 2012 with Kain’s input, Mosstrooper Peak was revised in 2018. Kain elaborates:

> Mosstrooper was written at a very difficult time for Nigel, and maybe partly for that reason when we returned to working together on the piece 6 years later, substantial cutting and reordering was done to tighten up and increase the impact of some movements.

These changes were informed by Kain’s performances over the six-year period subsequent to the work’s premiere in 2012, and by Kain and Westlake’s preparation for recording in 2018.

---

127 It is my opinion, however, that the published tempo change is simply an error. Performing it as indicated results in an incredibly slow tempo.


130 Ibid.
The cuts consisted mostly of sections that Westlake considered gratuitous and structurally detrimental. They significantly shortened the work, which nevertheless remains at over 20 minutes. Analysis of the creative relationship between Kain and Westlake in the creation of Mosstrooper Peak demonstrates Kain’s creative agency as a technical and musical collaborator. Analysis of the score also reveals Westlake’s conception of live performance as a key expression of the work. The sources used in this analysis are the revised 2018 edition of the score, Kain’s personal copy of the 2012 version with hand-written amendments, and Kain’s 2018 recording of the work. In my own practice of the work, I used the 2018 score which incorporates Kain’s revisions into the notation.

Kain’s alterations were informed by his understanding of the guitar, and his previous engagement with the work as a performer and editor. These include seemingly minor alterations to pitches that have a significant impact on the technical and expressive execution of certain gestures. For example, Kain’s revision to bar 127 of the 2012 score of “Mosstrooper Peak” makes a crucial difference to the idiomatic playability and expression of the figure which is repeated multiple times (see Figure 6.47 below). The slur transition from the first to the second chord is made more achievable through the change of the notes in the first chord to use the open E and A strings. Kain suggests playing G and C as the second chord, which makes use of the third and fourth fingers of the left hand. This frees the first and second fingers to perform the fourth chord of the gesture with far greater ease (see Figure 6.48 below). The execution of the indicated crescendo from subito piano is hindered by the difficulty of left-hand execution in the 2012 version, yet is comparatively attainable in the revised version (see Recital 3, “Mosstrooper Peak” bar 100).

131 Kain, email message to the author, November 21, 2020.
132 Appendix F contains a list of the some of the changes made to the 2012 version in the 2018 revision. Many of these moments were subsequently transferred to the duo version of the work.
133 When comparing music from the two scores, the bar numbers do not necessarily match. All references to my performances are indicated using the 2018 score numbers where appropriate.
134 Recital 3, “Mosstrooper Peak” bar 100: https://youtu.be/2Vj8 ZoNh0?t=1424
Kain’s revisions to “Butterfly Bay” offer insight into the subtle changes a player can make that result in more idiomatic execution. In bar 2, the Es which are written to be played as harmonics are only achievable by using the right-hand, as opposed to the more natural left hand (see Figure 6.49 below). Right-hand harmonics increase the difficulty of the passage, and result in reduced clarity and slightly dampened sound. Kain’s suggested revision is to perform the notes naturally, retaining the pitch but opting for a different timbre. Just two bars later, however, the A in bar 4 which is marked to be played as a natural, fretted note in the original version, is far more effectively played using Kain’s suggestion of a natural harmonic at the twelfth fret with the left hand (see Figure 6.50 below). This is not only easier for the performer, but results in a fuller, more legato sonority due to the harmonic’s ability to sustain without necessitating the performer hold the note with their left hand. So, almost within the same phrase, the use of harmonics that is the source of difficulty in one instance, provides the solution to a technical issue in another.

In the two examples above, the result is easier execution in performance of the subtle dynamic shifts, and *dolce cantabile* presentation of the phrases (see Recital 3, “Butterfly Bay”). Kain’s artistic agency, exercised in this way, frees the later interpreter to execute the expression of each gesture without technical restriction.

---

Interestingly, one example where Kain’s revisions to the original presented me with technical difficulties be seen in bar 26 of “Tangalooma” (see Figure 6.51 below). When learning the work utilising the 2018 version of the score, I found the note order of this bar to be a significant barrier to my execution of the gesture. The first half of bar 26 requires complex right-hand fingering to be performed at speed \((a-m-i-p-p-i-p-m-i)\). I re-ordered the notes to allow increased flow through the use of similar right-hand fingering to the rest of the passage up to bar 31 (see Recital 3, “Tangalooma” bar 26).\(^{140}\) Later investigation of the 2012 score revealed that the note-order I arrived at was the original composed by Westlake in the pre-revision notation (see Figure 6.52 below).

![Figure 6.51: “Tangalooma” bars 25-28 with Kain’s revisions incorporated.\(^{141}\)](image)

\(^{140}\) Recital 3, “Tangalooma” bar 26: [https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=1751](https://youtu.be/2Vij8zoNhw0?t=1751)

The most important conclusion to draw from this example is that my action in changing the notes of the score were based on the foundation of Kain’s artistic process and his collaboration with Westlake. That is, through my analysis of their interaction, I was conscious of idiomatic execution as being part of the aesthetic of the work’s composition. Thus, when encountering something that presented to me as unidiomatic, I felt confident making changes to the music that I saw as consistent with this aesthetic, and supported my own performative goals.

There is further evidence from both Westlake and Kain in the score that supports the importance of the creative agency of later performers. In interview, Kain stated: “I’m very cognisant of the fact that hopefully many other players will play the piece and I want it to be as playable and accessible to as many players as possible.” Kain’s decision to not put fingering suggestions on the published score is also evidence of a intentional distancing of his personal interpretation from the notated music, and is a telling aspect of Kain’s reflection on the role of future interpreters of the work. In this regard, Kain ensures the interpretive palette of future performers is not unduly coloured by his creative decisions as the first performer. An example of the consequences of Kain’s choice can be seen in bars 29-35 of “Smoky Cape.” Here I made the interpretive decision to finger the passage to achieve as legato a connection as possible between the first notes of each three-note group, whilst observing the laissez vibrer indication (see Recital 3, “Smoky Cape” bar 29). Kain’s interpretation of the passage, however, emphasises this same legato connection but between the third notes of each

144 Kain, personal conversation with the author, 14 March, 2018.
145 There are some fingerings on the score, however Kain stated that these are from Westlake, rather than himself.
146 Recital 3, “Smoky Cape” bar 29: https://youtu.be/2Vj8zoNh0?t=2096
three-note group.\textsuperscript{146} This can be heard in his recording of the work and also seen in his fingering of the score. The different fingerings result in different melodic emphases: mine creating connections between the lower notes in the voice, and Kain’s connecting the upper notes.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{“Smoky Cape” bars 29-34 showing the author’s fingering that allows for a \textit{legato} connection between the first notes of each three-note group.\textsuperscript{147}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{146} Nigel Westlake, “Smoky Cape,” on \textit{Forgotten Dreams: Australian Guitar Music}, performed by Timothy Kain, (Germany: Naxos Rights International Ltd, 2019), track 11.

