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Abstract

The present thesis investigates the music and career of Jeffrey Lewis (born 1942). The thesis is broadly divided into three sections. First is an account of the composer’s life, told mainly through an overview of his works, but also through a sketch of his early years in South Wales, his studies in Cardiff, Darmstadt, Kraków and Paris, his academic career in Leeds and Bangor, and his subsequent early retirement from academia. There follows a more detailed study of six works from the period 1978 – 1985, during which certain features of Lewis’s musical language came to the fore, perhaps most notably a very individual and instantly recognisable use of modal language. After an Epilogue, the thesis concludes with an Appendix in the form of a Catalogue in which all Lewis’s known compositions are listed, together with details of performances, broadcasts and recordings.

Lewis’s music often plays with our temporal expectations; the close interrelationship between texture, structure, harmony and melody, and its effect upon our perception of the passage of time, are explored in the main analyses. These are conducted partly by means of comparison with other works by Lewis or his contemporaries. Memoria is examined in relation to a similarly tranquil score, Naaotuá Lalá, by Giles Swayne. The following chapter discusses the extra-musical inspiration for Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, whose relationship to Tableau is then explored in the next. The difficulties of creating a large-scale structure that unifies the work’s various harmonic elements are also investigated. The analysis of Carmen Paschale considers it in relation to Lewis’s other choral music, whilst the final analytical chapter compares and contrasts two three-movement works, the Piano Trio and the Fantasy for solo piano. Lewis’s melodic writing in the Piano Trio is discussed in relation to that of James MacMillan, and the origins of the first movement of Fantasy in Oliver Knussen’s Sonya’s Lullaby are explored.

In the Epilogue, the possible reasons for Lewis’s current neglect are explored, various influences on Lewis’s musical thinking are laid out, and his achievements are assessed.
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1. INTRODUCTION

On 16 May 1993, Jeffrey Lewis delivered a lecture to the spring Regional Gathering of The Friends of Cathedral Music, held that year in the Cathedral and University city of Bangor, North Wales. During the course of the lecture, Lewis remarked upon a particular function of church music: ‘to prepare the mind for the act of worship, and to sustain and elevate throughout the course of the liturgy’. Later, he commented upon the ‘profound quality of stillness, as found in the music of John Tavener, Jonathan Harvey, Henryk Górecki and Arvo Pärt’, and observed that ‘music, of all the arts, is capable of conveying [the] timeless mystical dimension’ essential to ‘contemplation, … expressing and reflecting spirituality.’

To support his thesis, Lewis referred to the writings of D. J. Enright: ‘remove mystery – and in the process you remove the sacred and the spiritual – and you are well on the way to discrediting and demolishing religion.’

This mirrors an important aspect of Lewis’s stance as a composer. Replace the final word, ‘religion’, with ‘music’, and Lewis’s view of the transforming possibilities of music starts to come into focus.

---

1 The lecture was published as ‘The Church in crisis – Change and Challenge’, Choir and Organ, i (August 1993), 5 – 8.
2 Lewis did not acknowledge the source of this quotation and it has not been possible to trace it.
It comes as something of a surprise after reading the text of this lecture to discover that Jeffrey Lewis has no religious faith. His atheism does not, however, preclude a love of the ritual of the church – indeed, ritual in many different contexts – and his belief in the possibility of music as a mind-altering force has lain at the root of much of his work over the past four decades.

Two months before Lewis gave this lecture, he had retired from the post of Senior Lecturer at the University College of North Wales, Bangor, where he had taught for the previous twenty years. In fact, he had not lectured there since ill-health had forced a period of absence upon him in the summer of 1992. Between then and the occasion of his lecture, Lewis entered a fertile period of musical creativity. He composed *Lux Perpetua* for the Hilliard Ensemble, first performed at the 1992 Vale of Glamorgan Festival, and two settings of the *Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis*, one for St George’s Chapel, Windsor, the other for Bangor Cathedral. The second setting was premièred on the same day as Lewis’s lecture. Between these vocal compositions came two other scores: *Triology* for piano, written between September and November 1992 while Lewis was in hospital, and *Litania*, composed for the unusual combination of two piccolos, harp, celesta and percussion (tam-tam, glockenspiel and vibraphone). These two works were, uncharacteristically, not

---

3 Lewis was, along with Arvo Pärt and John Tavener, a featured composer at the Festival.
composed to any commission and they provide evidence that, for the first time in many years, Lewis felt he had the time and space to write as the mood took him.4

Each of these five pieces contains elements that suggest Lewis is writing music which ‘prepares the mind’ for contemplation or meditation: the ritualistic associations of repetition and bell-sounds in Litania, for example, or the sense that musical time is being stretched to a vanishing point of stillness and inaudibility in the outer panels of Trilogy, a distancing effect emphasised by the continuous use of una corda and the open-ended conclusions of each section. In all five works, Lewis seems to be ‘expressing and reflecting a spirituality’ unconnected to any form of organised religion, whatever associations the texts of the three vocal pieces might have.

An important theme of this study will be to trace the development of the young musician who spent the summer of 1967 studying with Stockhausen and Ligeti at Darmstadt into the composer of such works as Lux Perpetua and Litania, over the period of a quarter century of composition. This development is unexpectedly smooth and logical, since, after his return to the UK in 1968, Lewis’s music undergoes a continuing process of refinement. Rather than a

4 Apart from an orchestral score, O Mare, left unfinished in November 1991, Trilogy and Litania were the first non-commissioned works Lewis had written since he had started teaching in Bangor.
wholesale rejection of earlier ideas or any radical change of language, such as one might observe in the work of some of the composers Lewis referred to in his lecture, there is a subtle change in his use of that language and the ends to which it is put. The period during which this change really starts to make itself felt – from the orchestral piece *Memoria* in 1978 through to the middle 1980s – is the one which is here subject to the closest examination. The works written at this time reveal a composer whose music is both refined and potent, and provide compelling evidence of a creative artist at the very height of his powers.

### 1.1 Aims and objectives

Jeffrey Lewis is a composer whose works have not yet achieved the recognition they deserve. Such an assertion immediately prompts the questions ‘why not?’ and ‘in whose opinion?’, both of which I shall address over the course of this thesis. Over the last forty years Lewis has produced a steady stream of compositions, many of the highest quality. He is a composer whose intellectual rigour and expressive language are in balance, and whose technique goes far beyond mere display of craftsmanship. His finest scores seem to capture the essence of what so many composers have sought to represent through their art across the centuries: a means by which the listener may distance himself from the monotony of the
quotidian; a fleeting glimpse of the possibility of transcending one’s mortality; the attainment of a point of utter stillness.

My own interest in Jeffrey Lewis the composer dates from my years as an undergraduate student at the University of Wales, Bangor (then the University College of North Wales) between 1983 and 1986. I studied composition, orchestration and a course in Twentieth-Century Studies with him, and also heard the first performances of his Piano Trio and *Fantasy*.\(^5\) I took part in a student performance of *Mobile II*, and since then have performed, either as pianist or conductor, almost two dozen of Lewis’s works.\(^6\) The overwhelmingly positive response of both audiences and fellow performers has convinced me that this is music which communicates directly and powerfully and has something important and individual to say. The hypnotic quality of many of Lewis’s recent choral pieces and piano compositions, for example, has been remarked upon by sympathetic listeners who perhaps find an affinity between these works and those of the composers Lewis mentioned in his address to The Friends of Cathedral Music. Whatever similarities there may be, however, that hypnotic quality is achieved by very different means, most immediately obvious from the seamless surface of scores such as the *Sacred Chants* and *Sereno*.

\(^5\) The Piano Trio was first performed on 23 February 1984; *Fantasy* was first performed on 25 April 1985.
\(^6\) *Mobile II* was performed on 13 February 1986; for details of other performances and recordings see the Catalogue below.
The synthesis of the intellectual and the sensual, and the tensions caused by their proximity to each other, lie at the heart of much of Lewis’s music. Lewis’s occasional use of proportional schemes and symmetrical chords to structure parts of his scores and to generate some of his musical material reveals an almost Medieval delight in the abstract beauty of a musical construction. A pursuit of the sensual in texture, timbre, rhythm and melody, however, is just as important to Lewis as his intellectual experiments. This sensuality is far removed from any nineteenth century idea of Romantic expression or self-expression. Both aspects – poles, even – of Lewis’s style will be examined here, with a discussion of how the composer achieves a harmonious blend of these extremes.

In more general terms, an equally important aim of the thesis is to provide as comprehensive a guide as possible to Lewis’s music and other sources of information about the composer.

1.2 An overview

The opening chapter of the thesis, the Biographical Sketch, traces the progress of his studies at home and abroad and his subsequent parallel careers as composer and lecturer, noting important influences on his thinking and his music. It does not aim to include exhaustive biographical detail, but rather to provide a chronologically structured overview of Lewis’s output, anchored by
reference to salient life events where these may be interpreted as having had an impact – whether positive or negative – on his activities as a composer. This first section is subdivided by location: schooling in South Wales, study in Cardiff and then abroad, appointments in Leeds and Bangor, and retirement.

It is particularly frustrating to report that, with the exception of just two pieces, none of Lewis’s pre-University compositions is extant. They were stored in a trunk in a damp basement when Lewis lived in Sling, near Tregarth on the outskirts of Bangor, in the late 1970s and early ’80s; when Lewis moved to his current home in Llanfairfechan, they were discovered to be damaged beyond rescue.\footnote{Information provided by the composer in conversation with the author, 2004.} Discussion of early trends in Lewis’s musical thinking therefore must to be confined to an account of those years from information provided by the composer himself.

As an undergraduate at the University of Wales, Cardiff, Jeffrey Lewis was taught by Alun Hoddinott. The extent to which the influence of Hoddinott and his compatriots was either absorbed or rejected is examined in the first section of the thesis, and further developed in the chapter on Memoria, the earliest work studied in depth here. These passages also examine the implications of considering Lewis specifically as a Welsh composer, a description
that the composer himself finds irrelevant. Nonetheless, I have
briefly compared the development of Lewis’s musical language with
that of a slightly younger Cardiff student, John Metcalf, whose
music has at times explored a similar, modally influenced, language,
but whose ‘cultural roots are in the heart of Wales’.  

The award of a bursary for composition in 1967 enabled Lewis to
travel abroad and study with György Ligeti, Karlheinz Stockhausen,
Boguslaw Schäffer and Don Banks. Again, the process of engaging
with or discarding ideas and techniques is observed and noted. The
courses taught by Lewis during his subsequent appointments at
Leeds College of Music (1969 – 1972) and Bangor University (1973 –
1993) are discussed, the syllabus of the latter institution in
particular examined for any evidence of influence on his own
compositions from those years. For example, some of the composers
and works Lewis discussed during my time as an undergraduate –
Debussy, Messiaen and Berg, certain pieces by Stravinsky and
Bartók, and a handful of scores by Berio, Reich, Ligeti and
Lutosławski – will be seen to be particularly relevant to a study of
Lewis’s own language. Equally significant were those works or
composers he dismissed or ignored – understanding the reasons
behind such tacit criticism helps to pinpoint Lewis’s own
compositional stance.

---
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Retirement has been accompanied by continued ill-health, and an account of how this has affected his most recent work concludes the opening chapter.

Lewis himself was the source of much valuable information during the meetings that took place on a regular basis over the course of writing the present thesis. Some of the more formal, face-to-face, interviews were recorded, but the presence of microphone and recording device seemed to inhibit Lewis’s conversation, any such inhibitions evaporating whenever the microphone was turned off. It generally proved more fruitful simply to listen with pen and notepad close at hand, even if that means that only occasional glimpses of Lewis’s spoken style appear in the thesis.

Lewis’s accounts of past events, his views on his own and other composers’ work, and even his interpretation of my analyses and commentaries in the thesis and elsewhere shifted over time and according to context. A good example of Lewis changing position arose over my reading of the polarity in his music between, on the one hand, purity, as represented by the plainchant-like melodic phrases that permeate so much of his work, and on the other, sensuality, reflected in his frequent use of varied instrumental timbres and a richly expressive harmonic language. My reading of these extremes as a fundamental tension in his music was approved
for use in programme notes in 2004 and again in 2006;\(^9\) by 2008, however,\(^{10}\) Lewis was beginning to have misgivings about drawing attention to this polarity in his work. Similarly, allusions to the work of other composers either in programme notes or in the thesis were not infrequently queried, particularly when they referred to composers about whose music Lewis has ambivalent views: Stravinsky, Bartók, Britten or Tippett, for example.

These anxieties, of both influence and misinterpretation, probably reveal as much about Lewis as both a man and a composer as any detailed assembly of biographical information. Commentators such as Jolanta Pekacz\(^{11}\) have unveiled many of the difficulties facing the musical biographer – indeed, about the underlying assumptions and preconceptions of the role and relevance of biography itself – most obviously in the intermediary role he must play in presenting and interpreting the information at his disposal. When, as here, a composer projects several different, even conflicting views, sometimes simultaneously, the need to guard against writing an account which ‘has been purged of contradictory or confusing material’\(^{12}\) becomes paramount. In the limited space available, therefore, my priority in the *Biographical Sketch* was to present

---

\(^9\) In 2004 the notes were provided for the concert performances and subsequent recordings of *Litania* and *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, in 2006 for the first complete performance of the *Sacred Chants*.

\(^{10}\) I was preparing a new set of programme notes for the recording which included *Silentia Noctis*.


Lewis primarily through the prism of his works using, where possible, his own observations as the starting-point for my interpretations. Examination of his gradually shifting attitude towards some of these interpretations was profitable on occasions.

I would stress that my intention was not to present a thesis in the form of a bi-partite ‘life-and-works’ study but rather, in its second, major part, to examine on a more detailed scale a particular period in Lewis’s career, whilst still pursuing fundamentally the same line of enquiry as that found in the Biographical Sketch. Thus, biographical information finds its way into these analytical chapters just as analysis is present in the Biographical Sketch.

As certain compositional preoccupations take hold, it becomes possible to describe what could be termed Lewis’s aesthetic position as a composer. The six scores studied in depth in the second part of the thesis – Memoria, Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, Tableau, Carmen Paschale, the Piano Trio and Fantasy – have been selected as exemplars of this position. Connections between these works and others by Lewis will be examined and the technique of his musical language analysed. The use of extra-musical subject matter and texts and their representation in musical terms is explored, and their relevance to Lewis’s output as a whole is discussed. Lewis’s use of cryptograms, his quotations from other composers’ works, his occasional interest in proportional schemes, and the influence of
structural techniques more usually associated with film are amongst the topics referred to in this part of the thesis. I examine how the listener might perceive these ideas and how they might inform performance of Lewis’s works, as well as their significance in the context of a given composition in relation to more purely musical concerns.

I turn to the subject of the reception of Lewis’s music in the Epilogue which follows this analytical section. In particular, I examine some possible reasons for the neglect from which Lewis’s music has suffered in recent years, and conclude with an attempt to summarise Lewis’s musical influences and ‘place’ his music in the context of that of his contemporaries.

Perhaps the most difficult problem facing the researcher is locating scores of Lewis’s works. To date, only five of his compositions have been published and are therefore readily accessible. *Hymnus ante Somnum* and *Sequentia de Sancto Michaele* are published by Novello, the *Westminster Mass* by Roberton,13 *Dreams, Dances and Lullabies* by the small Welsh firm, Curiad, and *Chaconne* by the Baton Press in a Festschrift for Sir Michael Tippett’s eightieth birthday.14 Everything else is either in manuscript or has been self-published in very small numbers. Self-publication can refer either to the

---

13 Now part of Goodmusic Publishing.
14 For full publication details see the Catalogue.
preparation of transparencies for photographic reproduction, or to photocopying and binding the manuscript score. Lewis has favoured the latter method in recent years because it is simpler and less time-consuming. However, in the process the composer, frustratingly, has erased many interesting pencilled marginalia, including rough sketches and ‘notes to self’. That Lewis feels no particular reason to hide these notes, and that they have simply been removed for the sake of tidiness, is nevertheless clear from his willingness to pass casually annotated scores on to me prior to preparation for (self)-publication.

There is clearly, then, a certain fragility to the survival of the Lewis œuvre when the small number of copies of any given piece is located in just one place, the composer’s home. One reason for assembling the Catalogue which constitutes the third and final part of this thesis – apart from the obvious necessity for a complete listing of Lewis’s known works – is to indicate where manuscripts, copies of the music and recordings exist outside the composer’s possession. A more detailed explanation of the methodology for this Catalogue precedes the Catalogue proper.

1.3 Research materials

Previous Lewis research is limited, to say the least. Brief studies by Dalwyn Henshall of Lewis’s orchestral piece Memoria and his
ensemble piece *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* appeared in the journal *Welsh Music* in the early 1980s\(^\text{15}\) and an article by Colin Tommis on the guitar piece *Spectra* appeared in *Guitar International* in 1989.\(^\text{16}\) Kevin Murphy included a chapter on *Sonante* in a DMA thesis on Welsh clarinet music for the University of Illinois in 1990.\(^\text{17}\)

All three authors view the works they discuss favourably, not surprisingly in the case of the first two, who were both Lewis’s students at Bangor. Murphy’s context is different: he selected six works, four – including Lewis’s – in manuscript in the Welsh Music Archives (now the Welsh Music Information Centre), and examines them for Welsh traits and evidence of musical conservatism in Wales.\(^\text{18}\) He finds little evidence of elements that may be described as typically Welsh in any of the works, apart from a tendency towards lyrical lines; and he finds nothing to challenge his view that ‘the most striking aspect of contemporary composition in Wales... is its remarkable conservatism’.\(^\text{19}\) Murphy calls as evidence for this ‘an adherence to traditional formal models’ and ‘a strict adherence to bar lines’ as well as ‘the absence of... extended techniques,


\(^\text{17}\) Kevin Lloyd Murphy, ‘An Analytical Study of Selected Works for Solo Clarinet by Composers in Wales’, DMA Music diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1990.

