

Works by Andrew Imbrie & Gunther Schuller

The Emerson String Quartet

New World 80212-2

ANDREW IMBRIE

Andrew Imbrie was born on April 6, 1921, in New York City. He studied piano from the age of four, first with Ann Abajian and then with Pauline and Leo Ornstein from 1930 to 1942 and Robert Casadesus in the summer of 1941. Although Imbrie had begun to compose when very young, he did not study composition until he was in his teens. Abajian had encouraged him to write music, and in 1937 the boy began work with Roger Sessions, who was to have a great impact on his developing style. (Years later Sessions would refer to his former pupil as "one of the leading composers of his generation.") According to Sessions, when Imbrie came to him he had already had "some elementary training in harmony" and had spent the summer of 1937 studying with Nadia Boulanger in France. Reminded of this recently, Imbrie observed, "I wouldn't say that Boulanger's influence on me has been very important."

Initially Imbrie's studies with Sessions were private; after 1939 they were continued at Princeton University, where Imbrie had enrolled. After graduating from Princeton in 1942, he did a four-year tour of duty in the Army Signal Corps before returning in 1946 to work with Sessions at the University of California in Berkeley. In a 1962 article written to mark Sessions' sixty-fifth birthday, Imbrie pinpointed what was perhaps Sessions' greatest influence on his music:

In an era fascinated either by the motive or by "sonority," Sessions speaks most often about line. Those of us who have studied with him will remember with affection his tone of voice in speaking of "the large gesture," "the long line." Music which is deficient in this quality becomes monotonous or static...

In 1977 Imbrie told me, "I have no objection to my name being linked with Sessions. On the contrary, it's an honor. But naturally I prefer to be judged on my own rather than in comparison with my teacher."

In 1947 Imbrie received his M.A. degree from the University of California, in addition to an offer of a faculty position. However, as he had also received a Prix de Rome, he decided to postpone teaching in order to take advantage of the award. Imbrie has been on the faculty of the University of California since 1949; at present professor of music, he teaches composition, harmony, counterpoint, and analysis. Besides the Prix de Rome, Imbrie's honors include the New York Music Critics Circle Award, an Alice Ditson Fellowship, a

National Institute of Arts and Letters grant, two Guggenheim Fellowships, a Boston Symphony Orchestra Merit Award, the Walter W. Naumburg Recording Prize, and the first Walter Hinricksen Award.

Among the composer's works are: Trio for Violin, Cello, and Piano (1946); Piano Sonata (1947); Ballad in D, for orchestra (1947); On the Beach at Night, for mixed chorus and string orchestra (1948); Serenade for Flute, Viola, and Piano (1952); Concerto for Violin and Orchestra (1954); Little Concerto, for piano four hands and orchestra (1956); Legend, for orchestra (1959); Sonata for Cello and Piano (1966); Dandelion Wine, for chamber ensemble (1967); Three Sketches for Trombone and Piano (1967— available on New World Records 80541-2, New Music For Virtuosos); Chamber Symphony (1968); Concerto for Cello and Orchestra (1973); four string quartets (1942, 1953, 1957, 1969); two piano concertos (1973, 1974); three symphonies (1965, 1969, 1970); and two operas (Christmas in Peebles Town [1960], Angle of Repose' [1976]).

Imbrie's most recent composition is the Concerto for Flute and Orchestra (1977), written for the New York Philharmonic. Angle of Repose, commissioned by the San Francisco Opera to mark the United States Bicentennial, was premiered in November, 1976. Time magazine, citing the opera for its "diverse and energetic music [without] a lazy measure in the score... but with] a variety of rhythms [and] an interplay of colors," concluded: "Dissonance may dominate Imbrie's style, but he has a powerful gift for direct expression." Imbrie characterizes Angle of Repose as "my biggest work so far—two years of hard work."

Describing his own music is, Imbrie feels, "a little like describing one's voice and manner. It is easier to say what it is not than to say what it is." His style "does not strive to be American like my nationality, nor Scottish like my ancestry. It is neither experimental nor conventional." As for his method of composing: "I always start at the beginning and let the ideas shape themselves as they must; the direction they will pursue and the changes in character they will undergo become increasingly clear as I go on."