\textsuperscript{147} Westlake, \textit{Mosstrooper Peak: Sonata for Solo Guitar (2018 Revision)}, “Smoky Cape” bars 29-34.
Bars 42-47 of “Smoky Cape” are an example of how the visual presentation of the score demonstrates Westlake’s active consideration of performance in *Mosstrooper Peak*. Westlake twice splits the three voices, each with their own distinct rhythmic and melodic qualities, across three staves, allowing the interpreter to clearly differentiate them. This aids the learning and interpretation process by clarifying the articulation, phrasing, and expression of the individual musical ideas in each line (see Recital 3, “Smoky Cape” from bar 42).\footnote{Recital 3, “Smoky Cape” from bar 42: https://youtu.be/2Vtj8zoNhwo?t=2122}
The engraving of the notation also reveals the consideration of the act of performance in Westlake’s compositional process. The score is typeset such that all page-turns align with significant points of repose in the music. For this reason, some pages are left entirely blank (pages 9, 15, 20, 24, and 33), or with significantly fewer staves (pages 14, 35, and 41). Although this means the score is less visually pleasing than normal, the result is one that is easily performed from the page, without needing a page turner. While seemingly minor, these acts demonstrate Westlake’s conscious consideration of the performer’s engagement with the

---


The publisher of the work, Rimshot music, is owned and operated by Westlake, and as such he has complete control over this process.
work, and consequent expression in performance. The typesetting of the score shows Westlake’s active partnership with the creative agency of the later performer.

The analysis of the creative interaction between Westlake and Kain in *Mosstrooper Peak* shows how the pair not only collaborated on technical and musical elements of the work, but that they also support the co-creative role of the later interpreter-performer. Westlake’s engraving of the score played a role in my creative process as I familiarised myself with the work. Understanding their interaction informed my interpretation of the work, supporting the idea that later performers have the active capacity to develop extant musical works. My research into Kain’s preference for idiomatic execution spurred my own individual changes along the same aesthetic lines. Small changes such as these demonstrate the continuous reshaping of the work in the hands of new creative actors, and shows the spread of this artistic responsibility through time.

**CONCLUSION**

In each of the examples discussed in this chapter, a performer has had a significant artistic input into the creation of music for guitar. This involved varying modes of interaction with the process of composition. My analysis affirms and develops some of the central concepts of this thesis by seeing their application in a variety of other circumstances. Firstly, each work demonstrates the notion of distributed creativity in the sense discussed by Cook and Leech-Wilkinson: that the life of music exists in the engagement of many artists, each of whom make a contribution through their own understanding and interpretation. In the instances of transcription and arrangement, the actions of a later performer form the foundation of this distribution. For the composer-guitarists examined, distributed creativity is fundamental to their compositional idioms. In the examples of direct relationships between composers and performers, the creativity is distributed both at the genesis of the work, and through the involvement of later performers.

The direct actions of other performers, or the consideration of later interpretation as part of the compositional process, contributes directly to my agency as a performer. The agency exercised by these composers and performers is a catalyst for aspects of my own, providing context, motive, empowerment, and validation. Accordingly, the way in which my agency is expressed differs for each situation, while the prism through which it is viewed remains constant. In the music of Scarlatti, the actions of the transcribers prompted my own changes, variously changing the register of entire passages or altering bass lines. In the arrangements by Llobet, the didacticism embedded in the works expanded my own interpretive palette, offering the stimulus for some of my expressive modifications. In the cases of Coste, Houghton, and Brouwer, their consideration of the performer as part of the compositional process affected how I approached their music. Their knowledge of the instrument was influential in creating works that were idiomatic. With Coste and Brouwer, my engagement with the programmatic narratives was influenced by their performance-focussed processes. Houghton’s detailed consideration of the performer, however, impacted aspects of my technical execution of the work. The examples where there was a direct relationship between the composer and the performer provide perhaps the clearest window into the agency of the performer in shaping aspects of my artistic expression. Bream’s aesthetic influence on Arnold’s concerto, and the absence of fingering in the notation, contributed both to my decisions to use amplification in my performance, and to my alterations to the score respectively. I adopted Kain’s various alterations to pitch in Closed World, but also used indications from his changes to inform my own expressive decisions with regards to tempo. Lastly, in Mosstrooper Peak, I built upon Kain’s aesthetic of idiomatic execution to make my own changes to the music, and was encouraged by the unfingered score to make distinct and novel expressive decisions. In these instances, by the very nature of collaboration, the composer also engenders my agency as a later performer.

In every instance therefore aspects of my own creative agency mirror, extend, or are inspired by the actions of the other creative actors. This expands the same process explored with regards to the Folia Variations to encompass further repertoire for the guitar. Informed by my creative practice and the analysis of the artistic interactions that shaped the works, the findings in this chapter demonstrate my position as a co-creator. The agency of the other creators in these studies acts as a fulcrum from which to examine my own agency. My research allows me to understand, contextualise, and validate aspects of my own artistic
response, and to situate it as part of the distribution of creativity in the lineage of interactions that surround each work.
CONCLUSION

KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS

This thesis examines the co-creative role of the modern performer by investigating the artistic interactions between artists in the creation, and progressive development of, works for the guitar within the Western art music tradition. This evolutionary process brings change, meaning, and life to musical works. Focusing particularly on the artistic contribution of the performer and building on the research of Cook, Clarke and Doffman, and Leech-Wilkinson, I define this process as diachronic, distributed co-creativity. Central to this investigation are my own activities as a contemporary performer and analyst. The collaboration between Ponce and Segovia in the creation of the Folia Variations forms the main subject of this investigation, while less extensive studies of other works from the guitar repertoire support this central research. I use my position as both researcher and performer to inform my own reading of the works studied. The artistic outcomes of the research thereby enable a process of reflexive critique in the articulation of aspects of my co-creative contributions.

That the Folia Variations was the product of collaboration between Ponce and Segovia is well established by others. A significant aim of this thesis was to bring more clearly into focus the artistic input of both musicians. This research found that Ponce and Segovia’s creative agencies, their distinct musical sensibilities, aesthetic priorities, and personalities, informed the work in manifold ways. Examination of their creative collaboration at the work’s genesis drew on my engagement with the work as both a performer and as a musicologist. The resulting understanding provides new insights into how the work was created, while having demonstrable consequences for my interpretation. This led to the conclusion that the distribution of creativity between Ponce and Segovia had a marked effect on the work. My artistic agency, expressed through performance and analysis, and contextualised by my


research into Ponce and Segovia’s artistic interaction, results in a further evolution of the work. Bringing their creative interactions into the contemporary discourse means that I too form part of the diachronic distribution of creativity that perpetuates the work. Comprehensively identifying, analysing, and creatively responding to Segovia and Ponce’s individual and combined artistic input has not previously occurred in a single project.