\(^\text{18}\) The six works are William Mathias’s Clarinet Concerto and Alun Hoddinott’s Clarinet Concerto No. 2 (both published by Oxford University Press) and, for clarinet and piano, Clarinet Sonatas by Robert Smith and Timothy Taylor, Howard Watt’s *Scenes and Soliloquies* and Lewis’s *Sonante*.

\(^\text{19}\) Murphy, ‘An Analytical Study of Selected Works for Solo Clarinet’, 158.
performer determinacy, unbarred music, electronic manipulation of sound and systematic application of serial procedures’. Despite his general statement about the condition of Welsh contemporary music, Murphy goes on to acknowledge Lewis as ‘the most “progressive” of the composers in [his] study’, describing him as ‘the most outspoken proponent of the need for a break with the generally conservative philosophy toward composition in Wales’. In the chapter on Sonante itself he notes that in some earlier scores Lewis made use of ‘performer determinacy’.

Murphy’s analysis of Sonante itself is clear but, like Henshall’s analysis of Memoria, is more concerned with its external structure than its internal workings – its changes in texture rather than its harmonic organization. Nonetheless, Murphy makes valuable observations about Lewis’s tendency to rearrange his musical material to avoid repetition, the juxtaposition of the dramatic and lyrical elements, and his use of modes. However, to describe Sonante as based almost entirely on an untransposed nine-note mode is to underplay the importance of the occurrence of individual pitches in a particular register, the resultant modal subsets (octatonic

20 Ibid., 159. Murphy acknowledges, however, that Hoddinott is exceptional in that he uses serialism in his score.
21 Ibid., 138.
22 Ibid. For Lewis, this term refers mostly to passages whose duration is left to the performers or conductor to gauge. At their most straightforward, short repeating patterns provide a backdrop to melodic phrases (in Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, for example); in some earlier scores – Mobile III is a good illustration – the patterns themselves are chosen within given parameters by the performers, and the conductor steers the work from phase to phase. Realizations provides the most extreme example of ‘performer determinacy’ in Lewis’s output – melodic fragments have been provided by the composer but their order in performance is for the most part selected by the players.
collections, for example) and tonal centres. One senses that Murphy has not heard enough of Lewis’s music to distinguish between those features of the work that are particular to *Sonante* and those more generally applicable to Lewis’s output as a whole.

Both Henshall and Tommis were more generally aware of Lewis’s music, or at least of those works being written at the time they were students in Bangor, and the wider frame of reference of both writers enables them to discuss Lewis’s colouristic use of instrumental textures, his interest in cryptograms and, in Henshall’s case, Lewis’s sketches. I have engaged with both articles in the chapter on *Memoria*, with Tommis when discussing Lewis’s attitude towards musical nationalism, and with Henshall when discussing the structure of the work.

There are surprisingly few reviews of Lewis’s music. Reviews in *Musical Opinion* frame the period 1967 (Cheltenham Festival) – 1992 (Vale of Glamorgan Festival), with passing references in *Welsh Music* and *The Musical Times* appearing at intervals over the intervening quarter century. More recently, isolated CD reviews have appeared in *Gramophone* and on the website *MusicWeb International*.23 Lewis

---

observed that there was ‘no consistent policy on music reviewing in Wales’²⁴ even during the 1970s and 1980s.

The composer himself provided me with much information, both in our meetings and also during telephone conversations and, less frequently, in letters and even text messages. This information was mostly verifiable by reference to other documents – concert programmes and back issues of *Radio Times*, for example. I was able to consult two of Lewis’s contemporaries at Cardiff, Peter James and David Evans, for corroboration of Lewis’s memories of Cardiff, the latter also providing me with further concert programmes and a personal memoir of Lewis. Several of the artists who have taken part in performances of Lewis’s work over the last forty years were happy to discuss their collaboration with the composer.

None of the earlier studies of Lewis’s music has investigated in any depth the features of Lewis’s sound world that, in my opinion, make him a composer so urgently in need of assessment. His acute aural sensitivity in matters of instrumental and vocal scoring, his supple and expressive melodic writing, and the flexibility and range of his harmonic language all repay detailed study. It is, however, as a consequence of the skill with which he maintains control over *all* his materials – melodic, harmonic, rhythmic, textural and structural –

²⁴ Conversation with the author, 17 October 2010.
that he achieves his most striking and individual effect: the sense of suspended time that is such a powerful feature of much of the music under consideration here. Lewis creates a unique musical world; a world in which the willing listener, through the quality and beauty of the composer’s musical invention and his ability to create deeply satisfying musical structures from those ideas, will find that time seems to stand still.
2. JEFFREY LEWIS – A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

2.1 Early years

Jeffrey Lewis was born on 28 November 1942 in Neath, near Port Talbot in South Wales.\(^1\) His father, Thomas John Lewis (1905 – 1987), a steelworker, and his mother, Kathleen Theresa Power (1908 – 1978), had made their home at 11 Dalrymple Street, Aberavon, Port Talbot, in the early 1930s. Jeffrey Lewis was the second of two children; his brother, Anthony, was born on 19 August 1933.

Thomas Lewis’s family came from Llanelli; his father is described on his birth certificate as a ‘jobbing labourer’. However, Kathleen Power’s father, Richard Power, was from County Kilkenny in Southern Ireland, and her mother, Bessie Gardiner, was from Street in Somerset. Jeffrey Lewis’s maternal grandparents had married at Llangynwyd Parish Church, near Maesteg, midway between Port Talbot and Bridgend, on 27 December 1897; Kathleen was one of four children. They lived in Prior Street, Port Talbot.

Despite having married in an Anglican church, Richard Power retained his Catholic faith throughout his life: his funeral receipt, from August 1925, refers to his burial in a ‘Catholic shroud’ with a

\(^1\) A receipt dated 19 December 1942 from the West Glamorgan County Hospital, Neath (issued by the Public Health Committee of Glamorgan County Council), records that £3. 12s had been paid for the ‘maintenance of Mrs S (sic) T Lewis’ during her confinement.
brass crucifix. It is tempting to see Jeffrey Lewis’s fascination with the rituals of Christian religious observance, Catholicism in particular, as an inheritance of sorts, something ‘in the blood’, even though his mother had not been brought up as a Catholic and he was not particularly aware of Catholicism as a child; not, indeed, until he discovered the music of Messiaen.²

There is some evidence of musical ability on both sides of the family: Kathleen Power had learnt the piano as a child, and one of Thomas Lewis’s brothers, Cyril, had had some success as a boy soprano. Cyril Lewis (1921 – 2000) had been a chorister at St Paul’s Church, Port Talbot, and a short article published in the South Wales Evening Post of 27 June 1933 reports that he had ‘won fifty-five first prizes in eighteen months... including the capturing recently of a silver cup for the championship of Wales.’³ The boy was offered a scholarship by Wells Cathedral School but his father turned it down on economic grounds when, after making enquiries, he discovered that there would be no further income forthcoming beyond the scholarship itself. Cyril had ten siblings (Thomas Lewis was the eldest of the family) and, instead of moving to Somerset, in 1934 he joined a touring vocal group trained by ‘Arturo Steffani’ (real name

² Lewis has, however, mentioned a strong Irish Catholic presence in streets nearby, and he recalls both the sound of the Angelus in the evening from the Catholic church, St Joseph’s, and the daily segregation of Catholics and non-Catholics during school assemblies. Conversation with the author, September 2009.
³ Quoted on the website <http://www.boysoloist.com> (accessed 31 December 2010). The same article also remarks that ‘on Wednesday next he will defend his title as champion boy sack-racer of Wales.’
Frederick William Wisker) called The Sixteen Singing Scholars for which the family received some financial reward. He recorded for the Decca Record Company in the same year, both as a soloist and with the group, and appears in a film of *Love’s Old Sweet Song* (28 February 1935, Pathé). ⁴ Jeffrey Lewis has reported that Cyril’s singing career came to an abrupt end when his voice broke ‘on stage’ when the group were on tour in Ireland in 1935; he then followed his eldest brother into the steelworks. ⁵

After attending Mountain Primary School, Jeffrey Lewis won a scholarship at the age of eleven to Dyffryn Grammar School (now Dyffryn Comprehensive School) in Port Talbot. ⁶ Lewis’s early musical studies included private piano lessons with two teachers who took him up to a level approximately equivalent to that of ABRSM Grade 5. Later, he took violin lessons and joined the West Glamorgan Youth Orchestra: rehearsals were held on Friday evenings at the Grammar School in Neath. He went on residential courses with the Glamorgan Youth Orchestra and the Glamorgan Youth Choir, both formed while he was at school. Future Labour Party leader Neil Kinnock was a fellow member of the choir – Lewis can be seen seated in the row behind the politician on the photograph taken at
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⁴ *Y Deryn Pur* and *Cymru Fach* were released on Decca F 5139, the former reissued on Amphion PHI 189. *Love’s Old Sweet Song* was released on Decca F 5359. Information about The Sixteen Singing Scholars found at <http://www.freewebs.com/silversongsters> and <http://histclo.com> (both accessed 31 December 2010).

⁵ Conversation with the author, 17 October 2010. Jeffrey Lewis’s brother, Anthony, also sang in the church choir and played the piano; conversely, Lewis himself took on clerical work in the steelworks during the summer holidays when he was a student.

⁶ This school was also the alma mater of the actor Richard Burton.
Ogmore-by-Sea which appears in Eileen Jones’s biography. Of even greater significance to Lewis’s musical development at this time was his membership of the choir of St Mary’s Church in Aberavon, Port Talbot, from the age of seven onwards, the church at which he had been baptized on 13 January 1943.

Lewis started taking organ lessons from the St Mary’s organist and choirmaster, Colin Jones, in 1952, and these quickly overtook piano lessons in importance. Within three years he was assistant organist at the church, sharing the two Sunday services. The organist would improvise during the entry and exit of the clergy and choir, and the service would be framed by two voluntaries. Jones was evidently an organist and teacher of some ability and enterprise. He had taken lessons from Herbert Sumsion at Gloucester Cathedral, and he introduced a wide range of organ music to St Mary’s, including that of Buxtehude, Howells and Peter Racine Fricker. His playing of Bach’s Trio Sonatas seems to have inspired in Lewis a teenage obsession with the organ music of that composer. Lewis has recounted how his school lunch hours at this time would often consist of a hasty sandwich before a practice session in the church, and he has recalled cold winter evenings spent playing there. This is not remarkable behaviour, perhaps, for an aspiring musician, but probably conspicuous in the setting of industrial South Wales. It is

8 By John G (or J – the hand-writing is unclear) Lloyd, curate of the church, according to the baptismal certificate.
significant that Lewis chooses to present an example of single-minded, focused, activity from this period: it is the first indication to support a view that the occasionally troubled, obsessive phases he has experienced in later life have their deep roots in these formative years.  

There were a couple of school friends, one of whom was another organist – although he did not study with Colin Jones – with whom Lewis could share at least some aspects of his musical enthusiasms, although their tastes were much more traditional, and far less intense. Most of Lewis’s musical explorations were, therefore, conducted in somewhat isolated circumstances.

His next discovery was the music of Messiaen. The purchase of a KB transistor radio by Lewis’s parents in the mid-1950s opened up a new world of listening, and a broadcast performance by Arnold Richardson on the BBC Third Programme of *La Nativité du Seigneur* one summer in the late ’50s was his first, revelatory, experience of Messiaen’s music. Further musical explorations came through buying records of unusual repertoire through Discurio in London, which advertised in *Musical Opinion*. Although there was very little live music in the area, apart from occasional visits by the Cardiff 

---

9 Lewis has consistently described his early musical activities in these terms, an act of self-fashioning whose very selectivity illustrates a particular aspect of Lewis’s personality. Nevertheless, his emphasis on studious self-sufficiency and solitude over sociability creates a one-sided picture of the composer.
University Trio to his school, Lewis seems to have been musically omnivorous at this time. His preference, however, was for organ and church music, and the new music that was available through the BBC or on LP. The Youth Orchestra provided more traditional fare, although even that was not without interest to Lewis – he recalls being particularly taken by Schumann’s Piano Concerto at this time, for example.\textsuperscript{10}

I have already noted that only two compositions survive from Lewis’s schooldays, an untitled piano piece and an organ work entitled \textit{Improvisation on the Compline Antiphon – Salve Regina}. It is worth noting that St Mary’s made no use of plainchant (‘it was your normal, basic Anglican church with \textit{Hymns Ancient and Modern}’),\textsuperscript{11} and Lewis has been unable to recall the circumstances which led him to discover and use the \textit{Salve Regina}. ‘Port Talbot wasn’t a hotbed of authentic plainsong performance – the workers weren’t coming out of the steel works saying let’s sing the \textit{Salve Regina} antiphon!’\textsuperscript{12} Plainchant-like lines have been a significant ingredient in Lewis’s melodic language at several points throughout his career, and it is fascinating to find him engaging with it at this early stage. One can deduce a developing instinct for flexible, expressive contours from Lewis’s choice of thematic material for this work.

Neither is it too fanciful to see here, in embryo, another theme which

\textsuperscript{10} A further reference to Schumann’s music can be found in Chapter 8.2.
\textsuperscript{11} Conversation with the author, 2005.
\textsuperscript{12} Conversation with the author, 2005.
recurs in Lewis’s later music – the juxtaposition of the spirit and the flesh. Plainchant is associated with the sacred, and thus with ideas of ritual and even obsession; on the other hand it also has connotations of expressivity and freedom, made apparent in its sinuous shapes and rhythmic pliancy. The tension between these two poles lies at the root of much of Lewis’s work from the late 1970s on.

After Lewis had completed his schooling, achieving A-Levels in English, History and Music, he then had to decide what to take from higher education. The choice was not straightforward: there had been little or no careers advice from school, and the Universities Central Council on Admissions only came fully into being in time for entry in 1964. Lewis’s parents were passively supportive of his musical aspirations, but since no member of the family had been to University before, they could give no practical advice beyond encouraging him to follow in his brother’s footsteps and start on a teacher training course. Despite clear academic ability, Lewis found himself in the autumn of 1961 at the College of St Mark and St John in Chelsea.

In the absence of adequate careers advice, teacher training seems to have been the ‘default option’ for most sixth formers contemplating

13 Conversation with the author, 17 October 2010.
14 Anthony Lewis had completed a teacher training course at Caerleon College, Monmouthshire, some years earlier.
higher education at this time. Lewis has described the Chelsea College as a ‘very odd place’. It was an all-male establishment, a Church of England College with a chapel and dormitories, each bed separated by a curtain. It was not long before Lewis realised that neither the College nor the course was appropriate for him. He decided to move back to South Wales, and enrolled on a Music diploma course at the University of Wales, Cardiff, for the rest of the academic year.

2.2 Cardiff

The diploma course at Cardiff covered some of the elements of a Music degree, including harmony and counterpoint, but, as far as Lewis remembers, no composition. In autumn 1962, Lewis was finally able to enrol on the first year of a BMus Honours course.

At first glance, it is surprising that Lewis delayed his decision to avail himself of a University education for so long, since it had been in his mind when he was in the Upper Sixth Form, and he had at that point applied to Hull University for a place on their Music degree course. It seems that his nerve failed him at the crucial moment, however. He has described an underlying awareness that,

15 Conversation with the author, 4 September 2009.
16 The College took in female students for the first time in 1967. It moved to its current location, on the outskirts of Plymouth, in 1973.
17 See the Catalogue, J 2 (Improvisation on the Compline Antiphon – Salve Regina) for further information about his interview there with John Joubert.
at that time, very few of his contemporaries went on to University, whatever their abilities, and this seems to have shaken his belief in his own gift. These self-doubts have resurfaced, albeit in different forms, over recent years, and they are certainly responsible at least in part for the relative obscurity in which he continues to work. A deep distaste for anything suggesting self-promotion is but one manifestation of this lack of confidence in a remarkable talent.18

Nonetheless, his years at Cardiff University were conspicuously successful. One of his fellow students, Peter James, has written that ‘he was one of a flourishing group of young composers in Cardiff in the 1960s, and I was not alone in considering him easily the most talented of the group.’19 This view is echoed by another contemporary, David Evans: ‘of the four [post-graduate composers at Cardiff in the mid-60s] it was clear that Jeff was the most advanced. [Alun] Hoddinott told me that he felt that Jeff was the best composer of the four.’20 Harvey Davies, a recent champion of Lewis’s music, goes further; he has reported that Hoddinott claimed that Lewis was the most gifted composition student he ever taught.21

---

18 Conversations with the author, 2009 and 2010.
19 Correspondence with the author, 26 March 2001.
20 Correspondence with the author, 19 January 2009.
21 Conversation with the author, June 2008. Harvey Davies, pianist for Ensemble Cymru, and, with his mother, Helen Davies, half of the Davies [Piano] Duo, has premiered and performed much of Lewis’s music since the mid-1990s. His father, Edward Davies, was, for many years, violinist with the University College Trio in Bangor, and took part in the first performance of Lewis’s Piano Trio in 1984.
The Music degree course at Cardiff was a comprehensive one, including performance as well as academic studies (music history was a part of the syllabus throughout the course) and composition. The Professor of Music at that time was Joseph Morgan, who taught a course in Palestrina counterpoint; other lecturers included Alun Hoddinott, David Collier, and two Scots – both former students of Donald Francis Tovey in Edinburgh – Ian Bruce and Robert Bruce. Harmony was taught through the traditional method of Bach chorale harmonisations; students then progressed to the composition of chorale-preludes.