Imbrie's avoidance of predetermined forms can be traced to Sessions, as can the stress on counterpoint and the wealth of detail that is inevitably one of the memorable aspects of any Imbrie score. Bartók was another serious influence early in his career (the Second Quartet demonstrates this clearly), and Imbrie's polyphony, like both Bartók's and Sessions', tends to be underpinned with rhythmic energy. His linear juxtapositioning is lithe, highly polished, and versatile—more so, in fact; than Sessions'.

Imbrie's music is nontonal and intensely linear, harmony most often determined by counterpoint. Because of this, and because of his use—albeit unsystematic—of serial techniques (for example, the Third Quartet, in which, as Sessions has written, employment of the twelve-tone method is "always in the service of a basic musical conception"), Imbrie has on occasion been rather unfairly labeled a post-Schoenbergian with the unfortunate aura of academe generated by that term. Admittedly, with his background, his technical accomplishment, the complexity and essential nontheatricality of his style, and a resultant expression that can tend toward the terse and austere (Virgil Thomson once described it as "a shade hermetic"), Imbrie might seem a good example of an "academic" composer, as he is occasionally characterized.

But "academic" implies technique without content, which is a situation of no relevance to Imbrie. The expressive motoric surges of his Second Quartet, the lyric flights and dramatic outbursts of the Third, the impassioned rhetoric of the Violin Concerto, the bell sounds of the Third Symphony, and the brilliant, often sensuous colors of the Flute Concerto are the products of a poet, not a pedant. Although a university composer 11 by background and temperament, Imbrie obviously thinks of music as an expressive, communicative art, certainly a welcome attitude at a time when much of the new music that emanates from campuses seems aimed at small, select audiences of peers.

At his best, Imbrie combines generative spontaneity and a restrained but often telling lyricism (which can sometimes blossom into cadenzalike melisma) with rhythmic liveliness and an acute sense of instrumental color; That these qualities should be joined to structural clarity, fluid motivic development, and complex but masterfully controlled contrapuntal textures is a considerable achievement. -- by Phillip Ramey

Tracks 1-3

String Quartet No.4

COMMENTS BY THE COMPOSER

The *Fourth String Quartet* was commissioned by the Pro Arte Quartet and is dedicated to the members of that group. I had worked with them closely as they prepared performances of my other three quartets and was also able to benefit from their advice while composing this one. The premiere took place in Madison, Wisconsin; on November 17, 1969.

Composing for me is a process of drawing out the consequences (as I perceive them) of an initial idea. This idea may present itself as contour, resonance, rhythm, gesture, or some combination of these; and the first step for me is to pin it down, to give it more definitive shape and character. Once the idea has become specific enough, it begins to generate its own continuation. This is possible because every idea worthy of the name is fraught with potential energy: its components interact so as to create an expectation of forward movement. If this does not happen, it is always because the idea has been imperfectly realized and must be tinkered with until its various aspects are brought into effective cooperation.

The energies released by the first forward impulse eventually expend themselves to a point where they create a demand for contrast; yet the character of the new material is very much conditioned by that of the old. Thus the original idea generates not only its own continuation but the nature of its own opposite as well. In composing, I must ultimately reconcile the various opposing forces by finding a dramatically convincing resolution of their conflicts. The sense of the larger structure becomes increasingly clear as the work progresses.

I am not one of those composers who work by scenario, though I often sketch ahead for considerable distances before filling in details. The Fourth Quartet is not a serial composition, nor does it adhere to any other formal, precompositional rules.

Choices were determined by my sense of the rightness of events in context. Yet "contextual" does not seem a satisfying description. For me, no piece of music, however internally consistent, can be a law unto itself. Comprehensibility presupposes certain assumptions common to composer and listener—assumptions not stated but shared through much listening to music of all kinds. The composer relies on some of these, stretches others, defies still others. His style is the result of a fusion of countless predilections and habits, choices both conscious and unconscious.