The scope of this thesis is broadened beyond the *Folia Variations* in the final chapter. Utilising the same concepts and methods of investigation, these small studies demonstrate diachronic, distributed co-creativity in other works from the guitar repertoire, encompassing a wide array of creative interactions and time periods. Each work was chosen with the critical aim to bring a new perspective to the arguments surrounding the *Folia Variations*, and to function musically as part of the programs of repertoire delivered in the three recitals. They include transcriptions of Scarlatti sonatas, Llobet’s arrangements of Catalan Folk Songs, and works by the guitarist-composers Coste, Brouwer, and Houghton. Works that were written in collaboration between composers and guitarists form the last section of this chapter, and bring a particular focus to the actions of living composers and performers. The studies also explore other ways in which performers are co-creators in the development of music.

The research of Cook, Leech-Wilkinson, Small, Clarke et al, and Torrence has substantially shaped the arguments of this thesis. Along with resituating “the work” to exist as much in the performed act as in the score, they argue that the performer is a co-creator, and position the creative act of performance as fundamental to the enduring evolution of Western art music. Building on the research of these authors, I position myself as a co-creator, where my output contributes to the life of the musical works under consideration. This output is situated in the context of the genesis of, and artistic discourse surrounding, each work. The culmination of this research is embodied in my performances, which demonstrate the artistic conclusions drawn from my investigation, putting into action my creative agency and interpretation. They represent my part in the evolution of the music being researched, as I contribute new layers of meaning and understanding to the creative discourse. Critically, these actions position my research as an active manifestation of the concept of diachronic, distributed co-

---

creation. Investigating the works in preparation for performance provided a crucial source of evidence regarding the interactions that shaped them. Presenting my performances as a central component of my research is a fundamental point of differentiation to previous research in this field. It allows for reflexive critique, analysis, and contextualisation of my creative agency in a novel and lived extension of the theories of previous scholars.

My research into the relationship between Ponce and Segovia demonstrates the role that each musician had in the creation of the *Folia Variations*. Framed in terms of creative agency, this approach delineates each of their artistic voices. Segovia’s significant influence is demonstrated through his role as a collaborator with instrumental expertise. I show that his strong personality, goals as a musician, and control over much of the editorial and publication process were factors in how he shaped the work to realise his aims. Equally, my study of Ponce’s vision and stylistic evolution as a composer, his control of the compositional minutiae, and his mediation of Segovia’s input, illuminates the manifestations of Ponce’s artistic voice within the *Folia Variations*. The consideration of Ponce’s stylistic presence in this thesis makes a significant contribution to understanding his aesthetic perspective and collaborative role. The conclusion of this research is that the motivations of both musicians shaped the music. While working together, each exercised their individual creative agency to achieve discrete aesthetic objectives. Investigation into Segovia and Ponce’s communal efforts demonstrates the effect of their active collaboration on the *Folia Variations*. Through the examination of this aspect of their partnership, I illustrate how the intermingling of their aesthetics produces variations that represent aspects of both their styles. Further, the study concludes that they combined their distinct areas of expertise to address the many technical, expressive, and musical challenges posed during the creative process.

The investigation of the interactions between Segovia and Ponce forms a basis from which to critically examine and inform my own interpretation of the work. Understanding the *Folia Variations* through the prism of Segovia and Ponce’s creative agency brings clarity to my interpretation of its large-scale structure, the compositional forms of particular variations, the significance of the guitar techniques employed, the function of Ponce’s compositional techniques, and the performance of certain expressive details in the work. Throughout the study, these considerations are demonstrated to have a critical influence on my interpretation of the work in performance.
The examples from the classical guitar repertoire explored in Chapter 6 act as further substantiation of the concept at the core of this project: that the creative life of a work is distributed through time through the input of many artistic contributors. As in the investigation of Ponce, Segovia, and the *Folia Variations*, the discussions of these works explore how the knowledge generated by my research is used in my interpretation to variously expand, revise, emulate, or counter the creative agency of other artistic actors in each work’s history. This demonstrates how cognisance of the creative interactions that gave rise to each work can influence how they are interpreted, and that this understanding situates my actions as part of the ongoing development of their creative lineage. The discoveries from this aspect of the investigation offer further evidence that demonstrates how my engagement with works in a performance-focused setting informs the findings of my analysis, and that the findings of my analysis have meaningful consequences for my actions as a creative practitioner.

The decision to have a highly focussed scope of research means that there is potential for further research beyond what is included here. While the frame of reference concentrated on my individual responses is a strength and distinctive element of this research, it necessarily entails that the findings presented here are highly individualistic. The outcomes of the research are nevertheless applicable and meaningful to other interpreters.

The research is centred on guitar repertoire. To this end, this thesis invites additional investigation into the history, repertoire, and performers of the classical guitar. Ponce and Segovia collaborated on a multitude of other significant works, including four sonatas, another theme and variations, and 24 preludes. Additionally, Segovia collaborated with numerous other composers, including Moreno-Torroba, Tansman, Castelnuovo-Tedesco. These collaborations warrant their own investigations, and could build on the scaffold of this research. Beyond Segovia, there is potential for more research into the collaborations between living performers and living composers, focussing on the place of later performers within this creative dialogue. The last chapter of this thesis begins this process through the

---


interviews with Kain concerning his collaborations with Koehne and Westlake. Kain’s other collaborations, with composers including Mark Isaacs, Elena Kats-Chernin, and Richard Charlton, provide fertile ground for future study.6 These living composers and performers are comparatively under studied, and could provide a wealth of first-hand knowledge. Other guitarists who have collaborated extensively with composers are David Leisner, Eliot Fisk, and David Tanenbaum, each of whom could contribute to such research.7 The breadth of this style of study need not be limited to the guitar: collaborations between performers and composers of all types could benefit from similar research, as in the research of Fitch and Heyde, Clarke et al, and Le Guin.8

There is the opportunity for research by other practitioners, from a diversity of backgrounds and areas of instrumental expertise, to expand the applications and depth of the findings in this thesis. Just as Le Guin has explored some of the concepts in this thesis with regards to the cello in ensemble performance, so too could this thesis inform further research into the creative roles of chamber musicians in the co-creative development of musical works after their initial creation.9 This leads to an area of this study which could be expanded upon in further research: its performer-centric perspective. The decision to focus on performance was necessarily influenced by it being my area of expertise, and the medium through which I am able to express my creative agency. By centring on just my creative expression in performance, the artistic consequences for others in other creative realms are necessarily overshadowed. Similar studies could be, and in the instance of Clarke et al, have been,