Robert Joyce, at that time the organist at Llandaff Cathedral, taught Lewis organ as his principal practical study. Lewis’s repertoire included Liszt, Franck, Britten and Hindemith as well as those two early obsessions, Bach and Messiaen. Lewis has recalled how, during his first organ lesson, Joyce commented on how well he had been taught previously, a reflection on the excellent work of Colin Jones at St Mary’s. Lewis gained his ARCM in organ performance in 1963, and was to continue his organ studies as a postgraduate. He picked up his piano studies again, with Jenny Cuthbert, for the first time since he was about twelve, although these consisted largely of Lewis taking along new repertoire to sight-read in his lesson each week. He joined the Palestrina Choir (the University chamber choir) which was then under the direction of Peter James, now a distinguished editor of sixteenth century church music, including
the work of John Sheppard, as well as being a former Vice-Principal of the Royal Academy of Music. Choral singing is something that Lewis feels strongly should be part of every composer’s education, indeed an essential part of any musician’s training:

Very few music students sing [these days] and very few composers have a background of choral singing, but I did; I started off in the choir when I was seven; I sang as a boy in a four-part choir and then when my voice broke I sang with the men; and then there was singing in the choir at school, basically for Eisteddfods, and then of course there was the Glamorgan Youth Choir, and then when I was a student there was a lot of singing [in the Palestrina Choir]. I’m a strong advocate that all musicians should sing in a choir, and certainly that all composers should sing in a choir. Absolutely, because it’s not only good musically – I’m not saying you’ve got to have a wonderful voice – but it’s extremely good for musicianship; and the other thing is the joy – to use this much-maligned phrase – the joy of singing together. Especially unaccompanied music, because the demands are so specific, and greater than for accompanied music.

Amongst the repertoire Lewis performed with the Palestrina Choir was Britten’s *Rejoice in the Lamb* and *Missa Brevis*, masses by Palestrina, works by Thomas Tallis, and other Tudor music. He also performed organ solos in these programmes: works by Gibbons, Frescobaldi, Tomkins, Pachelbel, Vierne, Jehan Alain (*Litanies*),

---

22 David Evans also directed the choir on a number of occasions.
23 In a subsequent conversation (4 September 2009), Lewis’s only recollection of Eisteddfods was of conducting a school choir, in a part of Pergolesi’s *Stabat Mater*, rather than performing as a singer himself.
24 Conversation with the author, 2005.
25 Each concert featured a Palestrina mass.
26 I am indebted to David Evans for providing me with copies of the programmes of many concerts given by the Palestrina Choir in the mid-60s.
Bach and, of course, Messiaen. The usual venue for these concerts was Llandaff Cathedral but concerts were also given at St Mary's, Swansea, St Martin's, Caerphilly, St David’s Cathedral, Pembrokeshire (the Palestrina *Stabat Mater*), York Minster and Coventry Cathedral. The Palestrina Choir, augmented by other singers, recorded in St Mary’s, Swansea for the Welsh Qualiton label, which was active between 1958 and 1968: Lewis can be heard as organist on a limited edition LP which also includes organ duets by Tomkins and Nicholas Carlton. The disc should also have included Tippett’s *Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis*, but, when a note on the organ unfortunately developed a cipher, that part of the project was abandoned.

---

27 *Dieu parmi nous* (*La nativité du Seigneur*) on 25 November 1964 and again on 2 January 1965; *Le banquet céleste* on 13 April 1965; *Les anges, Les mages and Jésus accepte la souffrance* from *La nativité du Seigneur*, and the *Sortie* from the *Messe de la Pentecôte* on 23 November 1966 at St David’s Metropolitan Cathedral, Cardiff.

28 David Evans has provided me with the following anecdote involving a concert given by the Palestrina Choir at York Minster: ‘The Palestrina choir was invited to give a concert in York Minster and Jeff was to be the organ soloist. The choir sang Palestrina’s *Missa Papae Marcelli* as part of the programme and Jeff had planned to play some very loud Messiaen, because the organ was one of the largest in Britain. When his piece was coming towards the end he pulled out all the stops and the choir stalls where we were sitting began to shake and rattle from the sheer force and vibration of the sound. Following the concert we returned to Cardiff not expecting any repercussions from the event. A few days later we read in the newspaper that the tower of the Minster was showing serious cracks and was in danger of falling. A ban had been placed on the use of the full organ because the vibrations could affect the structure! We wondered if Jeff’s performance had been “the straw that broke the camel’s back” and Jeff got quite some leg-pulling from the rest of us about it.’ (Correspondence with the author, 19 January 2009.) A likely date for this is 1967, since according to the website <http://everything2.com/title/York+Minster> (accessed 8 September 2009), cracks started to reappear in the tower structure at this time.

29 Qualiton PAL-PR 2. Lewis recalled that his duet partner for the recording was Heather Lewis, now Heather James. However, a concert programme for 2 January 1965 (St Mary’s, Swansea) indicates that the same duets were performed by Lewis and Royston Havard, and that the Tippett *Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis*, originally planned for inclusion on the disc, was on the same programme. I am indebted to Hayden Wetzel, who maintains a website, <http://anglicanmusic.freeservers.com/> (accessed 21 September 2009), listing several thousand recordings of church music; this rare disc found its way into his Washington DC collection, and he confirmed that Havard was indeed Lewis’s fellow organist on the recording. (Email correspondence with the author, 20 September 2009.)
As well as the Palestrina Choir, there was ample opportunity for making music during the Wednesday evening concert series of the University Music Society. The students had a chance to air their own compositions as well as performing a wide range of other music.\(^\text{30}\) The University had its own resident ensemble, the Wang String Quartet, as well as a pianist-in-residence, Patrick Piggott (succeeded in 1965 by John McCabe), who gave regular concerts on Tuesday evenings.

Composition was, of course, the main focus of Lewis’s study, and he was taught primarily by Alun Hoddinott. There were weekly composition assignments, and occasional stylistic exercises (pastiche). The scores I have seen from this period reveal exactly what one would expect from a developing, but as yet immature, talent – a mixture of part-digested influences and occasional glimpses of a more personal voice.

Since so few scores are extant from pre-University days, it is virtually impossible to assess Lewis’s level of ability and experience as a composer at the point when he first arrived in Cardiff. The absence of dates on many of the student manuscripts also makes it difficult to judge his progress and in the Catalogue I have only been able to put together a tentative chronology of these compositions,

\(^{30}\) Lewis recalls performing Morton Feldman’s 1963 piano work *Vertical Thoughts 4*, but I have been unable to trace a date for this performance.
based partly on the type of paper used and the hand-writing style – not the most conclusive of methods – and partly on musical style. Only occasionally is there any external evidence that allows for a firm ‘no later than...’ dating of individual works.

Amongst the more atypical scores (in comparison with Lewis’s later work) one must mention the Psalm setting *Sing We Merrily* (1963), where the influence of Walton in the celebratory vein of *Belshazzar’s Feast* is clear; the Bartók of the *Six Dances in Bulgarian Rhythm* is a strong presence in Lewis’s *Four Piano Pieces*. Generally speaking, there is quite a wide-ranging sphere of influence on the music at this stage. Hints of Benjamin Britten and even the Peter Maxwell Davies of *O Magnum Mysterium* (1960) can be detected in the setting for unaccompanied choir of Samuel Daniel’s *Care-Charmer Sleep* (January 1965). This piece is notable for being the first of many connected with night, sleep and dreams, and both the musical language and use of the choral medium shows a marked advance on *Sing We Merrily*. Lewis also composed a pair of short organ pieces to which he added the title of *Diptych* at around the same time;\(^{31}\) the instrument was to be a favourite medium over the next ten to fifteen years. These are polished and attractive works, although the rhythmic and harmonic writing – as well as the title – owes a debt to Messiaen.

\(^{31}\) See the Catalogue for an account of the difficulties encountered in giving a precise date to this work.
Into the category of uncharacteristic work come the *Duo* for trumpet and piano and the *Sonatina* for bassoon and piano, written for another fellow student, Robert Codd, who was for many years principal bassoon in the BBC National Orchestra of Wales. Neither piece has ambitions beyond their rather apologetic titles. The titles of the *Two Dance Sketches* and *Portraits* are reminiscent of the Hoddinott–Mathias axis which Lewis was later, scrupulously, to avoid. Uncharacteristic for other reasons are two slightly later works: a BBC Wales commission, *Mosaic* for string quartet (December 1967) – an unlikely medium for Lewis, since it is one which at times he has said he actively dislikes, describing it to me once as ‘monochrome’\(^{32}\) – and a setting in Welsh of verses from the Book of Revelation, *Gweledigaeth* (January 1968). Lewis is not a Welsh speaker and has therefore not been drawn into the sphere of the sometimes Nationalist politics of composition in Wales: it would be quite wrong to think of him as a *Welsh* composer; rather, he is a composer who happens to be Welsh.\(^{33}\) This short but atmospheric piece is one of only two settings in the language through his entire output.\(^{34}\)

More typical products of this period include the *Improvisations* for flute and piano and the *Medieval Sketches* for harp. In the *Improvisations* we see for the first time a term which frequently

\(^{32}\) Conversation with the author, 2005.
\(^{33}\) This theme will be discussed further in Chapter 3.5 below.
\(^{34}\) The other is *Offeren y Llwyn* (1976).
recurs in Lewis’s mature scores, *flessibile*, although here it rubs shoulders with rigorous serial writing. The two harp pieces both take pre-existing music as a starting point, plainchant in the first and a Dufay *chanson* in the second. The latter has been identified as the opening of the Cantus of *Ma belle dame souveraine*.\(^35\) The discovery of this *rondeau* was a happy accident, one which led him to feel that he ‘could do something with [it].’\(^36\) Medievalism was in the air, of course: the discovery of a vast literature of unknown music was an incredibly revitalising force for composers and performers alike. The Early Music Consort of London was founded by David Munrow in 1967, and Peter Maxwell Davies is only the most familiar of the many composers invigorated by the music of that period. One could also point to early works by Lewis’s near-contemporary, Jonathan Harvey – the vocal writing in his *Cantata I* (1965) and the choice of texts for his *Carol* of 1968 both have the same sense of delight in reinventing the old. For Lewis, reference to the musical past was perhaps a convenient way of setting up emotional distance in his own music, akin to Stravinsky’s use of Latin in *Oedipus Rex*.\(^37\) Convenient, and perhaps more congenial than Bartókian pastiche, given the predilection for plainchant already noted.

\(^35\) Lewis’s source for this is not known, but it is likely to have been the (then) recent edition of Dufay *Cantiones* published by the American Institute of Musicology in Rome. Guillaume Dufay, *Cantiones*, in: Heinrich Besseler, ed., Dufay, Opera Omnia, 6 vols. (Rome: American Institute of Musicology in Rome, 1964), vi, 63.

\(^36\) Conversation with the author, 2005.

\(^37\) See also the introduction to Chapter 6 below for a discussion of other instances of emotional distancing in Lewis’s work.
It is in the central section of the second of the *Two Cadenzas* for piano, premiered in 1967 by John McCabe, where glimpses of Lewis’s mature language first start appear (Ex 1). The crystalline chords and delicate tracery of this flight of chromatic fancy provide a marked contrast to the serial writing that frames the movement. The sensitivity to voicing, register and texture, the rhythmic fluidity (and its notation), as well as the disposition of the hands at the keyboard, clearly anticipate the outer movements of the *Fantasy* for piano (1985) which, together with the Piano Trio, will be a focus of the final analytical study of the thesis.

The musical enthusiasms shared by the Cardiff students did not always coincide with those of their lecturers: ‘we weren’t interested in British mainstream composers; we were interested in the Continentals and more in the younger – for want of a better phrase – experimental British composers. I mean, we weren’t interested in Tippett. There was more of an interest in the big and newer names on the Continent and the younger breed of British composers.’

Lewis has mentioned Cornelius Cardew and David Bedford as examples of this ‘younger breed’, and he had first-hand experience working with both of these composers, in London (Bedford) and Leeds (Cardew). He was also aware of some early pieces by Harrison Birtwistle (*Monody for Corpus Christi*, 1959, and *Précis*,

---

38 Conversation with the author, 2005.
1960). However, there were certain works of both Britten and Tippett that excited interest in Cardiff, even if only briefly: Britten's *War Requiem*, for example.\(^{39}\)

Ex 1 *Two Cadenzas, No 2*, bars 36 – 39

It is probably more significant to consider the composers about whom Lewis was unquestionably enthusiastic. He had discovered

\(^{39}\) Conversations with the author, 2005 (Britten and Tippett), 2008 (Bedford) and 2009 (Cardew).
Stockhausen’s *Gruppen*, and, even more importantly, the music of Varèse. He had been exploring Messiaen’s music from the late ’50s on, assiduously collecting LPs and scores, and, as has already been mentioned, Lewis performed several of the organ works in recital.

I have already referred to a couple of Lewis’s fellow students from this period; also worthy of note are Howard Rees, a clarinettist and composer who went on to teach at Falmouth Art College and has turned to film-making in recent years; Paul Broom, a flautist and composer who has worked as a music copyist for Schott and OUP; and John Metcalf, who was a percussionist as well as a composer. The latter has worked in both Wales and Canada and is currently Artistic Director of the Vale of Glamorgan Festival.

Early recognition for Lewis came with workshop performances by the BBC Welsh Orchestra under John Carewe of *Fanfares with Variations* (1965) and the *Chamber Concerto* (1967). These were

---

40 Information provided in part by David Evans, correspondence with the author, 19 January 2009.
41 The combination of flute, clarinet, piano and percussion provides the backbone of Lewis’s *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun*, written for a concert described thus by David Evans: ‘[Alun] Hoddinott encouraged [Broom, Rees, Metcalf and Lewis] to form a group and write works for one another. Out of this idea grew the 66 Group, or, as others knew them, the Cardiff Group and they indeed did write works which involved them all and also some of the talented performers who studied at Cardiff. Particularly memorable was the concert given over entirely to their music which the group gave at the Cheltenham Festival [July 1967] and which won critical acclaim at the time.’ (Correspondence with the author, 19 January 2009.) E. M. Webster’s review of the Festival in *Musical Opinion*, xc (1967), 677 – 685, singles out *Epitaphium* for special praise: ‘Jeffrey Lewis’s *Children of the Sun* – an impassioned outcry about the effects of Hiroshima – was one of the most promising and original works of the whole festival. It is, of course, a young man’s work – but it has something to say.’
42 Lewis cannot recall the circumstances of these invitations, but he assumes they came about on Alun Hoddinott’s recommendation. (Conversation with the author, 17 October 2010.) However, see
performed as part of a series of concerts modelled on those given under the title *Musica Viva* by John Pritchard and the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra in the late 1950s and early 1960s. During these concerts, John Carewe would give an illustrated talk to the audience about the work, before presenting a complete performance of it; they were Lewis’s first significant exposure. He had already completed his *Symphony for Large Orchestra* as his ‘BMus Exercise’, but this was the first time he had heard his imagined orchestral textures in the flesh.⁴³

Lewis views his transition from generalist (musician) to specialist (composer) as a gradual process. Although he specialised in composition for his Masters degree, performing was still important to him, and his later work as a pianist in Paris and as a conductor in both Leeds and Bangor supports this picture. To an observer like his Cardiff contemporary David Evans, however, the time and care that Lewis gave to his composition suggests that it was becoming his priority:

> I shared accommodation with him for a time at Howard Gardens and had first-hand knowledge of his compositional methods. He would think a good deal about a new piece over several weeks, and after a short period sketching some of the basic elements, he would plunge into writing the final score. At this stage Jeff would work night and day until it was

---

the Catalogue for details of the circumstances of a 1967 workshop on the *Chamber Concerto* that casts doubt over whether the BBC was involved with presenting the second work.

⁴³ Not unexpectedly, Lewis’s *Symphony* had contributed to his achieving a First Class Honours Degree in 1965.
finished. I once remember that he hardly slept for a fortnight while he strove to finish one of his pieces.\textsuperscript{44}

Success and a steadily increasing reputation do not appear to have helped Lewis overcome a sense of ambivalence towards his vocation, however, and he has confessed to being reluctant to describe himself as ‘a composer’, even when he was receiving regular and significant commissions.\textsuperscript{45} Whether Lewis received a fee for his BBC workshop performances is unknown; his first BBC commission, for which he certainly would have been paid, was 	extit{Mosaic} for string quartet, completed on Christmas Day 1967.