These shared assumptions ensure not only comprehensibility but confidence. The listener must be somehow able to recognize the exercise of craft on the composer's part—to sense that the musical ideas, through the toughness of their own identity, create a resistance to the will of the composer who thought them up. The composer exerts his will on the material, but in terms not contradictory to the nature of that material. The listener's confidence is bestowed only if he can follow the trail of that process.

It is evident, then, that the unfolding of the musical drama is important to me: I do not regard my compositions as spatial or static. They move through time, and on a human scale. The energies just rescribed—the contrasts, the proportions and resolutions—are deployed in time in such a way as to attempt to meet the listener's requirements as he reacts to what is happening, and to engage him in the drama. The listener's requirements are assessed by a composer in the following way: he must, while composing, try to hear his own piece as if he were someone else. His critical faculty must always be ruthlessly active, for without it creativity turns to mere narcissism.

The opening movement of the Fourth Quartet begins *allegro con moto* with a brief upward surge of melody to a high point. Each note of the short ascending series is harmonized by a big chord. The melody then falls off and plunges. This whole element is immediately followed by another, in which the forward impetus is pinched off by overlapping semitones. This process is then repeated in much expanded form. By apposing two such elements—the first arching forward, the second checking the first—an effect of dynamic compression is created, which provides the necessary energy for what follows. The whole first section of the movement is, in fact, developed out of this thrust and counterthrust, whose interrelations become more complex as the two elements become subordinated to an overriding continuity of line. The agitation of this first part of the movement leads to a collapse, a slowing down, and a fading out. A lyrical *andantino* passage follows, in which the viola takes the solo part, quietly accompanied by a countermelody in the muted violins and *pizzicato* in the cello. The return of the first tempo brings renewed agitation, rising to a peak of intensity in which the original ascending melody appears as climax. But at its highest point, instead of being pinched off, it continues, rising still higher and suddenly becoming merged with the lyrical idea, thus bringing about a fusion of the two sections, which had so far been separated. The effect should be a kind of breakthrough in communication between contrasting emotional states, resulting in a not altogether untroubled serenity.

The second movement (Quasi scherzando) explores the possibilities of simultaneous as well as successive 12 contrast. A light, staccato, highly syncopated idea is first played off against a thematically related one that is quieter and simpler. A little later comes a passage in which four separate modes of attack are in play at the same time. This diversity is sometimes abandoned in favor of brief homophonic points of emphasis or arrival. Interplay between simultaneous and successive contrast is brought about also by chordal passages featuring rapid shifts in register and dynamics, which then break down into overlappings and, again, polyphony. On one occasion a vigorous and steady sixteenth-note motion is established, only to go underground as it is invaded by increasing stretches of silence, after which it again comes to the surface. In attempting to combine such varied details into a single movement, I had to find ways to maintain, however precariously, a thread of line and thematic syntax throughout.

The last movement (Aria) features solo cello in the main sections, with alternating solos by the first violin and the viola, and it attempts to restore the primacy of melody and to effect the reconciliation of conflict.

GUNTHER SCHULLER

Gunther Schuller was born on November 22, 1925, in New York and, except for four years at boarding school in Germany, grew up in that city. His grandfather was a bandmaster, conductor, and music teacher in Germany, and his father played violin in his youth under Wilhelm Furtwaengler and as an adult played for over forty years with the New York Philharmonic. Schuller entered New York's St. Thomas Choir School at twelve as a boy soprano. He began to study flute and French horn in his early teens and made his professional debut at fifteen among the extra horns in the American premiere of Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony, with the New York Philharmonic led by Arturo Toscanini. While in high school Schuller simultaneously attended the Manhattan School of Music, where he studied theory and counterpoint. He left high school in 1942 and never completed his formal education.

Schuller took his first professional job in 1943 with the Ballet Theater Orchestra on tour under Antal Dorati. Later that year he became first horn with the Cincinnati Symphony, and the following year he made his debut as a soloist-composer with that orchestra in his First Horn Concerto. In New York in 1945 he joined the Metropolitan Opera Orchestra, where he remained until 1959, when he resigned to devote more time to composing, conducting, and teaching.