---


8 Fitch and Heyde, ""Reccercar": The collaborative process as invention."; Clarke, Doffman, and Lim, "Distributed Creativity and Ecological Dynamics: A Case Study of Liza Lim’s ‘Tongue of the Invisible’."; Le Guin, *Boccherini’s Body: An Essay in Carnal Musicology*.
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conducted with a composer, transcriber, or arranger, as the primary researcher and creative practitioner.\textsuperscript{10}

My research utilising the growing discourse of creative practice studies in the context of the repertoire and musicians within the field of the classical guitar, broadens the scope of academic ideas and concepts with which members of the classical guitar community might engage. Buckley’s research has already contributed towards this.\textsuperscript{11} In this context, my position as both a researcher and performer is significant: the process and outcomes of my research contribute to bringing these traditionally discrete fields more closely together. The guitar community can benefit from the findings in this research by using it to situate their own creative acts within the discourse of creative practice research and performance studies. The conclusions of this thesis could be used by other performers to contextualise discussions of their creative role in Western art music traditions. By including the guitar in the discourse that repositions performance more centrally, this research creates more opportunities for performers to contribute their own knowledge to further widen the diversity of perspectives in this field. Here, the opportunity exists for the expansion of ideas regarding the role of the performer, beyond those I have articulated in this thesis.

\section*{Discussion of Findings}

\textit{Distribution of Creativity at a Work’s Genesis}

I chose to begin by investigating Segovia’s creative input into the \textit{Folia Variations}, as my own background as a guitarist and performer provided me a foundation from which to develop an understanding of his creative priorities during his collaboration with Ponce. My research demonstrates Segovia’s effect on the work, observed in his commissioning of Ponce as composer of the work, requesting the theme and variations form, and supplying the theme itself. The request for the \textit{Folia} theme, and the theme and variations form are strongly linked to Segovia’s wish for the work to be consciously positioned in the Western musical canon, and fundamentally shaped the work as a whole. On a smaller scale, Segovia was responsible for

\textsuperscript{10} Clarke, Doffman, and Lim, "Distributed Creativity and Ecological Dynamics: A Case Study of Liza Lim’s ‘Tongue of the Invisible’.",

\textsuperscript{11} Buckley, "Creative Performer Agency in the Collaborative Compositional Process."
aspects of multiple variations through suggestions to Ponce regarding the use of specific guitar techniques. Two variations based directly on Segovia’s suggestions in his letters are “Variation XV,” which includes octave doubling, and “Variation XVI,” which uses tremolo. Segovia’s aesthetic proclivities as a performer, and his ideas about positioning the guitar in the canon, are shown to be present in the work. For example, Segovia’s wish to include flamboyant virtuosity to satisfy his desire for broad public appeal can be seen in “Variation X.” Research into “Variation VIII” shows Segovia’s substantial influence on the tempo and expressive markings, directed predominantly by his stylistic interests as a performer. These conclusions provided me with a perspective on Segovia’s artistic role in the creation of *Folia Variations*. My findings regarding Segovia’s agency inform my own approach, including how I express the balance of creative voices embedded in the music. Discussed in more detail below, an understanding of the creative interactions that gave rise to the work, and the motivations of the creative actors at its genesis, became central to my creative practice and the development of my interpretation.

While my performance expertise gave me a scaffold to understand Segovia’s creative input into the *Folia Variations*, I was comparatively less familiar with Ponce’s artistic perspective as a composer. My research into Ponce’s creative agency, his goals as a musician, the progression of his compositional idiom, and his personality, therefore greatly enriched my understanding of the work. The results of this research illuminate aspects of Ponce’s artistic agency in the *Folia Variations*, showing that both his goals as a musician and his stylistic viewpoint as a composer significantly shaped the work. The most distinct expression of his modern-leaning musical sensibilities can be seen in “Variation V,” “Variation VI,” and “Variation VII,” which I designate “Ponce’s Triptych.” These variations exhibit his particular attention to motivic development, intricate compositional links to the theme, his use of syncopated accenting and implied shifts in meter, and a consideration of large-scale structures. Further, my research links Ponce’s use of dissonant harmonies in the *Folia Variations*, notably the recurring use of the French-sixth chord that first appears in his re-imagination of the theme, to an expression of his stylistic idiom. The analysis shows these characteristics are evidence of Ponce’s individual style throughout the work, disentangled from those of Segovia. This leads to the conclusion that Ponce’s powerful aesthetics permeate the *Folia Variations*. Understanding Ponce’s creative agency provided me with a further layer of knowledge that enriched my understanding of the work and was crucial to decisions in my interpretation.
Consideration of Segovia and Ponce’s individual artistic influences was a necessary prerequisite to the investigation of how the pair interacted and collaborated. By first considering each in isolation, and forming understanding of their discrete perspectives, it was possible then to analyse their collaborative interplay. My research concluded that their creative agencies interacted, at times in concord and at times in tension. Their aesthetic influences enrich the compositional intricacy, instrumental technique, expression, and historical positioning of the work. Ponce and Segovia’s communal actions are most clearly observed in the blending their styles, and their collaborative problem-solving. Perhaps the finest example of the intersection of their aesthetics is the “Fuga.” It allows Ponce’s style to flourish in the detail-oriented compositional approach and intricate use of counterpoint. Simultaneously, it satisfies Segovia’s wish for historical positioning, and the variation incorporates multiple musical suggestions from his letters. Communal problem-solving is most noticeable in “Variation XV,” where the variation’s imbalances became the subject of extensive discussion between the pair. Understanding Ponce and Segovia’s communal collaboration provided me with a third layer of context to the work’s creation.

This research therefore has meaningful implications for future performers and researchers. It highlights the details of Ponce and Segovia’s creative interaction, demonstrating how these details were significant in shaping the Folia Variations and how it is understood. Cognisance of the artistic influences that were at the genesis of this work is crucial in situating my own creative contributions to the discourse of the work, as will be discussed below.

Beyond the Folia Variations my research shows that, to varying degrees, a process of creative dialogue is often the norm between performers and composers. The transcriptions and arrangements discussed in this thesis highlight the different ways in which performers and composers work together, and how their particular creative agencies shape the evolution of the works. The transcribers of the Scarlatti sonatas, all of whom in these instances are guitarists, made artistic decisions that took into account the instrument, range, key, and musical content of the source material. They focussed on the idiomatic arrangement of the music for guitar, astutely reshaping the original music and interpreting the expressive priorities. This took the form of changes to chord voicing, octave displacements, and in the instance of Sonata K. 14, the subtle rearrangement of melodic lines. Llobet’s creative contribution in his arrangements of the Catalan Folk Songs turns the music from simple
melodies into complex works for the guitar that make extensive use of the instrument’s sonority and techniques.