Earlier that year, Lewis received two performances at the Cheltenham Festival. The 	extit{Two Cadenzas} referred to above were given by the Polish pianist Bronislawa Kawalla, and the première of 	extit{Epitaphium – Children of the Sun} was heard in a mixed programme given by the 66 Group (referred to in footnote 41). The latter concert was broadcast by the BBC. Lewis has described 	extit{Epitaphium} as an ‘anti- Vietnam War piece’, typical of the climate of the day;\textsuperscript{46} the texts were taken in part from 	extit{Peace News}, and as

\textsuperscript{44} Correspondence with the author, 31 October 2010.
\textsuperscript{45} This is a theme about which Lewis has spoken on several occasions, most recently in conversation on 17 October 2010. He has described observing Alun Hoddinott’s social ease in post-concert receptions and feeling that he would never be able to ‘network’ successfully in that way. It is surely this lack of self-belief – not in his music, but in his self-image – that has inhibited the advancement of his career more than anything else, as it almost did at the very start when Lewis found himself on a wholly inappropriate teacher training course. The subsequent lack of recognition of his work and achievements has in turn created a vicious circle of intensified self-doubt from which it is difficult to escape.
\textsuperscript{46} Conversation with the author, 2006. Lewis described himself as being politically engaged at that time; this is, however, his only overtly ‘pacifist’ work. A comparison between 	extit{Epitaphium} and 	extit{Pro Pace} (1981) makes clear the distance Lewis travelled in fourteen years, the later work being
well as references to the Vietnam War there are descriptions of Hiroshima.47

In the same year, Lewis had won the Welsh Arts Council Competition for Young Composers on the strength of his Trio for flute, oboe and piano, and the adjudicator, Michael Tippett, recommended that Lewis be awarded a bursary which would allow him to study abroad. He had already completed two years of postgraduate study at Cardiff and submitted a portfolio of compositions for his MMus. The limitations of the principality must have seemed clear when the opportunity to study at Darmstadt with Ligeti and Stockhausen came his way.

2.3 Darmstadt, Kraków and Paris

Jeffrey Lewis spent the summer of 1967 at Darmstadt, where he studied composition and compositional analysis with György Ligeti and Karlheinz Stockhausen.

The working day was structured around the compositional tasks on which the students were engaged in the mornings; afternoons were spent in workshops discussing either these scores or those of the essentially a prayer, a spiritual utterance, an interpretation emphasised by the predominantly Latin liturgical text and the absence of any dramatic or 'illustrative' music. By 1989 (see Tommis, ‘Y Gitar Gymreig’, 26) Lewis goes so far as to say ‘I hate the idea of music being used for any political or nationalist reason and I think that debases the whole art of music.’

47 See Chapter 6.6 for a discussion of the closing pages of the work.
distinguished teaching faculty. Stockhausen talked mainly about moment form, and in particular his 1964 piece, *Mixtur*; the students attended the performance in Frankfurt (23 August 1967) which was recorded and later released by Deutsche Grammophon. Johannes Fritsch, one of the sound engineers credited on the recording, was also studying composition at Darmstadt at this time, as well as being a viola player in the Stockhausen-Ensemble; Lewis also recalls the presence of the Kontarsky brothers, Aloys and Alfons, both as pianists and teachers.

Ligeti, too, talked about his own music, although Lewis remembers the impact – if that is the correct word – of hearing the first performance of *Lontano* at the Donaueschingen Festival even more vividly than the composer’s lectures on his own *Lux Aeterna*. Lontano still fascinates Lewis, as does the earlier *Atmosphères*, and works such as Lewis’s first two *Mobiles*, which date from just a short while later, in 1968, show the influence of Ligeti in their intricate textures and attempts to create the illusion of a musical ‘object in space’, viewed, like a mobile, as if from different angles. Each vocal or instrumental line (see Ex 5b below) uses only a limited range of pitches but the cumulative aural effect belies this simplicity.

---

48 Other lecturers at Darmstadt that summer included Earle Brown and Henri Pousseur.
49 22 October 1967, Donaueschingen; Südwestfunk-Sinfonieorchester Baden-Baden conducted by Ernest Bour.
Stockhausen’s work had a less profound effect than that of Ligeti on Lewis’s music, although the latter’s description of his own *Visual Music*, a piece dating from a few years later when Lewis was teaching at Leeds College of Music and based on the performers’ interpretations of symbols from the Highway Code, makes it sound like a close relation to Stockhausen’s *Stop*. Unfortunately, neither the score nor the performance materials of *Visual Music* are currently accessible.

After Darmstadt, Lewis attended concerts at the 1967 Warsaw Autumn Festival (16 – 24 September) and then spent two periods studying with Bogusław Schäffer in Kraków, firstly in February – March 1968 and then in May – August of the same year. In between these Polish visits he took lessons from the Australian composer, Don Banks, who was then living in London, and through him made contact with another Australian, Keith Humble, who invited Lewis to take part in some concerts with his new music ensemble in Paris.

Schäffer (born in Lwów in 1929) is a little known figure in the UK, despite coverage at the Huddersfield Contemporary Music Festival in

---

50 *Stop* was a piece that was programmed (13 February 1986) in one of the Contemporary Music Ensemble concerts in Bangor, although the role of director was on that occasion taken by John Pickard. At that point a Postgraduate composition student recently returned from studies with Louis Andriessen at The Hague Conservatory. Lewis did not know the Stockhausen piece when he composed *Visual Music*.

51 Lewis has been unable to locate a score of *Visual Music* at his home, and it is possible that all the performing materials have now been lost; it is unlikely that they would have survived the move to the new Leeds College of Music building in 1997 even if they had managed to survive the previous quarter-century.
1984. Adrian Thomas describes him as ‘the most iconoclastic and idiosyncratic figure in post-war Polish music.’\(^5\) His music was first heard in the 1960 Warsaw Autumn Festival, although his was already a familiar name as a critic, theorist and writer\(^5\) and he has explored a wide variety of techniques ranging from neo-classicism and serialism, the use of electronics, and ideas about extended notation (including graphic scores), to an increasingly strong theatrical element in his music.\(^5\) A 1964 collection, *Muzyka fortepianowa*, shows this stylistic variety well.\(^5\)

The music included dates from 1949 to 1963 and the earliest pieces are texturally clean, structurally straightforward works; the second movement of the 1952 *Sonatina* stands out by virtue of its white-note simplicity; the *Studium poliwersjonalne* (loosely, a *Study with many variants*, 1958) presents the pianist with a three-coloured score (in black, green and red inks), elucidating the linear and serial progress of the music; the following *Studium poliekspresyjne* (again approximately, a *Poly-expressive study*) removes stems from the crotchets and attempts a *rubato* notation using lines approximately connecting the noteheads (Ex 2). Parts of the *Kompozycja swobodna* (*Free Composition*, also 1958) anticipate the visual appearance of the

---

\(^5\) Ibid., 102. Lewis still has a copy of Schäffer’s *Klasycy dodekafonii* (*Classics of Dodecaphony*), Kraków, 1964, a volume including examples from the work of many composers, including Schäffer himself.

\(^5\) He has also been prolific as a playwright since the mid-1950s.

\(^5\) PWM, Kraków, 1964.
piano cadenzas near the end of the first section of Lewis’s *Duologue* of 1971, although Lewis has stressed that the musical effect of the two passages is quite different – Schäffer uses – and organises – all twelve notes of the chromatic scale whereas Lewis uses a (slightly) more limited set of pitches with far greater freedom. In *Duologue*, repetition within the line creates an embryonic form of the technique of harmonic activation that comes into its own in Lewis’s later works (Ex 3). The graphic scores of *Studium w diagramie* (1956) and, especially, *Nonstop* (1960) and *Kontury* (1963) have an air of playfulness and whimsicality that echoes Satie and Cage. A performance of *Nonstop* can last for anywhere between six minutes and eight hours.

Adrian Thomas draws attention to the performance instructions for *Nonstop* among [which] are several which encapsulate the musical and theatrical extremity of Schäffer’s intentions:

1. Sounds should be constantly varied; repetition of sounds should be avoided.
2. For each repetition of an element with the same symbol there should be a different rhythmic, dynamic and articulatory response.
3. The performer must try – as far as possible – to link smaller elements together into larger groupings (eg left-hand glissando + right-hand chord + whistling + foot-stamping = ‘a motif’).

The performer of the piece must be male with a baritone voice; when the piece’s duration is prolonged, between 3 and 8 pianists may take it in turns.\(^{56}\)

---

\(^{56}\) Thomas, *Polish music since Szymanowski*, 203.
These performance instructions anticipate some of the teaching notes that Schäffer added to one of the pieces Lewis composed in Kraków in the summer of 1968, *Chamber Music*, for solo violin with an ensemble of three flutes (doubling piccolo) and six violins:
1. more octave double stops (Vlns.)
2. passages with unusual double stops.
3. combinations of flageolets of flutes and flageolets of violins.
4. unequal symmetries; small asymmetry in symmetry.
5. single notes with double stops (solo vln.)
6. various bowings (espec. vln. solo p.37 leg. + stacc.)
7. Page 45 (!) – change!
   double stops + 3 fl. sounds same register converging to “one sound”
8. page 47 – 2 accomp. vlns. “colour” the solo vln. in separate places.  

The teaching notes that preceded the composition of *Chamber Music* (or else date from the work’s very early stages) are even more detailed and contain examples of ‘unusual’ violin chords – the semitones between the pitches of the chords are counted out in a way that can still be found in Lewis’s sketches today – and diagrams representing the shapes of melodic lines, partially elaborated into the notes themselves. Comprehensive lists of different articulations (see Ex 4) and the various ways of notating how a conductor might direct an improvised or free passage have been further annotated by Lewis himself, with one particular description – “same, but “different”” (Lewis’s punctuation) – echoing strongly across the decades as a compositional mantra.  

---

57 Score and notes provided by the composer.
58 See Chapter 2.6 below.
59 In Lewis’s lectures on *La mer*, for example, he drew attention to the idea of the sea as being ‘always the same but always different’ – the literal fluidity being reflected metaphorically by Debussy in his orchestral work.
Constant variation of all elements of the music (although, in
*Chamber Music*, in a non-systematic way); avoidance of repetition; a
fondness for unusual instrumental combinations and an ear for how
the sounds of those instruments might merge and colour each other
– all of these teaching notes were well-learnt and are clearly audible
in Lewis’s music. They also informed Lewis’s own composition
teaching, certainly when I was a student of his in the mid-1980s.

A further sheet of teaching notes lists the pieces that Schäffer set
Lewis to write next: a rough ‘DIAGRAM of ELECTR. OR CONCRE
MUSIC’; a ‘2nd STRING QUARTET SEXTET’; a ‘CONCERTO for PERC. (4 players) and BRASS ORCHESTRA (30 Instruments)’; ‘COLLAGE for [?]’; ‘PIANO PIECE (elements)’. A rough sketch of a graphic score with fragments of rhythmic notation and other indecipherable text can also be seen there.

Rather than composing a Concerto for Percussion and Brass, Lewis wrote a piece for ‘Brass Orchestra’ (eighteen players); that and Collage are the only works from this list that Lewis has traced, although a folder labelled ‘Written in Poland’ contains three other works, Antiphony II for Chamber Orchestra, an unfinished ‘Work for Large Orchestra’ and Four Studies for two flutes. Collage is described as being written for ‘Solo Orchestra’, an ensemble of thirty instruments, all treated as soloists.

All of these works (even the texturally simpler Four Studies) are elaborate constructions, and Chamber Music itself must rank as one of the most complex scores that Lewis has composed (with the possible exception of Mobile III, which was to appear three years later). The score (forty-seven sides of manuscript, with an approximate duration of fifteen minutes; it has never been performed) is meticulously notated in sharp, hard pencil, and is clearly first and foremost an exercise in sonorities, starting and ending with an almost inaudible note from the violin solo, pppp poss. lontano at the start, with the additional instruction to the
player: ‘do not put the finger of the left hand all the way down –
draw the bow almost without pressure’. The conclusion, requiring
the same technique, contains the additional note ‘EPN’ (see Ex 4),
and the *pppp poss. lontano* disappears *a niente*, providing an outer
frame for the piece (‘the music disappearing into the silence from
whence it came’\(^6^0\)) that is to recur throughout Lewis’s career. The
slow elaboration of the opening note, a focus on its infinite variety of
timbral possibilities, is characteristic of the time and perhaps also of
many student works before and since – the sense of a *tabula rasa*
upon which even the simplest idea appears pristine and original.
However, the introduction of the other instruments and the melodic
gestures they initiate reveal a more dramatic turn of Lewis’s mind,
as well as an elegance of utterance even in this dissonant context,
which we shall see again in his maturity, for example, in the more
violent pages of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*.\(^6^1\)

The gradual superimposition of many textural layers, outwith any
pulse, indicates that the work’s progress is more gestural than
narrative, perhaps echoing the elaboration of Schäffer’s contours
into notes on the explanatory sheets from Lewis’s lessons. The quiet
but intense violin *glissandi* that provide a backdrop to the solo part
anticipate the foreground movement of much of *Mobile I* (and that
vocal work’s transformation into the instrumental *Mobile II*), and the

\(^6^0\) David Jones, programme notes for *Sometime Voices*, a concert of Lewis’s choral music given at
Manchester Cathedral, 13 August 2002.

\(^6^1\) See Chapter 4.7.
slowly unfolding lines here have a clear relationship with the much simpler, but equally concentrated – and, crucially, continuous – textures of Chant VII of 2003. This is a remarkable example of consistency over thirty-five years of composition, in idea if not in language (Ex 5).

Ex 5a Chamber Music, extract from pages 7 – 8 of manuscript, showing the violin parts only

The notation here refers to the teaching notes shown in Ex 4: ‘A’ means ‘Arco’, ‘O’ means ‘Ordinario’; the previous passage is played sul tasto.

---

62 The notation here refers to the teaching notes shown in Ex 4: ‘A’ means ‘Arco’, ‘O’ means ‘Ordinario’; the previous passage is played sul tasto.
Ex 5b Mobile I, bars 1 – 6
Lewis’s lessons with Don Banks seem to have had less impact; Banks’s use of serial techniques did not greatly interest Lewis, but he recalls some stimulating conversation about the difficulties of ‘free’ musical notation, arising from a discussion of the final section of *Epitaphium*. He also made some interesting and useful contacts through Banks, including the composers Anthony Gilbert and David Lumsdaine, and Keith Humble, the director of the Centre de
Musique at the American Center for Students and Artists in Paris. Lewis was invited to join Humble’s new music ensemble for a series of concerts held at the American Center’s building on the Boulevard Raspail. He performed as pianist, and his Cardiff contemporary, Howard Rees, was also involved, as a percussionist. Lewis recalls Morton Feldman coming to a rehearsal looking like a Chicago gangster and leaving with an exhortation to the young players to ‘keep up the good work!’

To be in Paris in May 1968 during the student riots was to be present at a defining moment in history, and Lewis remembers the vandalism, the blockades of the riot police and their battles with the students. It is tempting to view Lewis’s enthusiasm for Luciano Berio’s Sinfonia as, in part, nostalgia for that particular time and place, although it goes far deeper than that: Lewis gave some penetrating lectures on the work when I was a student of his, and some years earlier he had directed the Welsh première of the original chamber version of the O King movement with the UCNW Contemporary Music Ensemble.

After this extended period of postgraduate study came to an end, Lewis spent the autumn of 1968 supply teaching in South Wales: a rather anti-climactic conclusion to a productive year of study, performance and composition. This proved to be only the briefest of interludes, however, since Lewis successfully applied for a post
lecturing at what was then called the Leeds Music Centre. He took up the new appointment in January 1969.

2.4 Leeds

Jeffrey Lewis’s appointment as Lecturer in Twentieth-Century Composition Techniques and Experimental Music at the Leeds Music Centre gave the composer considerable freedom to write his own music and to lead performances of the music of other composers who interested him. He was surrounded by musicians who, those on the jazz course in particular, were open-minded and enthusiastic about new music, and were in many cases gifted executants. He formed a New Music Ensemble, initially for the annual Festival, but which then continued to produce a regular series of concerts during the year. He also taught at an Experimental Music Class at the Centre on Monday evenings.

Amongst the performances that were mounted were one of Terry Riley’s *In C* and two of Erik Satie’s *Vexations*. Gavin Bryars, in his 1979 article on performances of the Satie work, refers to the latter performances. The first was given in June 1971 as part of the Leeds College of Music Festival. As well as Lewis himself, a team of

---

63 Leeds Music Centre became the City of Leeds College of Music in 1971.
64 First published as ‘Vexations and its performers’, *Contact* xxvi (Spring 1983), 12 – 20, although originally intended for a monograph on Satie edited by Ornella Volta. It is now freely available as part of the JEMS (Online Journal of Experimental Music Studies) reprint series at <http://www.users.waitrose.com/~chobbs/Bryars.html> (Accessed 7 September 2009).
students took part in the mammoth undertaking, including Barbara Winrow, an evening class student who was later to be the pianist in the first performance of Lewis’s *Realizations*. The article notes that the duration of this first, incomplete, performance was sixteen hours and thirty minutes:

Owing to regulations governing the use of the building in which the performance took place, the piece had to end at midnight, when 611 repetitions had been played. Barbara Winrow recalls ‘the real sense of frustration which we felt’ and the players’ ‘remarkable reluctance to stop’ before they had reached 840 repetitions.65

A year later, in June 1972, the same team gave a complete performance lasting twenty-four hours thirty minutes:

This performance was a successful attempt to play the piece by the same people whose attempt in June 1971 (see above) had been frustrated. This time the venue was a church, ‘which made a better setting, both acoustically and aesthetically’. Each pianist played for much longer periods than in the earlier performance.66

This full account of the many contemporaneous performances of *Vexations* also reveals the geographical coincidence of another marathon, organised by the then Professor of Music at Bangor University, Reginald Smith Brindle, given in the window of Crane and Son’s Music Shop on Bangor High Street on 9 – 10 February 1969. This performance lasted a mere twenty-one hours:

The performance was given on two pianos, played alternately; each pianist played 20 repetitions, which lasted 30 minutes. The students were organised into

65 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
two groups of five and operated a shift system: 4.30 p.m. to 11.30 p.m., group 1; 11.30 p.m. to 6.30 a.m., group 2; 6.30 a.m. to 10 a.m., group 1; 10 a.m. to 1.30 p.m., group 2. The first and 840th repetitions were played by Professor Reginald Smith Brindle, then professor of music at Bangor, who wore academic dress and performed 'rather individually'; the students dressed formally.67

The increasing complexity of Lewis’s music at this time contrasts sharply with the simplicity of Vexations; perhaps he could, however, see in Satie’s construction a greatly magnified form of the harmonically static but, texturally speaking, infinitely active world of Ligeti’s Lontano, drawn out in time from ten minutes to twenty-four hours’ duration. It is the numbing power of endless repetition that destroys the listener’s perception of time in Vexations; Jonathan Kramer has given vivid anecdotal evidence of the effect of this music on an audience in his book, The Time of Music.68

In February 1972 Lewis conducted the Leeds College of Music Orchestra in the first public performance of his Cardiff piece, Fanfares with Variations, at Leeds Town Hall, a concert in which he also directed the orchestra in Beethoven’s Piano Concerto No. 1. The sole reason for him, rather than the usual conductor (and College Principal) Joseph Stones, to direct this unlikely repertoire was that the soloist was Lewis’s wife, Ann Airton.69

67 Ibid.
69 Lewis met Ann Airton, a newly appointed piano tutor at Leeds Music Centre, in January 1970 and they married in Sheffield six months later on St Swithin’s Day, 15 July. The couple divorced in 1975 and Ann Airton married Brian Newbould in 1976.
A former student at Leeds College of Music, the organist Peter Morrison, has confirmed the ongoing obsession on Lewis’s part with the music of Messiaen at this time; with the single exception of a short untitled organ piece which Lewis composed for his wedding, however, the music from this period shows no direct influence of the great Frenchman.