Schuller's *Symphony for Brass and Percussion*, written in 1949, was performed by the New York Philharmonic under Dimitri Mitropoulos, who also recorded the work. *Spectra*, commissioned by Mitropoulos and the Philharmonic, was completed in 1958. Perhaps Schuller's most popular composition is *Seven Studies on Themes of Paul Klee*, commissioned by the Ford Foundation for the Minneapolis Symphony (now the Minnesota Orchestra), completed in 1959, and recorded by Erich Leinsdorf and the Boston Symphony. The Concerto for Orchestra was composed for the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Chicago Symphony and premiered in 1966. The Visitation was written for the Hamburg State Opera, received its American premiere by the San Francisco Opera in 1967, and was produced on television by the British Broadcasting Corporation in 1969. Among

Schuller's more recent works are *Tre Invenzioni*, for five quintets, written for the twentieth anniversary of the Fromm Music Foundation and premiered at Tanglewood in 1973; the *Violin Concerto*, written for Zvi Zeitlin on a commission from the Eastman School of Music; the *Second Horn Concerto*, written for Barry Tuckwell; and *Deai*, for two orchestras, premiered by the Boston Symphony and the Toho School Orchestra in Tokyo in 1978. He is now (1978) writing a concerto for trumpeter Gerard Schwarz on a commission from the Ford Foundation.

Schuller became interested in jazz when he heard Duke Ellington for the first time in Cincinnati. He made transcriptions from Ellington recordings, arranged Ellington compositions for pops concerts by the Cincinnati Symphony, and in 1955 composed the *Symphonic Tribute to Duke Ellington*.

In the late fifties, in a lecture, Schuller coined the term "third stream" for music that combines "the improvisational spontaneity and rhythmic vitality of jazz with the compositional procedures and techniques acquired in Western music during seven hundred years of musical development." Many of Schuller's own compositions have been wholly or in part third-stream music, including *Transformation*, for eleven instruments, premiered at the 1957 Brandeis University Festival of the Arts; *Seven Studies on Themes of Paul Klee*; and *Variants*, written in 1960 for the New York City Ballet and choreographed by George Balanchine.

In 1963 and 1964 Schuller conducted "Twentieth Century Innovations," a concert series sponsored by the Carnegie Hall Corporation. In North America he has guest conducted orchestras including those of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, Minnesota, Cleveland, Rochester, Pittsburgh, Houston, and Vancouver, and in Europe he has conducted the BBC Symphony, the Philharmonia Orchestra of London, the Halle Orchestra of Manchester, the French Radio Orchestra, the Berlin Philharmonic, the Tonhalle Orchestra of Zurich, and others. Schuller received the Alice M. Ditson Conducting Award from Columbia University in 1970 for his "unselfish championship of fellow composers through the conducting of their orchestral works here and abroad."

In 1972 Schuller presented the New England Conservatory Ragtime Ensemble at the Festival of American Music held at the school. On the program were his orchestrations of long-lost Scott Joplin works, whose subsequent recording won a Grammy Award in 1973 and has been influential in the current ragtime revival. Schuller conducted a suite from Joplin's opera *Treemonisha* at Tanglewood in 1974. The complete opera was premiered by the Houston Grand Opera in 1975 and opened on Broadway later that year with Schuller conducting.

In the sixties, over New York's WBAI, Schuller broadcast a weekly series, *Contemporary Music in Evolution*, of one hundred fifty-three programs analyzing music from 1900 to the early sixties. The series was subsequently heard on seventy-seven stations of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. In 1973 Schuller wrote and hosted *Changing Music*, a series of six programs on contemporary music that was produced by Boston's WGBH for the Public Television network.

Schuller has also written many articles and two books, *Horn Technique* (1962) and *Early Jazz: Its Roots and Musical Development* (1968). The latter received the ASCAP Deems Taylor Award. Schuller is currently working on a second jazz volume, dealing with later history.