The studies of compositions by guitarist-composers demonstrate the composers’ simultaneous attention to concerns of both composition and guitar performance. In the example of *Le Départ* by Coste, my research shows that Coste used his knowledge of guitar performance to inform aspects of his compositional idiom. This presents as passages that have technical familiarity to the later performer. Examination of Houghton’s *Stélé* demonstrates the most conscious consideration of the performer of any of the works studied. Houghton’s compositional process involves exhaustive performance directions coupled with frequent passages utilising idiomatic left and right-hand techniques. In my study of Brouwer’s *Sonata del Decamerón Negro*, I illuminate interplay between his compositional idiom, his consideration of guitar performance, and the programmatic narrative of the work. This manifests in the multi-layered intertextual references to guitar repertoire, which contribute to the work’s rich, extra-musical meanings.

Other examples of collaboration between composers and performers demonstrate various manifestations of performers’ creative agency. My research into the collaboration between Bream and Arnold shows that their interaction had a significant stylistic effect on Arnold’s Guitar Concerto, Op. 67. As a consequence of Arnold’s approach to concerto composition, Bream became the source of aesthetic inspiration, with Arnold making allusions to musical styles that were part of Bream’s aesthetic background. Further, my research shows that Bream’s artistic input is not fully encapsulated by the score. Analysis of Bream’s recorded performance reveals evidence of his performative consideration of the work through alterations for both technical and aesthetic reasons. The analysis of Koehne’s collaboration with Kain uncovers the latter’s creative agency in the composition of *A Closed World of Fine Feelings*. Kain’s input includes alterations to some notes, informed by his instrumental expertise. His more substantial changes alter the structure of the work, significantly shortening the *A’* section. My research into their relationship found that Koehne’s open approach to collaboration as a composer enabled Kain’s agency, and was a fundamental component of their creative interaction and the resultant music. In the instance of Kain and Westlake’s collaboration, my investigation brings to light Kain’s significant creative input. Kain participated in an extended revision process with Westlake, resulting in changes to the structure, notes, and idiomatic execution of *Mosstrooper Peak*. 
The conclusions drawn from these studies into other works of guitar repertoire demonstrate a commonality with the investigation centred on Segovia, Ponce, and the *Folia Variations*. They illuminate the impact that performers have on the compositional process, and that this impact is often heavily influenced by their experience and priorities as instrumentalists. Just as Segovia’s aesthetics shaped aspects of the *Folia Variations*, similar consequences of the actions of performers can be observed in other works. These investigations provide evidence of the distribution of creativity amongst contributors. Broadening the scope of instances where this co-creativity is observed, my research demonstrates that, although a multitude of creative decisions are made by the composer, the involvement of performers spreads the creative input amongst multiple actors. The conclusions drawn from my practice-based research offer a valuable source of insight to other researchers. The numerous examples of knowledge gained through my artistic engagement provide a substantial, creative contribution to the understanding of the music studied that can be expanded in future research.

The conclusions in this section have consequences for other performers by providing an understanding of the artistic influences and aesthetic considerations that produced these works. Uncovering the many means through which performers can influence the compositional process highlights avenues for performers to contextualise and inform their own interpretations, as will be discussed in the next section.

*The Artistic Agency of the Later Performer*

The conclusions above are connected by the artistic consequences they have for the performance of the works. The findings demonstrate that, alongside intuitive responses, conscious creative practice paired with musicological research and analysis forms an artistically significant aspect of performance and interpretation.

A very clear example of the interaction between my research and my performance can be seen in the conscious mediation of Segovia’s creative influence in my interpretation of “Variation VIII.” I performed this variation with a tempo and emotion significantly different to the score marking, a decision informed by knowledge of Segovia’s changes to the variation. Another example is my interpretation of “Variation X,” which was similarly coloured by an understanding of Segovia’s aesthetic influence on the work. I introduced the *rasgueado*
technique to the chords in this variation, in acknowledgement of Segovia’s inclination for Spanish flair.

Using insights from my research into Ponce’s artistic agency, my interpretive changes to “Ponce’s Theme” between my 2016 and 2018 performances indicate the evolution of my understanding of the *Folia Variations* throughout this project. I found that, through his use of harmony and intricate inner voices, Ponce imbued the theme with his own particular aesthetics. In response to these findings, I altered the interpretation in my second performance of “Ponce’s Theme” to emphasise these aspects, favouring simultaneously plucked, rather than rolled, chords. These changes demonstrate a process of self-critique, rooted in my evolving understanding of the interplay of aesthetics in the *Folia Variations*. A further example can be seen in my interpretation of “Variation I,” which emphasises characteristics linked to Ponce’s expressive voice through the motivic development of the French-sixth chord and the changing rhythmic motifs. A consideration of Ponce’s artistic presence was important in shaping my own interpretation of the work. It influenced my decisions regarding the use of *spiccato*, timbre, and rhythmic drive. It brings a compositional consideration to my creative practice, and adds a further layer of historical awareness that supplements the perspective shaped by Segovia’s involvement.

The conclusions arrived at in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 set the parameters for the investigations in Chapter 5. The collaborative dialogue between Ponce and Segovia informed my interpretation when responding to the challenges of performing this lengthy work. My research showed that both Segovia and Ponce had contributed to the cause of, and solutions regarding, the work’s length. Ponce crafted large-scale structural links between some variations, such as between “Variation XII,” “Variation XIII,” and “Variation XIV,” and also between “Variation XVIII” and “Variation XIX.” Understanding these considerations informed changes to my interpretation of these variations. I sought to convey a greater awareness and active expression of the harmonic transitions and juxtaposition of moods between variations. Similarly, understanding that Segovia had raised issues about the structural imbalance of “Variation XV” provided an additional argument in favour of my decision to perform its central section at a faster tempo.

From another perspective, my practical engagement with the *Folia Variations* throughout the research gave me insight into Ponce and Segovia’s collaboration, and its musical
manifestations in the work. In this regard, the conclusions I drew regarding the interpretation of “Variation XV” show an interesting convergence between my intuitive response to the music and my research. My initial, natural response to a perceived imbalance in the variation found its rationalisation through research. The tangible similarity of “Variation II” to a slur study, particularly noticeable in performance, invited investigation into historical intertextuality and allusion in the work. Consciousness of the historical positioning favoured by Segovia spurred the interpretation of historical allusions to the music of Corelli in some variations. Another example of a feature that was first uncovered through practical investigation is my interpretation of the dialogue-like structures in “Variation III,” “Variation XVII,” and “Variation XVIII,” each of which I interpret as mirroring the creative dialogue between Ponce and Segovia.