Lewis has also spoken about his encounter with Cornelius Cardew at this time. The Leeds College of Art was close to the old Leeds College of Music building on Cookridge Street and, either as part of the same initiative that took Cardew to Bradford College of Art in February 1972 and, three months later, to Cardiff College of Art, or during an earlier visit in March 1969, he also visited Leeds, and Lewis helped in organising a performance of part of *The Great Learning*.\(^\text{71}\)

Two pieces from this time stand out: *Mutations II* for organ and *Duologue* for violin and piano. *Mutations II* is a companion piece – in technique if not medium – to the orchestral *Mutations* premièred at

\(^{70}\) Conversation with the author, 2004.

\(^{71}\) An account of Cardew’s time spent working at the Art Schools is given in John Tilbury, *Cornelius Cardew (1936 – 1981) a life unfinished*, Harlow, 2008, 553 – 601. A visit to Leeds, on 16 March 1969, which included the first performance of Paragraph 2 of *The Great Learning* is mentioned on page 357 of Tilbury’s book. However, Lewis thinks it more likely that the later dates were the ones he was involved with; I asked him whether the 1969 reference was the correct one and he replied: ‘I’m not sure about the Leeds date – that would have been just after I’d started there in the January & it doesn’t feel right. Also the performance was in a church (Para. 2 for “choir” & organ), not the college of Art. I think the name of the church was St Aidan’s.’ (Correspondence with the author, 9 September 2009.) Lewis later confirmed that the name of the church was indeed St Aidan’s. (Conversation with the author, 18 January 2010.)
the 1969 Swansea Festival. It was written for the 1972 International Organist-Composer Competition in Zwolle, Holland, and Lewis was awarded second prize. The complexity referred to above is present in abundance in these scores. Both pieces display considerable density and violence, contrasted with moments of eerie stillness. A notable feature of both works is the device of an ‘expository chord sequence’ upon which the whole of the rest of each piece is based. In many different forms, this technique has stayed with Lewis throughout his career, often providing striking openings to his works and guaranteeing them an underlying cohesion of material.

In Mutations II, the chords are presented as a straightforward sequence (see Ex 6) and the pivot notes (C – E flat – B flat – C – F – F sharp) joining the chords provide a further set of pitches for development, or ‘mutation’. The figurations used both here and in Duologue remind one of Lutosławski’s keyboard writing in the later, leaner chamber works, such as the Epitaph for oboe and piano (1979), or the Partita for violin and piano of 1984 (see Ex 7), both in their chromaticism and in the degree of repetition employed. The texture, especially in Mutations II, tends towards a background activation of a narrow range of pitches, unlike the activation of more wide-ranging chords or clusters that would suggest Ligeti, or indeed other scores of Lutosławski (Livre pour orchestre, 1968, for example).

---

72 The first prize was won by Wim de Ruiter (born 1943) with Music for Organ.
However, if one slows down the rate of activation of these three or four note pitch sets to compare them with Lewis’s two *Mobiles*, which although composed in 1968 were revised in 1971, it is obvious that the thinking behind the technique comes from the same roots: an insistence upon a slow rate of harmonic change using limited pitch material but maximum textural variation (see Ex 5b above to see the first two points demonstrated clearly, and Ex 8 below to see the transformation of the relatively simple vocal textures of *Mobile I* into the more varied instrumental textures of *Mobile II*).

Ex 6 *Mutations II* for organ, opening
Ex 7a *Mutations II* for organ, continued (registrations as in Ex 6)
Ex 7b Lutosławski: *Partita* for violin and piano, movement 5, bars 107 – 114

Presto \( \dot{\omega} = \text{c.} \ 168 \)
Ex 8 Mobile II, bars 1 – 10
The techniques displayed in *Duologue* and *Mutations II* combine these ideas with the dramatic elements that were already present in the *Two Cadenzas* of 1966, but, especially in *Duologue*, they are now
more fully integrated into a satisfying structural whole. The serial techniques used in the outer sections of the second of the Two Cadenzas\textsuperscript{73} are found again in the final section of Duologue, and similar structural devices are used – repetition with tiny but telling changes; passages presented in retrograde form, starting and finishing at almost arbitrarily chosen points, the suddenness of the cutting reminding one as much of cinematic techniques as musical ones; and a strong sense of closure coming with a telescoped recall of the opening bars at the close of the work. In the Two Cadenzas crystalline, slow-moving textures provide momentary relief from the surrounding activity; in Duologue, the whole of the central section – similarly pellucid – creates an uncanny sense of time standing still, as the violin and piano circle warily around each other, only the pitches being precisely notated.

Something of the textural intensity of Ligeti’s work from the 1960s reappears in Lewis’s reworking of Mobile I into Mobile II, for two groups of instruments (Ex 8 above). Another chord sequence, this time a quotation from Debussy’s Prélude ‘...Feuilles mortes’, is here presented not at the opening of the piece but at key moments in the work. The idea of embedding pre-existing material, particularly material that is as strongly harmonically directed – and rhythmically clear – as the Debussy chords, into an otherwise melismatic texture

\textsuperscript{73} See Chapter 2.2 above.
is another way of distorting our perception of the passage of time; not only do we experience with something of a jolt a moment of rhythmic stability, but we also experience the shock of the familiar: the musical objet trouvé can create as surreal a landscape as anything in the visual arts. It also creates an illusion of time depth, a sense of perspective quite different from our usual experience of similar musical events happening in time relative to each other.

Quotation or allusion – whether acknowledged or not – plays a significant role in a number of Lewis’s scores. Lewis has spoken of ‘the smile factor’ in connection with his use of quotations in more recent works, most notably the references to Wagner’s Tristan und Isolde that pervade parts of the sequence of Sacred Chants composed between late 2002 and 2005: the juxtaposition of the familiar and the – often quite different – unfamiliar produces a pleasurable response, a smile of recognition. More controversially, perhaps, a deliberate reference to a familiar work can divert attention from a more general similarity to another work or style that a composer might wish to underplay.

74 A similar enjoyment may be derived from one of Lewis’s favourite works, the third movement of Berio’s Sinfonia.
75 The Liebestod quotations in Sacred Chant VI are quite obvious, and the references to Messiaen’s version of the same quotations in his Turangalîla-Symphonie are almost as clear. Perhaps Lewis is going to the extreme of quotation in order to draw attention away from the more general (though not continuous) influence of Messiaen on the organ writing here. David Lodge writes about this avoidance of what Harold Bloom described as ‘The Anxiety of Influence’ in the (1980) Afterword to his 1965 novel, The British Museum is Falling Down, a work in which Lodge deliberately adopts the style of a number of different writers (London, 1965, 1983). Lodge wrote his novel some years before Bloom published his theory in 1973.
The textural complexities of works such as *Mutations II* and *Duologue* are mostly fully notated; turning to *Mobile III*, which immediately preceded those scores, and *Strata*, which was the last work Lewis composed in Leeds, one finds the larger number of players used (six instrumentalists, including an impressive array of percussion, plus a vocalist, in *Mobile III*; twelve wind and brass players plus percussion in *Strata*) requires a more flexible approach to notation. This often involves the repetition of phrases or bars for a period of time measured in seconds, or, in the case of one improvisatory passage in *Mobile III*, minutes, the conductor co-ordinating the ensemble as a whole. The significance of moments such as these is that they exist outside any pulse, as pure texture. Lewis maintained an interest in creating such ‘timeless’ passages for another decade, even in comparatively (harmonically and rhythmically) straightforward works such as *Carmen Paschale*.

The title of one of the last pieces written in Leeds, *Dream Sequence* (1972), for countertenor, cello and harpsichord, reminds one that the temporal alchemy of works such as *Mobile II* and *Mobile III* creates a world closer to our experience of time during sleep and dreams than that experienced by our waking selves. The text comes from the ancient Hindu spiritual treatises, *The Upanishads*, from a

---

76 The repetitions in *Mutations II* are not given any timings but clearly rely on the same sense of judgement on the organist’s part as to what constitutes an effective end result.

77 The presence of a notional pulse does not, of course, guarantee that it will be perceptible, a point I develop further in Chapter 3.2.
section entitled *The Supreme Teaching – Dreams*. The opening line – ‘Abandoning his body by the gate of dreams the Spirit beholds in awaking his senses sleeping’ – inspires simpler textures and a greater reliance on expressive warmth than any of the other works discussed so far; the monodies of both the cello and the countertenor have the same intensity as the instrumental and vocal lines of *Mobiles I* and *II*, but are wide-ranging where the earlier works are constrained. This is a vein that Lewis will return to, reaching its peak in *Silentia Noctis* (1989), whose text, although less mystical than that of *Dream Sequence*, is nonetheless related in its subject matter.

### 2.5 Bangor

In January 1973, Jeffrey Lewis returned to Wales, this time to take up a post in the Department of Music at the University College of North Wales, Bangor. Only just thirty, with an impressive list of awards, prizes and commissions behind him, Lewis was about to join a department which, under the leadership of its recently appointed professor, William Mathias, was gaining a reputation as being vital and forward-looking.\(^{78}\)

---

\(^{78}\) Mathias was Professor and Head of Department between 1970 and 1988, succeeding Reginald Smith Brindle.
Lewis spent some twenty years as a Lecturer, later Senior Lecturer, at the University. His subjects included Composition, Orchestration and Twentieth-Century Studies, and he also formed and directed the activities of the Contemporary Music Ensemble.

Lewis discussed in his classes a range of twentieth-century repertoire with a strong preference for works that might be studied for their textural and colouristic interest as well as for their structural, harmonic, melodic and rhythmic qualities. These included works by Bartók (*Duke Bluebeard’s Castle, Music for Strings, Percussion and Celeste*), Berg (Violin Concerto, *Wozzeck*), Berio (*Sinfonia*), Crumb (*Vox Balanae*), Dallapiccola (*Quaderno musicale di Annalibera*), Debussy (*L’isle joyeuse, La mer, Nocturnes, Prélude a l’après-midi d’un faune*), Ives (*Three Places in New England*), Ligeti (*Chamber Concerto, Lux Aeterna*), Lutosławski (*Musique funèbre*), Messiaen (*Et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum, Oiseaux exotiques, Quatuor pour la fin du temps*), Ravel (*Gaspard de la nuit, Miroirs*), Reich (*Drumming*), Satie (*Le fils des étoiles*), Schoenberg (*Chamber Symphony No. 1, Piano Pieces Op. 11*), Stockhausen (*Inori*), Stravinsky (*Le sacre du printemps, Symphonies of Wind Instruments, Symphony of Psalms*), Varèse (*Amériques*).

There was some overlap between works used as examples in Composition and Orchestration classes and those used for analysis in Twentieth-Century Studies lectures.
Density 21.5) and Walton (the first movement of his Symphony No. 1).  

Just as there are some surprises on that list – in particular, the unexpected presence of the Walton Symphony and the Schoenberg Chamber Symphony – there are some surprising omissions too: no Webern, Dutilleux, Boulez, Feldman or Cage, for example. Other significant missing names include a large number of British composers, most notably Birtwistle, Maxwell Davies, Britten and Tippett. Perhaps more understandable is his avoidance of – with the exceptions noted above – any ‘symphonic’ music in his lectures, or indeed any music that relies on tonal argument (however extended that tonality might be) for its effect. Lewis has commented that his exclusion of certain works or composers was dictated by the University Library resources, although this did not prevent him discussing Crumb’s Vox Balanae, of which there was only a single score.

The music of Feldman (Christian Wolff in Cambridge, Three Clarinets, Cello and Piano, Vertical Thoughts I) and Cage (Amores) was included in the concerts of the University Contemporary Music Ensemble, and, over a decade, Lewis presented programmes that included

---

79 Reference was also made to the harmonic language of Wagner (Tristan und Isolde), Liszt (Mephisto Waltz No. 1) and Scriabin (the ‘mystic chord’).
81 Lewis did lecture on Tippett’s Concerto for Orchestra in the 1970s, but his growing dislike of the piece caused him to drop the work from his ‘repertoire’.
82 Conversation with the author, 2005.
student compositions and established contemporary repertoire in equal measure. Perhaps reflecting his activities at the American Center for Students and Artists, Lewis included a number of works by other American composers in these concerts: Lou Harrison (First Concerto for Flute and Percussion), Ives (The Unanswered Question), Reich (Clapping Music) and Rzewski (Coming Together) were amongst those represented. Contemporary classics were not neglected: works by Berg (Vier Stücke), Messiaen (Le baiser de l’Enfant-Jésus), Satie (Trois morceaux en forme de poire, Sports et divertissements, various songs), Stravinsky (Octet) and even Weill (various songs in arrangements by Berio and Dalwyn Henshall) were performed. Some British works were also heard – Purcell-Maxwell Davies (Fantasia on a Ground and Two Pavans), Machaut-Birtwistle (Hoquetus David), Bryars (Jesus’ Blood Never Failed Me Yet) – and, perhaps in homage to his former teacher, Stockhausen’s Tierkreis was given on two occasions.

Lewis’s output during the time he was lecturing at the University includes some three dozen scores (in the Catalogue these are numbered J 44, Refrain, to J 80, Lux Perpetua). The period 1978 – 1985 is the main focus of the present thesis, and is represented by works J 56, Memoria, to J 67, Fantasy; in this brief overview, therefore, the most important characteristics of the dozen or so works on either side of the central concerns of this study will be noted.
Throughout the 1970s and into the ’80s, Lewis’s output is studded by a sequence of orchestral works, mostly commissioned by the BBC. The two earliest scores, *Aurora* (1973) and *Praeludium* (1975), are quite different in scale, *Praeludium*, at nine minutes, being less than half the length of *Aurora*. There are similarities between the two works, however. Both deal in extreme contrasts: density and movement are countered by stillness and the sort of icy clarity already encountered in the central panel of *Duologue*.

*Aurora* is very much a work of two halves. While the opening is active and assertive, the conclusion explores regions of timelessness through slow, pulseless, ascending phrases and precisely imagined orchestral textures, dominated by quiet, widely spaced string chords, often topped with harmonics, and woodwind lines shadowed and highlighted by harp and tuned percussion. *Praeludium* is structured rather differently: it is constructed around a chord sequence, each chord of which is identified with a particular character and orchestration. The contrasts of density and stillness are here presented on a much more compressed scale than in *Aurora* and, just as the earlier piece may be viewed as an extended orchestral counterpart to *Duologue*, *Praeludium* may be seen as corresponding to *Mutations II*. Especially in its more tranquil moments, we catch glimpses of ideas to which Lewis was to return.

---

83 *Scenario*, written at the same time as *Praeludium*, is a work about which Lewis now has reservations and he has not shared any information about the work with me.
much later: the solo violin writing anticipates that of *Scena* (1988), and the quintal harmony comes into its own in the piano works from the 1990s (*Trilogy, Musica Aeterna*). Near the end of this ‘curtain-raiser’ there is a cadenza for percussion and timpani, the wide range of untuned instruments used in a generously vigorous manner to which, *Time-Passage* aside, Lewis has not returned.

Influences are not obvious. Lewis’s often violent musical contrasts could be seen as having an affinity to the ‘Movement’ and ‘Arrest’ in Tippett’s recent Symphony No. 3 (1970 – 2); *Duologue* and *Mutations II*, however, both predate the Tippett work and are already achieving similar aims. The brass fanfares which open *Aurora* suggest an affinity with the music of Charles Koechlin (the *Hymne au soleil* of 1933, although Koechlin’s fanfares are for strings and timpani); the widespread string textures already referred to, which are found again in *Memoria* and in the opening pages of Lewis’s Piano Concerto, echo those in Koechlin’s *Les bandar-log* (see Ex 9); the more decorative writing of the outer panels of *Trilogy* recalls the original piano version of *Les heures persanes*. This is an apt connection on several levels: Koechlin’s music was largely unknown

---

84 Lewis has commented on how often he was commissioned to write a piece for the ‘overture spot’ at this time – *Aurora, Praeludium* and *Memoria* were all required to sit in this uneasy position for their first performances.