Schuller was acting head of the composition department of the Berkshire Music Center at Tanglewood from 1963 to 1965, when he succeeded Aaron Copland as head of the department and became responsible for directing contemporary-music activities. At the time of writing he is the artistic director of the Center as well. He also taught composition at Yale, which he left in 1967 to become president of the New England Conservatory, where he remained until 1977.

Besides the Ditson and Taylor awards and others, Schuller received a National Institute of Arts and Letters Award and the Brandeis Creative Arts Award in 1960; Guggenheim Fellowships in 1962 and 1963; the Darius Milhaud Award for the Best Film Score of 1964 for his music for the Polish film *Yesterday in Fact*, which he composed while on a State Department-sponsored trip to Poland; and the Rodgers and Hammerstein Award in 1971. He is a member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters and the National Council on the Arts.

Tracks 4 - 6

String Quartet No. 2

COMMENTS BY THE COMPOSER

Gunther Schuller's Second String Quartet was composed in 1965 on commission of the Iowa University String Quartet. The work was started in Tanglewood, continued on board the *Nieuw Amsterdam*, and finished in Berlin, where Schuller spent a year as composer-in-residence on a grant from the Ford Foundation.

The work is in three movements, the first of which contrasts clusterish, densely harmonic ensemble passages with brief lyric or quieter melodic sections, usually featuring just one of the four instruments, lightly accompanied by the others.

In the second movement the textural and characterological contrasts of the first movement are further exploited and expanded. The five elements used to provide a constantly varied continuity and texture are: (1) fortissimo triple- and quadruple-stop chords; (2) short cadenzalike declamatory phrases by individual members of the quartet; (3) accompanimental sustained sounds, usually muted; (4) sustained cluster sounds, usually played ponticello; (5) various short pointillistic interjections in the form of quick glissandos, various swoops, blurps, twists, yelps, whinnings, wails, and so on. An attempt is made to integrate these "unorthodox" string effects and sonorities into the total fabric of the movement.

The form and texture of the third movement are based on the systematic use of the six basic intervallic categories in our Western chromatic scale. Each of the five subdivisions of the movement emphasizes certain of these intervallic characteristics, both harmonically and melodically. The movement's five subdivisions are broken down further into twenty-one smaller subsections, exploiting the various ensemble combinations possible in a string

quartet. Thus there are four solo sections, six different duos, four different trios, and, of course, one full quartet. The quartet section returns several times as a kind of rondo repetition or refrain. The subsections are brief, on the average six measures (or about twenty seconds). An unbroken chain of solos, duos, trios, and quartets result, each in turn exploiting the above-mentioned varied intervallic characteristics.

Quite beyond these technical considerations, the work hopes to exploit the inexhaustibly rich sonoric and expressive capacities of the string quartet. The issuance of this recording of my Second String Quartet has focused in me some reflections—and concerns—that I should like to share with the listener. These thoughts came to me, pincerlike, from two directions, converging at that point where the musical substance (or content) of this work and the demands placed on the performers meet. In endless hours of rehearsing I witnessed the struggle as four greatly gifted young musicians conquered note by note, bar by bar, the challenges and requirements of this particular work.

I mentioned "concerns." There were many, accumulating over the months during which we worked together to bring those curious black dots and lines on my manuscript paper to life, to a (hopefully) meaningful acoustical reality. Concerns about the quality, even the validity, of the composition; concerns about its practicality, its realizability, its possible relationships to the string-quartet repertory—and deeper concerns yet: was all this extraordinary effort commensurate to the final result, the conclusive experience for the four musicians and for the audience?

We each will have our own and perhaps differing verdict—at least in the meanwhile—until some "ultimate" verdict is delivered by posterity. The interim verdicts concern me only insofar as they are the outcome of an exchange between a work, its composer, and the four performers who, through it, were induced to explore what was for them at first totally new and strange territory.