This investigation therefore demonstrates the artistic, interpretive, and analytical consequences of understanding Ponce and Segovia’s creative roles in the Folia Variations. This approach results in a multifaceted, detailed interpretation of the work. In particular, it allowed me to make conscious decisions about my own interpretive and stylistic aesthetics, and how they interact with those of Ponce and Segovia. The collaborative nature of Segovia and Ponce’s interaction, demonstrated in Chapter 5, establishes the final link between my artistic agency and theirs. By creating an understanding of the interaction between these two musicians at the genesis of the work, my research situates my own interpretive decisions within the context of their dialogue, while my own layers of artistic interpretation further this discourse and the creative life of the work. My actions as an analyst and performer extend the distributed creativity of the work into a contemporary context, situating me as a co-creator in the evolution of the work. Just as there was an intersection of Segovia and Ponce’s styles, so I too contribute my aesthetics perspectives via performance. As they undertook a process of creative problem-solving, so I too continue this process on my own terms, but informed by their actions. Therefore, although the observations and changes that I made in my interpretation of each individual variation were modest, they combine to build a substantial, new, and evolutionary interpretation of the work.

These findings regarding my creative role also have implications for other performers of the Folia Variations. They demonstrate that an awareness of the artistic climate and interactions surrounding a work’s creation can fundamentally influence how it is interpreted. For other performers, this thesis therefore provides an analysis of these influences, and an example of
how these analyses might be utilised to inform an interpretation. My creative response, however, is just one interpretation of these findings. Others may therefore use this research to inform their own interpretations. Further, as I do in my discussion of “Variation V” and “Variation VI,” other performers may use the findings of this research to critically reflect on their own interpretation.

Through investigating the creative interactions that formed other works, I was also able to similarly draw conclusions regarding my agency as a performer. In each example, the actions of the performers involved informed my own creative decision-making. That is, the analysis and interpretation of the artistic interactions that shaped these works provided starting points for aspects of my own creative agency. Understanding the creative processes undertaken by the transcribers of three Scarlatti sonatas was the inspiration and stimulus for changes in my own performance of the transcriptions. In my interpretation of Sonata K. 380, I retained some passages in their original relative octave in contrast to Williams’ transcription, while in Sonata K. 77, I chose to maintain consistency and a sense of symmetry between phrases of the bass line by altering the octave drops to instead be unisons. Study of Llobet’s skilful arrangement of the Catalan Folk Songs, and the identification of the distinctively didactic nature to their musical variety, informed my own changes in performance. These were focussed on introducing greater variation in timbre, and alterations to particular rhythms.

In the examples concerning guitarist-composers, insights into each composer’s consideration of the performer as part of the creative process were significant in my interpretive decisions. Coste’s consideration of the performer impacted my interpretation of Le Départ, empowering the extension of my own creative agency. In preparing the work for performance, I found Coste’s use of guitaristic techniques resulted in a simpler learning process. As a consequence, I was afforded greater capacity to interpret and creatively respond to the work’s programmatic elements, particularly in orchestrating parts through contrasts in timbre and articulation. Houghton’s very detailed directions to the performer had a different effect on my engagement with his work, Stélé. His exacting focus constrained my artistic agency so that it was expressed mostly in subtle, technical changes. The findings of my research into Brouwer’s compositional process affected my interpretation of the Sonata del Decamerón Negro. Uncovering Brouwer’s intertextual references to other guitar repertoire created large-scale musical waypoints which benefitted my communication of the work’s structure in performance. Further, these references instilled a sense of familiarity to me as a later performer of the work,
helping me to create a vibrant, emotive interpretation. These details were crucial in informing my choices of tone-colour, dynamics, and characterisation throughout the work.

My research into the artistic agency of performers and composers in collaboration was the foundation for my own artistic choices, as well as a source of inspiration and tension. My investigation into Arnold’s Concerto demonstrates Bream’s influence on the work as a performer, but also reveals the space for the creative contribution of later performers. In particular, areas of the score required editing for playability, prompting me to scrutinise my interpretive priorities. Understanding Bream’s decisions at these points shed light on his collaboration with Arnold, as well as providing a point of critique for my own decisions. Kain’s alterations to Koehne’s Closed World were the source of inspiration for my own artistic decisions. These decisions mirrored Kain’s in some respects, where I adopted his note changes. More significantly, Kain’s structural changes inspired my own interpretive tempo choices. These changes have a notable structural and expressive result in performance. In Westlake’s Mosstrooper Peak, my understanding of the circumstances of the work’s composition were consequential for some of my artistic decisions. Firstly, I felt enabled by Kain and Westlake’s approach to idiomatic execution to make changes to the note-order in “Tangalooma.” Secondly, the decision by Kain and Westlake to provide minimal fingering on the score was a catalyst for many of my decisions surrounding the phrasing, accenting, and expression throughout the work.

The conclusions detailed above demonstrate the consequences, for my own creative agency as a performer, of the findings from the musicological and analytical investigations. In the same manner as my understanding of Ponce and Segovia’s aesthetics and relationship informed aspects of my performance of the Folia Variations, so too can this process be observed in my creative response to the findings of my research into these other works. Each show that the creative context of a work’s composition, and an understanding of its genesis, forms a meaningful component of my creative and musicological output. The distribution of creativity in the compositional process, an attribute shared by the Folia Variations and every work in Chapter 6, is therefore a fulcrum around which my own creative contributions are constructed.

The conclusions drawn above are significant for other interpreters of these works, as they provide an illustration, both in analysis and in performance, of how the interpretation of a
work can be contextualised in the actions and aesthetics of its original creators. In each case, this understanding can form the starting point for the construction of a new, informed interpretation. These findings can be utilised by other performers to shape aspects of their performances. In the examples of transcription and arrangement, the understanding articulated regarding the creative roles that performers took is shown to influence the decisions of other performers concerning texture, register, or timbre. The conclusions with respect to works by guitarist-composers leads performers towards a deeper consideration of the programmatic elements of these works, and how the performer’s technical idiosyncrasies can function within that context. Lastly, this thesis highlights the creative consequences that concurrent collaboration between composers and performers can have for other performers. It offers a better understanding of performance solutions to issues of notation, such as with Arnold’s Concerto or Koehne’s Closed World. Further, with Westlake’s Mosstrooper Peak, the way in which aspects of my interpretation were founded on understanding the aesthetics of the work’s creation could form the basis for further artistic changers by others. This is particularly applicable to the discussion of idiomatic execution in that work. As discussed regarding the Folia Variations above, my creative responses form a single perspective that can be derived from this research. Other performers may therefore use this research and my artistic output as a foundation upon which to build their own interpretations.