85 It is perhaps the orchestration of the chords that open the Piano Concerto rather than the chords themselves that evokes memories of *Les bandar-log*: the opening chords of Lewis’s *Threnody* for piano suggests Koechlin rather less, even though there is a close harmonic similarity between those parts of *Threnody* and the Piano Concerto. *Les bandar-log* would have been familiar to Lewis through its inclusion on the EMI LP (ASD 639) which also contained Messiaen’s *Chronochromie* and Boulez’s *Le soleil des eaux.*
for many years, and that extraordinary Alsatian’s work falls into no convenient category. His music moves between extremes of the rigidly academic or the freely improvisatory, whilst Lewis’s explores the extremes of violent complexity and tranquil simplicity; Koechlin’s interests in plainchant and the gamelan mirror Lewis’s; and a strong sense of being beholden to no-one in compositional style pervades the work of both men.

Ex 9a Koechlin: *Les bandar-log*, bars 1 – 5 (string parts only)
Ex 9b *Aurora*, bars 150 – 151 (string parts only)

Ex 9c *Memoria*, bars 1 – 5 (string parts only)
Stravinsky seems to be hiding in the shadows of Praeludium: the language of the piece, certain gestures and turns of phrase, even occasional details in the orchestration (the final upward woodwind flourish, for example) all suggest that Le sacre du printemps was at the back of Lewis’s mind during its composition, even if the shape and structure of the work are quite different.\(^\text{86}\)

Unrelieved density is a feature of the 1977 ensemble piece, Time-Passage, too. This score was probably the most complex Lewis had

\(^{86}\) Lewis rejects the suggestion that Le sacre du printemps influenced the composition of Praeludium in any way; my assessment is based upon repeated hearings rather than a study of the score itself – Lewis now only possesses a transparency copy of the work.
written since his student days. Its figuration, however, anticipates that found in later, more consonant scores and is a significant development at this stage.\(^{87}\) It is worth noting that Lewis rejects the concept of consonance and dissonance in his own work.\(^ {88}\) It is certainly difficult otherwise to explain how Lewis could write a work like *Offeren y Llwyn* at the same time he was working on *Time-Passage*.

The choral piece is based almost entirely upon a single mode, A – B – C sharp – D – E – G: the sixth degree, F sharp, is rarely heard, although near the end it softens to an F natural; the third degree, C sharp, is occasionally changed to a C natural. The bass line is static, poised on an A for much of the piece; the ‘tonic’ of the mode, however, seems to be drawn towards E, which is where much of the melodic writing seems to aim. There is, considering the absence of harmonic movement, a curiously unsettled feel to the piece; phrases are short-breathed and the pacing of the work seems hurried. The modal writing seems for once to have inhibited Lewis’s usually reliable sense of scale and timing. By the time we next encounter this sort of language, in *Memoria*, Lewis had reached a very individual solution to its peculiar demands, a solution that is explored in detail in the chapter devoted to the orchestral work.

---

\(^{87}\) This is explored in detail in Chapter 3.1.

\(^{88}\) See Tommis, ‘Y Gitar Gymreig’, 22.
Lewis was invited at this time to write two organ pieces for Gillian Weir, *Esultante* in 1977 and *Momentum* in 1978. *Esultante* is a strikingly Messiaenic piece – there are echoes of *L’ascension* in the mystical second movement and of *Dieu parmi nous* in the ecstatic third. *Momentum* is a considerably darker work, characterised by fragmented rhythms and pounding repetition, ideas that resurface in the 1980s and ’90s. The gradual chord changes in more harmonically static passages anticipate the textures of the third section of *Tableau*, a similarly challenging and multi-faceted work.

At this point, the reader intending to follow a chronological survey of Lewis’s music must turn to the main body of the thesis (Chapters 3 – 7), where I examine six scores in depth: *Memoria*, *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, *Tableau*, *Carmen Paschale*, the Piano Trio and *Fantasy*. Lewis’s musical fecundity during this period was such that I could have chosen a number of other scores of similar quality for close examination – *Stratos*, *Elegy*, *Pro Pace*, *Limina Lucis*, for example. The reasons for my final selection are various. *Memoria* is, as I noted in my Introduction, the first large-scale work in which a very specific, new, harmonic direction – already hinted at in some earlier pieces – makes itself felt, and thus the structural thrust of the piece is significantly different to that of previous scores. *Epitaph* develops some important ideas first encountered in *Stratos* that would, in some form, remain a part of Lewis’s language for the next decade or more. Uniquely in Lewis’s output, it has explicit extra-
musical associations, which, for a composer whose thinking is largely abstract, offers a valuable insight into the relationship between notes, timbre, and texture, and what might provoke them into existence. **Tableau** is in some respects a transitional work, a musical laboratory or atelier, but, as well as sowing seeds that will grow to maturity over the next ten years or so, it also invites questions about how we listen and respond to musical structures more than any other of Lewis’s works from the period. **Carmen Paschale** was chosen over **Pro Pace** – a special case anyway, in that it requires live electronics for its performance – because it represents a return to choral writing, a medium which is to be hugely important to Lewis over the decades to come. The Piano Trio and **Fantasy** provide an opportunity to compare and contrast the composer at work with outwardly similar structures approached from quite different angles – melody predominates in one, harmony in the other – and to see the first fruits of ideas first planted in **Tableau**. I regret not having the space to explore **Limina Lucis** in greater detail, but that fine work would require a study of its own to do it justice: its relationship to **Carmen Paschale** and – less obviously – to **Memoria** are both touched upon here, but the harmonic language, orchestral writing and – again – the unusual construction of the work deserve detailed analysis beyond the scope of this thesis.
During this period, the Guild for the Promotion of Welsh Music published details of the commissions funded by the Welsh Arts Council since its records began in 1969. Lewis had received thirteen commissions in the eight years since his return to Wales in 1973. Five of these commissions were orchestral pieces, four of them premiered by the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra. To put these figures in context, the only composers who had received more invitations from the Welsh Arts Council were senior, well-established names: William Mathias (twenty-four), Alun Hoddinott (twenty-three), Daniel Jones (sixteen), David Harries (sixteen) and Mervyn Burtch (fifteen). However, all these composers had been resident in Wales during the entire twelve-year period under consideration. David Wynne received twelve commissions, John Metcalf eleven and Reginald Smith Brindle just one (although he had moved to the University of Surrey in 1970, taking him out of the principality and therefore rendering him ineligible for Welsh Arts Council funding). These statistics clearly illustrate Lewis’s steadily growing reputation as a composer during the 1970s and the early 1980s.

The first works Lewis completed after the period covered in the analytical chapters of this thesis, 1978 – 1985, were two choral pieces commissioned by Royston Havard, a fellow student at Cardiff. *Hymnus Ante Somnum* is a deceptively simple work, structurally

---

more sophisticated than it first appears. Although the spirit of John Tavener seems to be invoked here, both in general mood and in the verse-refrain shape, there is subtlety in the irregular alternation of the verse-refrain pattern, in the continual variation of phrase lengths and vocal scoring, and, especially, in the concluding hypnotic half-speed repetitions.\textsuperscript{90} The Lethean waters do indeed seem to wash over us in these final moments. There is in \textit{Hymnus Ante Somnum}, as there had been in parts of \textit{Carmen Paschale}, a strong flavour of plainchant in the shape of the melodic lines, and a quotation from the hymn \textit{Now the day is over} concealed in the organ part provides an additional layer of aesthetic pleasure for anyone who discovers it. The circumstances of the work’s composition are not unlike those which led to the composition of \textit{Offeren y Llwyn}: Lewis was asked to write a pair of anthems for the Cardiff Motet Choir, and he wrote first this vocally straightforward score, simplifying his language to suit the abilities of the dedicatees. Its successor, \textit{Sequentia de Sancto Michaele}, makes no such concessions.

Its fanfare-like opening and, later on, the undisguised octatonic scales (an unusually overt reference to Messiaen) create an uncharacteristic and rather self-conscious air of public utterance.

\textsuperscript{90} Tavener’s celebrated setting of William Blake’s \textit{The Lamb} (1982) similarly concludes with a half-speed phrase, but the effect is considerably weakened by having also been heard at the end of the first ‘verse’. Lewis uses this simple device to telling effect, completely avoiding any hint of the sentimentality that affects Tavener’s setting; Lewis’s work is more austerely objective and has a greater sense of musical inevitability.
Lewis seems here to have been constrained rather than liberated by the demonstrative text; that he can write in an extrovert, celebratory vein on his own terms is obvious from works such as *Limina Lucis*, or the climactic moments of *Carmen Paschale*. Here, however, it is the quiet conclusion that is undoubtedly the best part of the score.

In between the two anthems come two works for wind instruments, the Wind Quintet and *Sonante* for clarinet and piano, both of which date from 1986. The Wind Quintet could hardly provide a greater contrast to *Hymnus Ante Somnum*. Flowing chant-like lines have been replaced by irregular rhythms and jagged, fragmented melodic patterns. The Wind Quintet and *Hymnus Ante Somnum* display, like *Offeren y Llwyn*, *Time-Passage* and *Memoria*, signs of an increasing polarity between still, calm, harmonically uncomplicated pieces and more turbulent works. However, despite the angularity of much of the writing there is greater textural clarity here than in earlier, multi-layered scores such as *Time-Passage*. The irregular rhythms are often presented in unison, and the frequent use of quintal harmony, in conjunction with the medium itself, creates a lean and open sonority (see Ex 10, showing the contraction and expansion of the opening chords). The frequent occurrence of the number five in time signatures as well as the use of fifths in the harmonic writing perhaps suggests the track Lewis’s mind followed in composing for this number of instruments. The language of Messiaen’s *Et exspecto*
resurrectionem mortuorum, another wind-oriented piece, is suggested at times.

Ex 10 Wind Quintet, bars 1 – 4

From the first page, held single notes on one instrument emerge out of chords played by the whole ensemble. The structurally significant single note, again owing its origins to Messiaen, this time in the *Abîme des oiseaux* from the *Quatuor pour le fin du temps*, had already appeared in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, and we hear it again at critical points in the structure of both *Sonante* and *Cantus* – there seems to be timbral significance here, since in these works, as in the Messiaen, it appears on the clarinet. In the Wind Quintet, however, these sustained notes ricochet from instrument to
instrument, as they do with even greater violence in the violin and piano duo, *Scena*.\(^91\)

The circumstances surrounding the projected first performance, which was to have been given by the Athena Ensemble in Bangor, were unhappy: the rehearsal Lewis attended, some days before, was so under-prepared that not only did Lewis (on the prompting of his then PhD student, John Pickard) insist that the performance be cancelled, but the players themselves decided to abandon the whole concert. A year or so later, a quintet drawn mainly from the ranks of the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra (including Lewis’s old friend, the bassoonist Robert Codd) gave the work’s first performance in Aberystwyth.

*Sonante* dates from later the same year. In a virtuoso duo for clarinet and piano, it combines many of the compositional features I shall explore in greater detail in the chapters below on *Tableau*, the Piano Trio and *Fantasy*. Thus, we hear a dense ‘exposition’ which plays with our temporal expectations in gradually lengthening phrases. The length of these phrases is carefully controlled using Fibonacci numbers (also a feature of the Wind Quintet); the melodic phrases themselves combine fleeting references to chant-like shapes (again) and music by Debussy (*Children’s Corner*) and Dutilleux.

\(^91\) The texture of the latter work is discussed more fully below in Chapter 7.6.
(Ainsi la nuit) with the characteristic ascending lines that had started to appear as early as Aurora and that undergo many transformations in a range of guises and contexts. One of the strengths of Sonante is its fearless cutting from one type of musical material to another and the following section features moto perpetuo figuration of the sort we have also heard in the Piano Trio and Fantasy. There is a telescoped ‘recapitulation’ (an image of ever-tightening coils and spirals pervades this music – the Fibonacci influence at work, perhaps?) and, most unusually for Lewis, an abrupt cutting-off rather than a worked-through conclusion.

Scena, for violin and piano, is structurally and stylistically similar to Sonante, the peremptory opening gestures expanding into anxious longer phrases and violent, rhythmically unpredictable movement. It breaks new ground in its final pages, however: the unobtrusive embedding of melodic or harmonic motifs which repeat and fade into the distance. Threnody is the work in which this effect is most movingly achieved; in Scena, one almost feels that Lewis has not yet sensed the full significance of what he has written, and the work concludes with a brief recollection of the slowly ascending lines that bring Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise to its seraphic close.

92 The allusions or similarities to works by Dutilleux and Debussy are, according to the composer, coincidental, although the Debussy ‘reference’ could almost be considered a self-(mis)-quotation in the wake of the similar melodic shapes found in the final movement of Fantasy – see Chapter 7.7.
Both *Sonante* and *Scena* create dynamic structures in which different types of material are either contrasted (for example, the lullaby-like passages in both works act as a foil to the preceding violence, and clearly signal the final sections, different as they are) or grow organically from the opening bars. These works tackle the problems of the single-movement structure with a more traditional response to tension and relaxation than we encounter in *Memoria*, *Epitaph* or *Carmen Paschale*, where there is greater emphasis on either a seamless musical shape or a wave-like progression of climaxes.

Both works prepare the way for the single-movement Piano Concerto. A virtuoso work would have been out of character, and of no interest to Lewis in any case. However, a work in which dramatic contrasts have a part to play – so long as they could be integrated into a single movement and, most importantly, resolved in Lewis’s own distinctive manner – was not an unattractive proposition. It was commissioned for the 1989 Chelmsford Festival and first performed by Lewis’s long-time pianistic collaborator, Jana Frenklova. I have already commented upon the Koechlin-like wide-spaced string chords of the opening (and the obvious textural similarity to the openings of both *Memoria* and *Threnody*), and this chord sequence underpins the whole work. (Lewis once remarked to me that
‘sometimes I feel I’ve spent my whole life writing chaconnes’ – an exaggeration, of course, and easily open to misconstruction, but a clue as to one of the ways Lewis achieves structural unity in some of his scores.) The piano writing often recalls Ravel (there are echoes of the Piano Concerto for the Left Hand at the first entry of the soloist), and in the brief and noticeably unvirtuosic cadenza the Prelude to Tristan und Isolde is quoted.

Whereas in Sonante the Debussian reminiscences, from ‘The Little Shepherd’, are apposite, Lewis’s use of Wagner here, and again in the Sacred Chants of 2003 – 5, is less easily explained. Their function seems to be more closely related to that of the quotations in Mobile II from Debussy’s ‘...Feuilles mortes’ (Préludes, Book II) which were discussed above.

*Dreams, Dances and Lullabies* returns to a world close to Lewis’s heart, that of the mystery of the night. This work for solo harp is based on a quotation from a Welsh folk song, *Hun Gwenllîan*, and its title (originally *Lullabies, Dances and Dreams*, but mistakenly reordered by John Metcalf when he produced Elinor Bennett’s recording of the piece for Lorelt, and transferred in that form to the published score) comes from a short poem composed by Lewis

---

94 Sonante is dedicated to Lewis’s daughter, Sarah Heloise, who was born – on his birthday – in 1985.
95 See Chapter 2.4.
himself. I have referred elsewhere to the ‘uneasy lullaby’ near the end of *Sonante*, and its recurrence in *Scena*; that mood seems to pervade this nocturne too, reminding us that Lewis had two young children at home when he was writing the piece.

*Silentia Noctis – The Silence of the Night* – continues the nocturnal theme, although the associations contained within this triptych are sexual rather than innocently child-like. Many of Lewis’s now-familiar fingerprints can be found in this refined work: a melodic style derived from plainchant; vocal lines highlighted by the piano; the rocking paired quavers in the piano that we have heard in the ‘lullaby’ section of *Sonante*. The dramatic element, crucially, is also present here; characteristic ideas are put to the service of the text with correspondingly heightened expression – hear, for example the rising vocal line at the words ‘I raise me up…’ in the first part, or the way the paired quavers melt into a picture of the poet Petronius’s dream-world in the central panel, aided and abetted by a perfectly timed bass-line: the two interdependent musical terraces perfectly evoking one succumbing to sleep. In the final section, the range of the vocal pitch-set gradually shrinks as the lover’s thoughts become ever more obsessively centred on the one significant element of the past; the circling (inwardly spiralling) melodic shapes mirror this, bringing with it an intense musical depiction of obsessive love (Ex

---

97 See Chapter 7.6 for further discussion of this texture.
The techniques learnt in *Sonante* and *Scena* are here put to simpler but still more dramatically effective use.

Ex 11a *Silentia Noctis*, bars 120 – 123
Threnody was written for Jana Frenklova. It has a poignant history: it is dedicated to the memory of Thomas, the son of Frenklova and Bruce Wood, who had died, aged only two, in 1990. The slow-moving chords of the opening recall the string chords which open the Piano Concerto, and there follows a melodically decorated variation of this chord sequence: another ‘chaconne’. Between these two sections there is a collection of melodic fragments suspended within a second, simpler, chord sequence; these fragments foreshortened in the final moments of the work, and at the same time Lewis almost imperceptibly introduces the motifs that will conclude the work. He suggests a floating away into time and space through use of the extreme registers of the piano, and he times the
(dis)appearance of the motifs with care: this technique, which I noted occurring near the end of Scena, has now been completely assimilated and here produces a haunting effect (Ex 12).

Ex 12 Threnody, page 6, last 7 bars

At the time of the first performance of Threnody, Lewis was writing his Westminster Mass, one of a series of Mass settings commissioned by Martin Neary for Westminster Abbey – further evidence that Lewis’s music was arousing interest, and not only in Wales, at this time. In the late summer of 1992 he was, together with John
Tavener and Arvo Pärt, a featured composer at the Vale of Glamorgan Festival, during which his *Lux Perpetua* was premiered by the Hilliard Ensemble.