As a relatively successful composer, the experience of having my music misinterpreted, rejected, laughed at, or, for that matter, beautifully interpreted, praised—even sometimes overpraised—is by no means new. And generally a composer learns to live with all manner of verdicts and reactions. But what impressed me with this particular experience of preparing my Second Quartet for recording was the process by which we all evolved to a deeper comprehension of the substance—the essence, if you will—of this piece.

A few things happened, things that in the normal "professional" course of events never happen, are never even touched on, because usually there isn't enough time to learn, to penetrate a work, to digest. I believe that the players were eventually convinced of the merits of the piece. I know that they convinced me of its merits, which I had begun to question when we first started working. Another thing: the rehearsals proved once again how inadequate our notation is in dealing with the subtleties of performance; how important it is for the composer to be present to interpret those minute nuances and feelings that cannot be represented in notation; and how virtually every note can require elaborate verbal exegeses to clarify the myriad performance questions that arise. The whole process of our prolonged rehearsal period reminded me of peeling an apple in circular fashion, round and round, until we had arrived at the core.

I was, of course, aware of the formidable difficulties of this work. Perhaps at first I was the only one. For the players the first encounter with the quartet must have been akin to that of a mountain climber, standing at the foothills of an unclimbed peak shrouded in clouds, not knowing what's actually up there, nor exactly how to get there.

The "process" I mentioned earlier brought us from that groping beginning to a point where, months later at the recording session, the group played the work as if they had performed it all their lives. They really heard and felt it.

Along the way there were many discouraging moments—for them and for me. At times I almost lost conviction in the work. At one rehearsal I remember being unable even to recall precisely the reasons for what I had written, to conjure up even for myself the image, the feeling, the motivations, the essence of what I had written thirteen years earlier. The distance between what I was hearing at rehearsals and what I thought I had written was at times so great that the former seemed completely to mask out the latter.

If this was tough for me, one can imagine how frustrating it must have been for the players, who, of course, did not have the advantage of knowing the work, the luxury of not being able to remember something.

But in the rehearsals, including the many the quartet held without me (woodshedding sessions, we call them) notes, passages, phrases, ideas that were at first meaningless abstractions, technically (seemingly) insurmountable obstacles, hasty annoyances, gradually became meaningful, became tangible, became recognizable music—perhaps became for the players even beautiful. For example, a passage would at first elude the players because its intent was obscure to them and, in addition, made great technical demands. No music yet at all. I would now try to supply the rationale, the intended feeling of the passage. That helped. Now the musicians at least knew what the goal was. But technically it could not yet be realized, until some hard hours of practicing, both individual and collective, took place.

As the technical difficulties were gradually resolved, the shape, the meaning, the "feeling" of the music began little by little to reveal itself. And as that occurred, in turn the technical problems gradually dropped away like so much unnecessary ballast. This moment in learning a piece of music has always been the most exciting for me: when the understanding of the content (and intent) beneficently influences the technical progress, which in turn reveals more of the content, this again in turn informing the technical realization, and so forth in a fascinating dialogue in which both aspects successively and alternately inform each other, until content and technical realization have moved fully into phase, have in fact become one.

Then there were moments in the rehearsals when the rhythms, pitches, and dynamics may have been accurate but the harmonic relationships, let us say, were not yet heard. That fine line had not yet been crossed between merely playing the correct pitches and calibrating their subtle relationships to one another. And then having to do that in virtually every measure of the piece. A composer, if such harmonic nuances are part of his language, could probably write pages of verbal explication about every measure. How then does one get this into the score? Mostly one doesn't. And since the atonal and/or

twelve-tone language is still foreign to the vast majority of musicians, only very few talented and very experienced musicians can infer all that from the score, let alone from their individual parts.

Since I am a strongly pitch-oriented composer for whom harmonic relationships are a primary motivation in composing, it was very exciting to see how the four players began gradually to hear the harmonies. By the time the recording sessions rolled around, the musicians were doing more than playing in tune; they felt aurally at home in my language.