Performance, Co-creativity, and the Evolution of Musical Works

The outcomes articulated in the two sections above, regarding the granular understanding of creative interactions between performers and composers, the insights drawn from my practice-based inquiry, and my creative response to this knowledge, contribute both artistic and analytical layers to the evolution of these musical works. They form an expression of my own artistic voice that consciously considers the creativity embedded in the works by multiple actors. This evolution and extension of a work through time is therefore an enactment of the concept of diachronic, distributed co-creativity, explored throughout the thesis. Just as the dialogue between Segovia and Ponce, and the music it spawned, was the source for further creative development in this project, my contribution can form the nucleus of further artistic and musicological development, thought, and understanding for other researchers and performers.
Defining the concept of diachronic, distributed co-creativity, facilitated by the research of Cook, Clarke and Doffman, and Leech-Wilkinson, allowed me to express my findings creatively in performance, documenting my research in an artistic, accessible, and public manner. Further, these performances enable later self-critique. This research shows how creative discourse can span across time through the intersection of musical, analytical, and historical ideas. Diachronic, distributed co-creativity therefore enables this study to be more than an investigation of music and musicians of the past. Rather, it is about the contemporary artistic and musicological conclusions that can be drawn from investigating these past interactions. It is about my own lived and embodied experience, and the communication of this experience and findings to an audience.

These findings have important implications for performers and researchers of Western art music. They contribute to the ongoing reconsideration of the pervasive nineteenth-century perception that performers are simply re-creators of an intangible, single source of creativity embedded in the score by composers. It argues instead that music is constantly evolving and that the involvement of many creative actors, of whom the performer is one, enriches music by adding layers of perspective, style, interpretation and understanding. Rethinking the role of performance, and viewing music as moving and changing rather than as static, gives a sense of purpose and progression to the output in this project. This process acknowledges the significant creative role of the performer in the generation of new understandings and expressions of music.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Translation Note

Below is a revised translation from a passage in the Segovia-Ponce Letters, written by Karina Bontes-Forward on February 21, 2018. This passage is relevant to the discussion of “Variation XV” in Chapter 5. The translation seeks to bring clarity to Segovia’s precocious writing and decode a troubling sentence.

The original text from page 63 of The Segovia-Ponce Letters:

Una imaginación harmónica tan poetica y tan rica como la que tu tienes, debe encontrar modo de superar lo que has hecho, tanto en la de accordes de tres notas, que suenan marvillosamente en la guitarra (y que se presta, soltando una nota, y tomando otra, a pasar por modulaciones finísimas que parezcan polvo de modulaciones) como en la frase que has añadido a la de octavas, que se halla a dran desnivel, y en la cual se cae con extrañeza, para levantarse de nuevo alegremente al ir Da Capo.¹

Alcázar translation from page 65 of The Segovia-Ponce Letters:

A harmonic imagination so poetic and rich as you have, should find a way to overcome what you have written, as well in the one with three-note chords, which sound marvellously on the guitar (and which lends itself, dropping a note here and picking up another there, to pass through very fine modulations that seem like a dusting of modulations) as in the phrase that you have added to the one with the octaves, where it finds itself in great imbalance, and in which it curiously drops again to pick up happily upon moving to the Da Capo.²

Bontes-Forward translation:

A harmonic imagination as poetic and rich as yours, should be able to find a way to overcome what you have written; equally in the one with three-note chords [Variation XIV], which sound marvellously on the guitar (and which lends itself to dropping a note here and picking up another there, so that it passes through very fine modulations that seem like a dusting of modulations), as in the phrase that you have added to the one with the octaves [Variation XV], where it finds itself in great imbalance, and in which it curiously drops again to pick up happily upon moving to the Da Capo.

A note from Bontes-Forward on the translation:

In Alcázar’s translation the word “tanto” is translated to “as well”, and the word “como”, used after the parentheses, is translated to “as”. The result reads as if the solution for “Variation XIV” is in some way related to that of “Variation XV.” Segovia, however, continues in the same sentence to criticise “Variation XV.” Bontes’ translation, on the other

¹ Segovia, The Segovia-Ponce Letters, 63.
² Ibid., 65.
hand, concludes that “tanto” is more clearly translated in this instance as “equally”, leaving
the later word “como” to be contextualised to mean “as”. The words “tanto” and “como” in
Spanish form a correlation equality, thus indicating “this is equally applicable in the case of X
as it is in Y.” In this case, the suggestion is that Ponce’s imagination should be as equally
capable of resolving both problem one as problem two, not that the solutions to both
problems are the same. The result clarifies Segovia’s request for two independent musical
solutions to two independent musical problems, and removes the confusion of the sentence.
This interpretation of the original text is swiftly validated in the paragraph that follows: “If
you have the time and the inclination, write, then, two other complete variations to substitute
for the one with three-note chords [Variation XIV] and the one with harmonics [Variation
XX], and put a finer chisel on the one with octaves [Variation XV].” Lastly, the word “to” is
added to the sentence “and which lends itself to dropping …” for grammatical clarity.
Appendix B: Interview Between Callum Henshaw and Timothy Kain

This interview was conducted via email correspondence on February 8, 2019.

Callum Henshaw: Could you define your aesthetic priorities when working with a composer? For example, is it creating a score that is an idiomatic reflection of the composer's intention? Or, alternately, working within the aesthetic paradigm of the composer to create a score that can be used as a tool towards the effective performance of the music?

Timothy Kain: I aim to make the guitar writing as idiomatic and comfortable to play as possible whilst maintaining the composer's original intention.

The first thing is to fix any passages that are impossible to play and then to make suggestions regarding possible, but very awkward passages. I almost always work with the composer on this, either in person or on the phone, presenting them with the various alternatives and allowing them to choose which they like best.

I'm very cognisant of the fact that hopefully many other players will play the piece and I want it to be as playable and accessible to as many players as possible. This also serves the composer who wants his [their] piece to live on and have as many performances as possible. For me a big part of commissioning is to increase the repertoire for the guitar and for everyone else who plays.

At the same time, I'm happy to retain really difficult passages where it's the only way and clearly serves the composer's intention.

CH: Can you tell me a bit about working with Koehne? What were his priorities? What did you want out of the relationship? What was he like to work with?