Reviews of *Lux Perpetua* were favourable. Stephen Pettitt, writing in *The Times*, was far more enthusiastic about the piece than he was about the other major new work of the Festival, John Tavener’s *A Village Wedding*, and indeed about much of the music by Arvo Pärt:

Jeffrey Lewis’s *Lux Perpetua*, a beautiful pocket requiem for unaccompanied voices whose direct but poetic manner (no Welsh fire-and-brimstone here) made it stand up well beside arguably the most important new work I heard… Tavener’s *A Village Wedding* [in which]…the principal feature was an irritatingly simple tune …for some reason the work simply did not take flight. Pärt’s *Berlin Requiem* felt laboured, while the three-movement *Trivium* for organ alone lived down to its title and *Cantate Dominum* said little.

Kenneth Loveland was writing from the perspective of a Welsh critic who had been following Lewis’s career since the composer’s student days in Cardiff; he commented that ‘at 49, [Lewis] seems on his way to a wider recognition than has so far been accorded him. His style has now acquired the distinctive personality to which one always felt it would aspire…’ This view acknowledges the stylistic integrity of *Lux Perpetua*, but rather oddly ignores almost a decade and a half’s worth of recognisably individual composition. However, in other respects, Loveland’s words must have seemed a reasonably accurate

---

summation of Lewis’s career as he approached his fiftieth birthday – there had been a steady stream of commissions, many from internationally renowned musicians and organisations, as well as fairly frequent broadcasts of his orchestral and chamber works, but to date a wider fame had eluded him.

A little over a year earlier, in 1991, a new development occurred that, had it come to fruition, might have enhanced Lewis’s career and reputation still further, both in the UK and abroad. Helen Hodkinson, Executive Producer for New Music at Virgin Classics, wrote: ‘Following a hearing of your orchestral piece Memoria on Radio 3 a week or so ago... I am very keen to hear cassette recordings of as much of your work as possible, as I feel, certainly after listening to the performance of Memoria, your work may well be appropriate for this important (on-going) Series.’

Over the next few months, plans to record a disc of Lewis’s orchestral music started to take shape; this was to include Memoria and, possibly, a new work. Lewis hoped that Limina Lucis would also be recorded – he sent the score to Virgin Classics – and it would indeed have made a very suitable coupling with Memoria.

---

100 Letter of 16 May 1991 to the composer. The series referred to was for Virgin Classics’ contemporary music catalogue.
101 The first complete draft of Lewis’s O Mare is dated 15 November 1991 and could well have been Lewis’s response to the prospective commission.
In 1992, Virgin Classics was taken over by EMI, and the project was abruptly abandoned. This must have been a bitter disappointment to Lewis, and the success of the Vale of Glamorgan Festival performances must have seemed a poor substitute for the promise of an orchestral recording, released internationally. Rogers Covey-Crump states that the Hilliard Ensemble liked Lewis’s *Lux Perpetua* very much, and they have programmed it on a couple of occasions since. However, a further opportunity for exposure of Lewis’s music was missed when, in 1996, the work was not included in the ECM New Series double-CD set *A Hilliard Songbook: New Music for Voices*, which included other works commissioned at around the same time.

The timing of the Virgin Classics takeover could not have been worse for Lewis. There had been difficulties in his marriage, leading to separation in 1993 and divorce in 1998; nervous illness – depressive and obsessive in origin, exacerbated by a stressful period of academic upheaval at the University – started to appear more

---

102 Email correspondence with the author, 7 – 8 January 2009.
103 ECM New Series 1614/15 453 259-2, 1996. John Casken’s *Sharp Thorne*, of 1991 – 2, for example, was included in the same programme as *Lux Perpetua* when that work was performed at the Spitalfields Festival in 1994 and later recorded.
104 This was Lewis’s second marriage – he married Sheelagh Hywel in 1983.
105 The highly successful curriculum built around ‘period studies’ (in which courses in Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, Romantic and Twentieth-Century music were all taught by a combination of essays, analyses and pastiche exercises) introduced by William Mathias in the 1970s were replaced by modular courses devised by the new Professor, John Harper. Lewis was deeply depressed by this change in the curriculum, a change that still angers him and that he feels was, educationally, a retrograde step, since it meant not only that students could elect to take options that were (subjectively) of only ephemeral value, but also – and more significantly – that a student could complete a degree course without any contact with twentieth-century or contemporary music whatsoever.
and more frequently, leading to a decision to take early retirement in 1993. In fact, Lewis was not to return to the University at all after the end of the summer term of 1992, as he spent a lengthy period of time in London’s Bethlem Royal Hospital in the autumn of that year. His room at the University was cleared and his books, scores and recordings returned to his home in Llanfairfechan. Unfortunately, not all of his belongings came back and Lewis suspects that a degree of pilfering went on. This, together with the sense of personal violation that must have accompanied such an undignified end to a teaching career, may be, I suspect – although I admit that it is pure speculation – the reason why, although almost twenty years have elapsed since his departure from the University, he has not yet been able to sort methodically through the scores, parts and manuscripts in his two workrooms at home: yet another item may be found to be missing.

At this point, Lewis’s career as a composer – mostly, as we have seen, successful, and frequently searching for new and more concise ways of expressing musical and extra-musical preoccupations – started to change direction.

2.6 Illness and Retirement

Jeffrey Lewis’s hospitalisation in the autumn of 1992 gave him, unexpectedly, the time and mental space to concentrate on
composition, without outside distractions. He was able to work to a daily routine, and by the end of November had completed a large-scale piano piece, *Trilogy*. The outer movements are structurally identical – the same number of bars, the same type of events; it is the notes themselves that differ, rather in the manner of Satie’s *Gymnopédies*: the same music is heard as if from a different vantage point. The central movement reworks the material in the rhythmically ‘convulsive’ style already found in the Wind Quintet. The structure of the first movement is fragmented and then reordered in the second, but one can map bars from the opening, slow and hypnotic, panel onto this vigorously alert ‘harmonic, rhythmic, study’.¹⁰⁶ The rhythmic aspect of the second movement clearly owes something to the Stravinsky of the final pages of *Le sacre du printemps*. A dreamlike aura pervades the outer panels of the work; near quotations from ‘…Feuilles mortes’ again make an appearance, and there is a beatific calm about the superimposed fifths that conclude these sections. Such an extensive use of quintal harmony is a new departure, at least in this pure form, even though Lewis had used it in parts of the Wind Quintet and it had been an incidental part of his vocabulary since at least as far back as 1979 (*Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*).¹⁰⁷ Perhaps significantly, Lewis’s next major piano score, *Musica Aeterna* (1996 – 7), was also written

---

¹⁰⁶ Lewis’s own description, used in the programme notes for my recording of the work released in 2001.

¹⁰⁷ It also appears, fleetingly, in *Praeludium* (1975).
during a long spell in hospital, and its conclusion too is announced by superimposed perfect fifths.

I referred in my Introduction to the period of intense compositional activity which followed Lewis’s unexpectedly early departure from the University of Wales. Neither Trilogy nor his next work, Litania, were written to commission: the central section of Trilogy was originally conceived as a work for brass ensemble before taking flight in its present medium; Litania started life as a study in timbre. Lewis has maintained a habit over the years of imagining unusual – and sometimes unlikely – combinations of instruments, and Litania was the result of one such flight of fancy.\textsuperscript{108} Like Chamber Music (1968) for solo violin with three flutes (doubling piccolo) and six violins, the scoring of Litania (two piccolos, harp, celesta and percussion) favours a treble-oriented balance; even those instruments that are capable of producing lower pitches or sounds (harp, tam-tam) often have an ‘edge’ to their attack which counters excessive bass resonance. The use of the triangle beater to produce tam-tam strokes and the frequent harp harmonics are good examples of this timbral manipulation.

The musical starting point of Litania is the twelfth-century plainchant melody of Adam de St Victor, Jubilemus Deo, which Lewis

\textsuperscript{108} Another is an untitled, two-page, eighteen-bar fragment, dated 5 April 1995, for piccolo, harp and percussion (one player – tam-tam, medium and large suspended cymbals).
uses again in *Antiphon*, essentially a theme and variations for trumpet and organ. *Litania* is structurally a much more sophisticated work, and in it Lewis uses an embedded chord sequence as an unchanging ‘objet’ rather than subjecting it to continued variation or commentary. In this respect it harks back to the embedded Debussy quotations in *Mobile II*. There, however, the fixed and clearly recognisable chords provided moments of focus (harmonic and rhythmic) within a less sharply etched texture; here, the rhythmic language of the whole work is crisp and precise. There are also some textural effects here (rapid crescendi and decrescendi on single repeated notes, for example) that refer back to earlier, complex scores such as *Time-Passage*, reinforcing the view that Lewis has never turned his back on the language of his pre-1978 scores but has simply refined and (occasionally) simplified it. The ubiquitous ascending melodic lines take on a harmonised form here which is a new development – although we have already seen them as piled-up piano chords in the second movement of *Fantasy*, in which form they recur in *Bellissima* and *Risoluto* – and the ritualistic conclusion takes the *Threnody*-like ‘spaced-out’ ending, but measures out the beats in a strict Fibonacci progression. Indeed, ritual seems to underpin the whole work, which led me to comment in my programme notes for the first performance that the title irresistibly leads one to think of Stravinsky’s description of his
Symphonies of Wind Instruments as ‘an austere ritual unfolded in terms of short litanies’.  

Commissions continued to be forthcoming as well during this fertile period: Lewis completed two settings of the Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis, one for Bangor Cathedral and one for St George’s Chapel, Windsor. They were completed just a fortnight apart, but Lewis tackled each setting quite differently: the Bangor setting is in a white-note, modal style, whilst the Windsor setting makes a more varied use of organ textures and timbres. The Bangor setting was later adapted from its SATB original for boys’ voices. The circumstances of its première have already been described in the Introduction.

In Cantus, a two-movement work for clarinet and piano, a quasi-Eastern evocation of gongs and bells in both instruments is imaginatively painted, and Lewis demonstrates here how his use of a concentrated exposition can work even in a static, undramatic context. A comparison of the opening bars of Sonante with Cantus reveals the same techniques in action despite the huge difference in mood between the two works. The dedicatees of Cantus, Peryn Clement-Evans and Harvey Davies, had done much to promote Sonante in the preceding years, and commissioned the work for

---

109 See Chapter 3.6 for Lewis’s response to this and other comparisons with the works of other composers.

110 See Chapter 7.6 for an extract from the opening bars of Cantus.
performance at the Beaumaris Festival in 1996. The opening pages of the second movement seem rather undercomposed: a single line of melody in the low treble of the piano (echoing the rhythmic writing encountered in \textit{Litania}) punctuated by occasional bass notes does not create the sense of intense dynamic activity that would provide a contrast to the near-immobility that pervades the first movement.\footnote{Lewis has, however, observed that such a contrast was not his aim, and he rejects the notion that this part of the piece is underwritten – instrumental monody is not unique to this work in his output, and the texture is precisely what the composer had intended.} However, the work’s telescoped conclusion brings the work round full circle in a wholly satisfying manner, providing a further structural reminiscence of \textit{Sonante}, although here it is the slower material that is reprised. I shall discuss the connection between the ending of \textit{Cantus} and that of the Piano Trio in my chapter devoted to that work and \textit{Fantasy}.

Harvey Davies, this time together with his mother, Helen, commissioned \textit{Night Fantasy} for piano duet. The rhythmic writing here is much more convincingly `fleshed out’ and something of the influence of Louis Andriessen’s harmonic style may be detected in the piece. The connection between the `piled-up’ chords found in Andriessen’s \textit{De Staat} and those in certain of Lewis’s works from the mid to late ’90s and the turn of the millennium is discussed in the chapter on the Piano Trio and \textit{Fantasy}.\footnote{See chapter 7.6. This pounding chordal texture can also be found in works as early as \textit{Momentum} (1978).} Coincidentally, Lewis found himself seated next to Andriessen at a dinner during the
Waterford Festival in Ireland at the time of a performance of Night Fantasy.

1996 proved to be another year of ill-health. I met Lewis in February of that year at a lunchtime performance of Carmen Paschale given by the BBC Singers under Stephen Cleobury at Manchester University, and was aware then that he was distracted. The BBC announcer, Rodney Slatford, made reference in his spoken introduction (this was a live broadcast) to an Abelard and Heloise music theatre project which was in the exceptionally early planning stages at that time. Lewis had mentioned it in passing when Slatford had called him a few days earlier to prepare his script, but he had not realised that the information would enter the public domain. It cast a shadow over the rest of the day for him and even, I think, coloured his reception of the performance. By the autumn, Lewis was back in hospital. As had been the case four years earlier, however, he found the atmosphere conducive to creative work.

Musica Aeterna was the result. It is an extraordinary score, and one which bemused Lewis himself, as he remarked to me the first time I saw it. It is closer to the first of Ligeti’s organ Studies, ‘Harmonies’ (1967) than anything else, although written on a much larger scale; there are affinities too with the more slow-moving of Messiaen’s organ works. From that the reader will have gathered that it is a chordal ‘study’, an étude in harmonic writing for the composer as
much as in tonal control for the pianist. The development of pianistic (or indeed any other instrumental or vocal) skills *per se* holds little interest for Lewis and the suggestion (again by Harvey Davies) to write a set of piano studies became simply a convenient hook for Lewis’s ideas. Such a massively conceived score deserves more space than is available here, but, briefly, instead of building up a piece from the fragments of a dense but brief exposition, Lewis here works on a larger scale from the very opening. There are no spirals here; in their place are two interlocking wedges: the material which predominates in the first part of the piece is gradually superseded by ideas which at first are presented as interruptions, ‘folds in the texture’, to use a phrase I shall return to in my analysis of *Memoria*. The mosaic of short motifs found in *Threnody* and the first movement of *Cantus* is here magnified to form an imposing structure. Lewis set himself challenges in devising the chord sequences at the opening (Ex 13), but paradoxically there is no scheme that an analyst can point to as a ruling equation for the piece – just at the point where a pattern seems to be forming Lewis pulls the rug from under us. Even the irregular phrase lengths of the first section are really only explicable as a way of making sure the listener does not get too comfortable. There are, yet again, embedded chord progressions (*ppp misterioso*) which use the

---

113 See below for a discussion of Lewis’s techniques in forming chords and chord sequences.

114 One is reminded of Boguslaw Schäffer’s note referring to ‘unequal symmetries’ and ‘small asymmetry in symmetry’ almost thirty years earlier.
extreme keyboard registers: echoes of both the central section of the Piano Concerto and the closing bars of *Threnody*.

Ex 13 *Musica Aeterna*, bars 1 – 26

As with *Trilogy*, there is an air of serenity about the piece: I have already commented upon the blissful quality of the superimposed fifths which bring both works towards their conclusions. It is clear from the title that Lewis was again trying to create a sense of timelessness, to fashion a work which emerges from silence and
disappears back into it. Tempting as it is to look for a spiritual
dimension here – and I referred in the programme notes for my
recording of the work to the Walt Whitman-like measured movement
of the cosmos (‘O great rondure…’) – my belief now is that here, and
in the many similar attempts to achieve stillness through the
movement of music in time, Lewis is, consciously or not, trying to
demonstrate that inner peace is possible, even for a troubled mind.
There is nothing to be gained from looking for a Messiaen-like
religious angle here, or even a Holstian mysticism (although The
Planets is, unexpectedly, a work Lewis admires; I shall refer in my
final chapter to some parallels between Lewis and Holst).

Musica Aeterna was completed in January 1997; the double bar of
Teneritas was put in place some eight months later. Yet another
commission from Harvey Davies, this time with flautist Jonathan
Rimmer, this is a much gentler piece than Cantus. There is just one
moment of harmonic density (an echo of the second movement of
Cantus) but it is essentially concerned with a single, simple moment
of modal change. Again, Lewis seems to be trying to achieve a sense
of time being stretched almost to a standstill: whilst eight minutes is
not an unusual length for a flute and piano duo, for a harmonically
static work it is long enough to be disorientating. There is a familiar
soundworld of bells and gongs, the piano highlights the flute’s
melodic line, and the whole piece grows out of its concentrated
exposition. It is the extreme simplicity of concept that is the new
departure here, and this will resurface in several of the *Sacred Chants*.

There is a gap in the work-list at this point, no doubt caused by yet another setback for Lewis. The application to the Welsh Arts Council for funding for *Teneritas* (submitted by Harvey Davies) was refused, and, especially given Lewis’s somewhat precarious state of health, this must have been a particularly cruel blow. No reason has ever been given for this refusal and no subsequent approach to the WAC or its recent incarnations has proved successful.

A commission from Matthew Greenall and the Elysian Singers for a choral work to be premièred at York Minster in October 1999 seems to have inspired Lewis to give of his best again. The ‘structural slipperiness’\(^\text{115}\) of *Memoria* returns in *Recordatio*, and the work proceeds in a series of expertly controlled waves; thus it also shares some structural similarities with *Carmen Paschale*, as well as a common text source, Helen Waddell’s *Medieval Latin Lyrics*. There is a sense of authority – and authenticity – about this score. Techniques honed in other works are used here with real confidence: an almost filmic fading in and out from idea to idea, and a genuine attempt to create music for the temporal and spatial properties of the performance venue for which it was written. Not surprisingly, we

hear echoes of plainchant again; unexpectedly there are evocations of bells here too (another parallel with *Memoria*).