There were other fascinating discoveries. In highly complex rhythmic contrapuntal passages, as in the last movement, we learned that the natural and seemingly logical impulse to "listen to each other" didn't work. The time differentials between adjacent notes were so minuscule—measured in partials of seconds—that they were of no use in the normal process of hearing, reacting, and playing accordingly. We found instead that if everyone played absolutely correctly and with the right feeling in his own rhythmic trajectory, the result would not only be accurate regarding the desired composite rhythm (heard vertically) but would also be audible as a multilayered rhythmic polyphony (heard horizontally).

With such performing difficulties to overcome, I often wondered, especially in the early stages of rehearsal, if it was all worth it. Would the final result warrant all that agonizing effort? Was it really necessary to conceive such difficulties? Could there not be easier ways to achieve the same or similar results? These are all good questions composers should continually ask themselves—and I fear often don't—questions, I dare say, audiences of new music ask all the time.

I now know that the answer to these and similar questions can only come from the performer—not any performer, but the one who has truly struggled to conquer the performance problems of a work. That is to say, had we been forced to produce a verdict, to answer those questions in regard to my Second String Quartet early in the rehearsal process, we would all—maybe myself included—undoubtedly have, answered in the negative. Perhaps for some listeners the result will still be questionable, but we felt that only after struggling with the problems to that point where we felt at ease in their realization did we have a right to an opinion. Only when the performing technique and the content have become one can you have an informed opinion.

Alas, contemporary music is a field in which everyone is immediately an expert, even when knowing nothing about the music and operating only on the flimsiest likes and dislikes. What is mere opinion—often not well-informed—is stated as if it were fact and law. The history of music should have taught us how wrong we can be, how often the world's verdicts have been mistaken. But it was in the crucible of this particular experience that I learned how deeply we must penetrate beneath the surface of a work before we are entitled to any kind of a judgment.

The Second String Quartet began with a blank piece of manuscript paper thirteen years ago. Some months later, as a result of that mostly inexplicable and mysterious phenomenon we call the "creative process," those blank pages were filled with little dots and lines, symbols, and a few words—untested, untried, unheard except by myself in my inner ear.

The miracle of birth is always wonderful and astonishing. But the realization and translation of those black dots into an audible reality are just as miraculous. For the composer, when the performance is poor, the experience is torturous; when it is beautiful, it is like a rebirth. To my four young colleagues I owe the fact that they made me love my creative child again by carrying the struggle to "realize" the work—I reject the word "interpret"—to the ultimate of their talents and energies. And in that instant they helped to restore and maintain my faith in myself. No composer can receive a greater compliment.

THE ARTISTS

THE EMERSON STRING QUARTET, winner of the 1978 Naumburg Award in Chamber Music, has performed at New York's Pierpont Morgan Library and Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Cleveland Art Museum, the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., and at numerous colleges and universities throughout the country. In February, 1978, the Quartet, whose members are all Juilliard graduates, was featured in Walter Piston's Concerto for String Quartet, Wind Instruments, and Percussion with the National Orchestral Association in Carnegie Hall. Beginning in the summer of 1977, the Quartet has been in residence at the Vermont Mozart Festival in Burlington, Vermont. Unlike most quartets, the Emerson alternates its violinists on the first and second parts. Its members are listed below:

EUGENE DRUCKER (violin) is a graduate of Columbia University and the Juilliard School, where he studied with Oscar Shumsky. Mr. Drucker has been a participant at the Tanglewood and Marlboro Music Festivals, and has made two tours of the United States on the "Music for Marlboro" series. He was the top American prizewinner in both the International Violin Competition in Montreal in 1975 and the Queen Elisabeth Competition in Brussels in 1976. Formerly with Speculum Musicae, Mr. Drucker is currently a member of the New York Chamber Soloists.

PHILIP SETZER (violin) began studying the violin at the age of five with his parents, both members of the Cleveland Orchestra. At seven he was accepted as a pupil of Josef Gingold, and later studied with Rafael Druian at the Cleveland Institute of Music and Oscar Shumsky at The Juilliard School. In 1976, Mr. Setzer won a bronze medal in the International Queen Elisabeth Violin Competition in Belgium. He has appeared as a soloist with the Cleveland Orchestra and the National Symphony and has participated in the Marlboro Music Festival.