TK: Graeme Koehne was exceptionally easy to work with in the sense that he was completely open to me changing almost anything I wanted, and he didn't necessarily need to hear what I'd done to have to approve it. He is very unusual in that regard among composers, at least in my experience. He totally trusted me to make the piece work on the guitar as well as it could. He was very aware of the fact that he didn't have a great grasp of the complexities of writing for the guitar and almost overly defers to the performer in that regard. What I wanted from the relationship was a great new piece from Graeme, a composer whose music I knew and admired.

CH: Can you tell me about the duration of that creative process?

TK: With regard to duration of the relationship I can't remember exactly but it did take a very long time for him to write the piece. In fact, it came as Two Lyrical Interludes originally, both adapted from some piano pieces of Graeme's. The second Interlude really couldn't be made to work on the guitar without an extensive rewrite and Graeme eventually withdrew it. Having said that I did perform it a couple of times, rather awkwardly, before the withdrawal.
CH: Can you tell me your thoughts on the difference between your performance of the music and the published notation? Particularly thinking that there are modifications in your recording that are not represented in the score.

TK: The changes I made were principally to allow increased resonance and flow. At times the original choice of notes didn't fully allow that on the guitar, as it did on the piano, so the occasional rearrangement of pitches within a chord allowed the intention of the music to be properly realized. I did eventually send my revisions to Graeme but by then the original version had been lodged at the Australian Music Centre and disseminated from there. I thought that wasn't a bad thing in this case as Graeme has such a liberal attitude to changes being made and that gave every player a chance to do it their own way, as has happened.

CH: Can you tell me a bit about working with Nigel on Mosstrooper? What were his priorities? What did you want out of the process? What did he want out of the process?

TK: I had known Nigel for about 20 years by the time I commissioned Mosstrooper. We had played together in Attacca and I had commissioned 6 other pieces before this, but no solos. Added to this professional collaboration we had become close personal friends. So, the stage was set for a major work. This was what I specifically asked Nigel for—a large-scale solo work that could be in any form he wanted. As with all Australia Council commissions, a duration must have been set for the piece but I don't remember what it was, only that Nigel wrote an even longer piece than asked for. As with all the composers I've commissioned, I allow them to write exactly what they want, what they feel they want to express, rather than being in any way prescriptive artistically. I'm looking for genuine emotional statements, pieces with depth that will stand the test of time.

CH: Did Nigel have ideas about what you as a performer would contribute to the work?

TK: I don't know if Nigel had specific ideas about me as a performer and what I might contribute to the work. He must have had some though as we knew each other well and he had heard me play many times. I know I found some aspects of the piece difficult to grasp emotionally and took some time to really "get inside" the piece. He really loves this aspect of the [Naxos, 2019] recording though, that to him it has real depth and a very personal quality to it. Moments like that make the very long haul of commissioning, practicing, fingering, reworking again, and again very worthwhile. Mosstrooper was written at a very difficult time for Nigel, and maybe partly for that reason when we returned to working together on the piece 7 years later, substantial cutting and reordering was done to tighten up and increase the impact of some movements.
Appendix C: Discrepancies between Kain’s Performance and the Score of A Closed World of Fine Feelings

- Bar 11: F-sharp on crotchet beat two changed to A to retain fuller resonance and easier left-hand execution.
- Bar 12: F-sharp on crotchet beat two changed to G to retain fuller resonance and easier left-hand execution.
- Bar 16: E on the quaver two of crotchet beat three omitted for a more legato phrase.
- Bar 21: F-sharps on crotchet beats two and four changed to A to retain fuller resonance and easier left-hand execution.
- Bar 22: E on crotchet beat 2 changed to G to retain fuller resonance and easier left-hand execution.
- Bars 45-46, and 53-56: the A’s on the second dotted crotchet beat of each bar in these sections are eminently more playable and idiomatic as natural harmonics at the twelfth fret. Furthermore, by utilising harmonics, greater resonance is achieved with less physical effort, simultaneously enhancing the musical effect, whilst decreasing the strain of performance.
- Bars 102-108: the A’s on the second dotted crotchet beat of each bar in these sections is advised to be played an octave down as an open fifth string. Similar to above, this results in greater resonance with less physical effort whilst not diminishing the musical effect.
- Bars 117-127: this section is omitted to shorten the work.
Appendix D: Kain’s Revisions to Mosstrooper Peak

Listed below is an indicative sample of the changes made by Kain to the score by mutual agreement with Westlake. Each alteration is accompanied by a brief explanatory note with the reasoning or intended effect. All bar numbers in this list refer to the 2012 score. Corresponding locations in the 2018 score are noted where relevant.

I. “Burning Point”
   - Major structural changes to reduce overall length: halves the number of repetitions of each gesture in pre-revision score.
   - Effectively halves the length of the opening movement in the revision, making it much more prelude-like

II. “Mosstrooper Peak”
   - Bar 27: bass notes removed as ineffective and technically awkward
   - Halfway through bar 69 to halfway through bar 88: absent in revision. Corresponding bar in revision: 89
   -Bars 118, 120 and 122: third beat glissandi removed. Corresponding bars in revision: 91, 93 and 95
   - Bar 124 and 125: A₃ changed to G₃. Assists with technical execution. Corresponding bars in revision: bar 97 and 98.
   - Bar 127: chord F₂ and A₂ changed to E₂ and A₂, and chord G₂ and B₂ changed to G₂ and C₃. Assists with technical execution. Corresponding bar in revision: 100

III. “Tangalooma”
   - Bar 26: Kain suggests to reorder notes as follows: D₅, A₄-sharp, D₃, E₂, G₃-sharp, D₄, G₃-sharp, A₄-sharp. The aim of this change is to aid performance whilst retaining the same harmony. See further discussion below.

IV. “Butterfly Bay”
   - Bar 2: E₃ harmonic changed to natural note. Change made for fuller resonance and ease of execution
   - Bar 4: A₃ natural note changed to A₃ harmonic. Change made for fuller resonance and ease of execution. See further discussion below.
   - Bar 37 and 52: G₄-sharp changed to B₃, D₃-sharp changed to D₄-sharp. Change made for ease of playing without altering the essence of the chord too greatly.

VI. “Smoky Cape”
   - Bar 31-37: several of the E₂ bass notes are absent in the revision. Change made for improved textural clarity. Corresponding bar in revision: 29-35.
   - Bars 40-47: absent in revised edition
- Bar 82-85: doubling of notes marked ‘optional’ in revised edition. Corresponding bars in revision: 75-77.
- Bar 85: D3 removed from chord to assist execution.
- Bar 86-104: absent in revised edition
- Bar 110-113: the notes of the first crotchet beat are repeated to fill the bars, and the length of the passage is halved. The last crotchet beat of bar 113 is rewritten as: E2, A2, D3, G3. Assists with execution. Corresponding bars in revision: 98-99.