LAWRENCE DUTTON (viola), born in New York in 1954, studied violin and viola with Margaret Pardee while at The Juilliard pre-college division, and studied viola with Francis Tursi at the Eastman School. He later studied viola with Lillian Fuchs at The Juilliard School, from which he received both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Music. Mr. Dutton has been a soloist with the Juilliard Philharmonia and the Virtuosi Ensemble, and has performed with the New York Chamber Soloists, the Orpheus Ensemble, and the New York Philomusical.

ERIC WILSON (cello) studied with Leonard Rose and Harvey Shapiro at The Juilliard School, from which he received both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Music. He has appeared as soloist with the Toronto C.B.C. Orchestra, the Brooklyn Philharmonia Orchestra, the Jeunesses Musicales World Orchestra and the Cecilian Chamber Orchestra, as well as with orchestras in Norwalk, Connecticut and Plainfield, New Jersey. Mr. Wilson presented the New York premiere of Ligeti's cello concerto.

MASAO KAWASAKI (viola) studied at the Toho School in his native Tokyo and at The Juilliard School in New York; his teachers have included Josef Gingold, William Primrose, and Dorothy DeLay. In 1971 he won the competition sponsored by Japan's NHK Broadcasting System, and subsequently performed on the NHK networks. Mr. Kawasaki has performed throughout the New York area with the Orpheus Ensemble.

BETSY NORDEN (soprano) is a member of the Metropolitan Opera. In February 1977 she won acclaim for her Sister Constance in the company's new production of Poulenc's Dialogues of the Carmelites. She made her European debut that summer at the Spoleto Festival as Despina in *Così fan tutte*; and has also appeared with the Central City Opera and the Miami Symphony. Miss Norden makes her recording debut on this disc.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDREW IMBRIE

Boykan, M. "Andrew Imbrie: Third Quartet," PNM, III (1964), 139.

Imbrie, Andrew. "Beethoven's Metrical Ambiguity," in *Beethoven Studies*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1973.

"The Composer in Academia: Reflections on a Theme of Stravinsky," *College Music Society Journal*, X (1970), 79.

"The Composer and the University," *California Monthly*, LXXVII (December, 1966), 42.

"A Grain of Salt," in "Symposium: The Crisis in Theory Teaching," *College Music Society Journal*, V(1965),36.

"One Measure of Eternity," PNM, IX (1971), 51.

"Roger Sessions: In Honor of His Sixty-fifth Birthday," PNM, I (1962), 117.

"The Symphonies of Roger Sessions," *Tempo*, CIII (1972), 24-32.

GUNTHER SCHULLER

Hentoff, Nat. "The Third Stream," *International Musician*, LX (October, 1961), 24. ff. Schuller, Gunther. *Early Jazz: Its Roots and Musical Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. *Horn Technique*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

"Third-Stream Music," in "Talk of the Town," *New Yorker*, XXXVII (December 9, 1961), 42-44.

ANDREW IMBRIE

String Quartet No. 4

(publ. Malcolm Music, Ltd.)

1. I (7:23)

2. II (6:16)

3. III (6:13)

GUNTHER SCHULLER

String Quartet No. 2 (publ. G. Schirmer, Inc.) 8 I (4:09)

4. II (9:08)

5. III (5:50)

Emerson String Quartet: Eugene Drucker, violin; Philip Setzer, violin; Lawrence Dutton, viola; Eric Wilson, cello

Producer: Elizabeth Ostrow

Engineers: Bud Graham (Cowell, Shepherd, Harris, Imbrie); Stan Tonkel (Schuller) Assistant engineers (Schuller, Imbrie): Ted Bronsan, Bob Waller

Mixing engineers: Don Van Gordon (Cowell, Shepherd, Harris); Stan Tonkel (Imbrie, Schuller)

Editing: Don Van Gordon, Soundwave Recording Studios Recorded at Columbia

Recording Studios, 30th Street, New York Digital mastering: Paul Zinman, New York Digital