2000 saw the production of two relatively short pieces; they could not, however, be more contrasted. *Bellissima* was written for Ensemble Cymru (a familiar and faithful line-up including Harvey Davies, Jonathan Rimmer, Peryn Clement-Evans and his brother Huw) and first performed at the Bangor New Music Festival. It is dedicated to Lewis’s children, Richard and Sarah, and takes as its starting point an Ibiza ‘House Anthem’ in tribute to Richard’s interest in DJ mixing at that time. The playback of the original before Lewis’s ‘remix’ would have undoubtedly surprised some of his former colleagues.

The second commission of the year was *Dead Leaves*, for the recorder player, John Turner, and pianist, Keith Swallow. It was given at the Machynlleth Festival, and is a gentle elegy dedicated ‘to the memory of Chouchou’ and based again on Debussy’s ‘...Feuilles mortes’. A subsequent commission for John Turner, *Risoluto*, was completed in early 2004. It has been recorded but to date has not received a public performance. Like *Bellissima*, it is in Lewis’s ‘rhythmic-convulsive’ style. It is scored for recorder, oboe, bassoon and piano.
A long period of silence followed *Dead Leaves*. At around that time I completed recording my first disc of Lewis’s music, which included *Threnody* and *Trilogy* as well as *Sonante*, *Cantus* and *Teneritas*. Lewis became involved in every aspect of getting the disc ready for production, spending a great deal of time and energy on the project. I believe this distracted him from facing the difficult fact that there were no new commissions coming in, there had been no broadcasts of his music since February 1996, and that he was feeling more and more isolated from the musical mainstream. What he heard of new music did not impress him – indeed he was, and is, fiercely critical and often contemptuous of much that was broadcast – and what might be termed ‘avoidance tactics’ became a pattern that to this day is a part of Lewis’s life.

In August 2002, a concert of his choral and organ music was given at Manchester Cathedral.\(^\text{116}\) This was given to coincide with the opening of an exhibition of paintings by Mick Brown and Jeni Farrell-Booth, two artists based on Anglesey. Brown had been one of the original collaborators on the (thus far) ill-fated Abelard and Heloise music-theatre piece, and he had used a recording of *Carmen Paschale* as a continuous soundtrack for a previous ‘installation’ at the Ucheldre Centre in Holyhead. The Manchester concert was deemed a success by both audience and participants, and a repeat

\(^{116}\) See the Catalogue for full details of this event.
was planned for the following February, this time at Bangor Cathedral. For that, Lewis composed four *Sacred Chants*, one to precede each of the other works in the programme.

It was difficult to imagine how these scores might have had a life beyond that particular event – not because of any question of quality, but simply because they were so clearly ‘preludes’ to the larger works. After the concert, however, Lewis kept composing and by the summer of 2003 he had added a number of other Chants to the original four, for a variety of scorings – solo organ, a cappella voices, choir and organ. Then, composition stopped and it was not until he was asked for a work for female voices to be performed at Liverpool Anglican Cathedral in February 2005 that Lewis picked up where he had left off, firstly with a revision and extension of *Chant III* for that event. After some encouragement from me, by the end of 2005 a set of eleven *Sacred Chants* was ready for performance, again in Manchester Cathedral, in February 2006.

Lewis would be the first to admit that the assembly and ordering of the pieces that make up this set was, to a certain extent, dictated by chance. However, after listening to this eighty-minute sequence in one sitting, there is no doubt in my mind that here is the true home for the first four Chants, the third in its revised and extended form; the complete cycle provides the listener with a powerful musical experience. That is not to say that individual movements may not be
extracted and performed separately: indeed, I have taken the three a cappella Chants and given them in performance between pieces by Tallis and Byrd, to convincing effect.

Lewis used the quotation from *Tristan und Isolde* which had found its way into *Chant II* in several of the subsequent pieces: more Wagner appears in what were to become *Chants V* and *VI*. Lewis had taken the powerful eroticism of *Carmen Paschale* as the starting point for the new Chant written to precede the Bangor performance in 2003, and this was a cue to weave the Wagner quotations into the music; there was obviously still a fascination in creating works around Wagner quotations, culminating in the organ solo (*Chant VI*) which echoes Messiaen’s *Turangalîla-Symphonie* in its powerful, *Liebestod*-based climaxes. The difference between his treatment of Wagner and Messiaen’s lies in the tension Lewis creates between this sensual, almost neo-Romantic style and the chaste plainchant-like lines that are woven into the texture and given equal weight and significance. The presence of Lewis’s ‘musical letters’ as a cryptogram in *Chant VI* indicates an element of musical self-portraiture here.\(^{117}\)

Discussion of the *Sacred Chants* almost brings this brief survey of Lewis’s life and career up to date. Since their première, Lewis has

---

\(^{117}\) Lewis uses the letters (notes) E – F – F – R (D) – E – E – S (E flat), which are taken from his full name, in much the same way that he takes A – B (B flat) – E – A – D – H (B) – E – S (E flat) – E from the combined names of Abélard and Heloise in *Epitaph* (see Chapter 4).
worked on a number of other scores. Three – *Beyond the Heavens*, for soprano, viola and piano, a substantial (but as yet untitled) piano work, and another, shorter, piano work entitled *Memoria Echoes* – have been finished. Two further piano works are almost complete: the first, started in March 2009, is on a similar scale to the previous, untitled, piano piece; the second, started in March 2010, will be shorter and has already been given a title, *Pulsing*. Lewis is also working on a new choral piece, *Fons amoris*, based on the Latin poem *Stabat Mater speciosa*, a Christmas counterpart to the more familiar passiontide text, *Stabat Mater dolorosa*. Two other projects have been, for the moment, set to one side: a work for cello and piano (for Heather Bills and Harvey Davies) and a trio for alto flute, viola and harp which flautist Jonathan Booty invited Lewis to write for his ensemble after attending the first performance of the *Sacred Chants*.

*Beyond the Heavens* was first performed at Lewis’s sixty-fifth birthday concert held in the Powis Hall, University of Wales, Bangor, in November 2007; the programme also included the première of *Sereno*, and performances of *Gweledigaeth* (the first for almost forty years), *Night Fantasy* and *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*. The textures of *Beyond the Heavens* are often spare, and a sense of the

---

118 Despite its title, *Memoria Echoes* shares only an all-embracing air of tranquillity with *Memoria* itself.
work's conclusion being its raison d'être recalls the beautifully judged endings of both *Silentia Noctis* and *Threnody*.¹¹⁹

The textures of the two recent untitled piano works are quite different, and return to the world of *Musica Aeterna*. The writing is often dense, and the structure of the completed piano work – increasingly complex right-hand textures over implacable left-hand chords – is presented as a single trajectory. There is a considerable element of risk in Lewis’s concept: the simple, almost naïve, opening bars (Ex 14a) – Ravel in neo-Baroque disguise (recollections of *Le jardin féerique*?) – are ruthlessly transformed into music that is both formidable and unrecognisable (Ex 14b). Placing the opening and closing pages side by side clearly illustrates the scale of the journey, which is some twenty-five minutes in execution. The relentless intellectual progress is disguised as an unbroken musical line whose cumulative power comes from an absence of punctuation, a refusal to submit to periodicity or to offer the listener the comfort of articulation points.

¹¹⁹ I discuss the text of *Beyond the Heavens*, and its significance in the context of music that aims to create a sense of timelessness, in Chapter 3.7.
Ex 14a *Untitled Piano Piece* [J 101] (2008), bars 1 – 13
Lewis has provided me with several sheets of chords and chord sequences, and in one case, a list of whole-tone scales and five- or six-note chords formed by combining the scale with one or two ‘foreign’ notes. They give invaluable insight into Lewis’s working.

---

120 There are few dates on these sheets and I suspect the earliest pages date from the 1980s – one looks very like the chord sequence that Lewis used as an orchestration exercise for the Bangor Year 3 BMus students. Another set is dated 14/2/09; it also contains some of Lewis’s thoughts on possible titles for his *Untitled Piano Piece* [J 101]: ‘RELENTO? Surge? Relentless. Waves. Illuminare? (surge)’
methods, at least at the preliminary stages. The most fascinating
structures are what Lewis has described as ‘Symmetrical Chords’,
referring to their palindromic interval structures. This way of
thinking has its roots in Lewis’s composition lessons with Boguslaw
Schäffer.121 Schäffer’s composition, Nonstop, already referred to,
contains instructions to the pianist(s) to create chords whose right
and left hand shapes mirror each other. An early page of Lewis’s
composition notes from 1968 included a simple analysis of a chord
by counting the semitones between the notes, a habit that must
have become ingrained and certainly informs these more recent
sketches, and no doubt much else besides. Lewis has pointed out
that in these chords there is minimal octave doubling, and that the
chords are either wide-spread – often with fifths or tritones as their
outer intervals – and thus pianistically unplayable without grace
notes in the bass or delayed upper notes (both a constant feature of
Lewis’s piano writing in both his solo and chamber works), or else
closely spaced in the middle register of the piano. Ex 15a shows
examples drawn from this recent catalogue of chords. It is worth
adding that the wedge-shaped progression that opens out from a
tightly packed five-note starting point to the physically impossible
eleven-note conclusion (second line) could easily be regarded as a
reservoir of notes, or turned into a pitch-set or mode.

121 See Chapter 2.3 above.
Another sheet (see Ex 15b) shows symmetrical chords in which the notes of each hand are symmetrically formed in addition to the right hand mirroring the left; the central note, E, remains, as in the earlier example, constant throughout the sequence.

How are these intellectual exercises softened into Lewis’s more flexible musical contours? In a surprising number of cases they are not; or rather, the voicing of the chords, or their scoring, whether vocal or instrumental, does the work of converting the raw harmony into music. Even when one considers the openings of two of Lewis’s most immediately attractive scores, *Memoria* and the Piano Concerto, it is worth remembering that their starting points are both chord sequences presented simply, if not, by virtue of their orchestration, starkly. A final example (Ex 15c) from these leaves shows the opening of a projected *Piano “Chord” Piece* in which it is clear that the ten chords (selected from seventy-nine chords on the previous pages, as – with one exception – the only nine-note chords) are not going to be presented in austere form but, instead, the opening is going to evolve gradually and gently. The compositional train of thought then breaks off into the creation of still more chords (together with enthusiastic marginal ‘notes to self’): dissatisfaction, perhaps, with what had so far been achieved in the *Piano “Chord” Piece*, but unabated fascination with the theoretical idea behind the work.
Ex 15a Symmetrical chords, including a wedge-shaped progression

Ex 15b 11-note symmetrical chords, symmetry within as well as between the hands
There have undoubtedly been difficult periods over the last few years. Another hospitalisation at the end of 2003 proved traumatic and the composition of *Risolute* in its wake, during the early part of 2004, was only achieved with difficulty. My second Lewis recording
project (*Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, *Litania* and *Musica Aeterna*) shortly afterwards gave the composer a focus for his energies once again, and prompted him to write – with greater ease than had been the case with *Risoluto* – another piano piece for me, *Sereno*.

It is clear that the last decade has seen a sharp decline in Lewis’s fortunes and reputation as a composer, with no BBC commissions or broadcasts, and a general neglect of his music except by a few individuals, notably Harvey Davies, either in collaboration with his mother Helen or with fellow members of Ensemble Cymru, and John Turner, who, as a result of having heard Peter Lawson play *Threnody* at a BBC New Music weekend in Manchester in 1995, became interested in Lewis’s music. John Turner was also at that time a supporter of the Cheshire-based record producer, Stephen Plews, and his company, ASC. My own approach to Plews in 2000 was a happy coincidence of timing since one of the works I wanted to record was *Threnody*. As a result, John Turner and the Ida Carroll Trust helped make my first recording project financially possible. My chamber choir, Altèri, has also very generously allowed me to programme much of Lewis’s choral output.

Lewis’s most recent projects have sometimes been slow to achieve their final form. I sense, however, that it is not so much composition itself that is difficult, but rather that the circumstances conducive to composition are so rarely ideal. This has manifested itself in a
number of ways. Inhibitions about being overheard working at home have led Lewis to think occasionally about approaching other venues where he might hire a room with a piano in order to set up a more regular routine for composition. These have, so far, come to nothing. More seriously, recurring negative thoughts relating to the recent dearth of performances and broadcasts of his music both in Wales and elsewhere have often outweighed the compositional urge. Taking that point from the personal to the general, Lewis often describes a powerful depression over the state of serious art music in Britain, as revealed by what he perceives as increasingly safe BBC radio programming, the side-lining of all but popular music in arts programmes, the decreasing number of commissions available from the major orchestras, the absence of new music in their repertoire, and the rise to fame of composers based less on musical merit than political exigency. How far these perceptions are justified is in this context irrelevant, since they are Lewis’s psychological reality and have clearly had a powerful impact upon his creativity, as indeed they would on any but the most Panglossian composer.

Nonetheless, he has completed several scores over the period I have been engaged on this thesis, even if the number of ideas and compositions started far exceeds those which achieve fruition. The completion of the set of *Sacred Chants, Risoluto, Sereno, Beyond the Heavens, Memoria Echoes* and the *Untitled Piano Piece* all postdate my registration as a PhD student, and I have already indicated some
of the other compositions which have been started or at the very least thought about. It is ironic that the *Untitled Piano Piece* was written when one could easily have forgiven Lewis for finding it totally impossible to compose any music at all, since at that time (the summer of 2008) his house was undergoing major structural repairs. The domestic disruption as well as the constant presence of a workman should have caused inspiration to dry up completely; on the contrary, work on the first half of the piece progressed quickly and it was only after the building work was completed that Lewis’s belief in his score – in its quality and its sense of musical direction – started to waver. The work was finished in waves of compositional energy, and the concluding solution to the piece, which, given the music’s sense of irreversible forward motion, could have proved difficult, is in fact both intellectually elegant and musically powerful (see Ex 14b above).

Lewis has never been a prolific composer, although one senses a fluency in the works of the 1960s and ’70s that is now probed, questioned and distrusted. The associated chores of producing scores and parts also seem to have been undertaken more easily in the past. One can only hope that in due course the relative fecundity of earlier years will be rediscovered, and with it greater recognition from the musical world at large.
2.7 In conclusion

There is more than one way of organising an account of a composer’s life and work, and the preceding Biographical Sketch has been arranged according to the progress and development of Lewis’s education and career, those divisions mostly coinciding with geographical moves. An alternative division, this time according to the style and preoccupations of Lewis’s compositions, could look like this:

1. Works written before 1965 (J 1 – J 11 in the Catalogue). Student works, revealing a range of stylistic influences but little that is characteristically Lewisian, excepting the use of a plainchant melody in the Improvisation on the Compline Antiphon – Salve Regina (J 2) and the subject matter of the text used for Care-Charmer Sleep (J 7). The latter, and Sing We Merrily (J 6) are both works for which Lewis retains affection.

2. 1965 – 1967 (J 12 – J 20). Student works that start to show greater maturity and sense of purpose. They still reveal an eclectic range of influences – from a continuing interest in plainchant in the first of the Two Medieval Sketches (J 12) to the use of serial techniques in the Improvisations (J 13) and in parts of the Two Cadenzas (J 17) – but many of these elements will be retained, developed and incorporated into Lewis’s own individual language in
the future. The rotating chord sequence in the final pages of *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun* (J 20) is particularly prophetic.

3. 1967 – 1971 (J 21 – J 37). Many of these works display a far greater degree of complexity than has been found before, although the Trio for flute, oboe and piano (J 18) already hinted at this line of development. Lewis was clearly encouraged during his time in Darmstadt and Poland to explore more ‘advanced’ techniques in depth, exploring extremely varied instrumental timbres and elements of performer determinacy, for example; nonetheless, *Stanzas* (J 21), a work that preceded his foreign studies, already demonstrates fluency in and command over the use of these techniques. *Spatials* (J 22), *Mosaic* (J 23), *Chamber Music* (J 29) and *Mobile III* (J 37) all contain either fully notated passages of enormous intricacy, passages where the performers ‘realise’ a set of pitches or where the conductor determines the duration of such a realisation. Simpler textures – a return to linear writing – start to appear in works such as *Mobile I* (J 32) and *Mobile II* (J 33); *Gweledigaeth* (J 24) reveals an ability to use the techniques associated with his most complex scores in a more practical, ‘performer-friendly’ manner.

4. 1971 – 1978 (J 38 – J 55). The first wave of mature works. Many of the complexities that would make performance of the works written in the previous four years problematic disappear here, although the sonic surface of many of these pieces is still intricate,
and both language and structure can be difficult to grasp. Lewis
returns to the style of the Two Cadenzas in parts of Mutations II (J
38) and the outer panels of Duologue (J 39), but a new, crystalline
stillness pervades the central section of the latter work. This
juxtaposition of violence and calm recurs in Aurora (J 46) and
Esultante (J 54), and looks forward to later works. Other indications
of things to come may be found in the subject matter and relative
simplicity of Dream Sequence (J 40), the modal writing of Offeren y
Lluyn (J 51) and the ‘piled-up’ chordal writing of Momentum (J 55).
Visual Music (J 42) and Realizations (J 47) look back to the
improvisatory, performer-determined works of 1967 – 1971; Ritornel
(J 48) and Time-Passage (J 52) are the final works whose notation
results in a consistently complex texture.

5. 1978 – 1989 (J 56 – 75). A second wave of mature composition,
most obviously marked by an increased use of modal writing, often
based around a tonal centre, and increased textural clarity. Some
works retain passages of performer- or conductor-determined
textures (Stratos, J 57, Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, J 58,
Carmen Paschale, J 61), and more astringent modes are used in
parts of Tableau (J 59), the Wind Quintet (J 70), Sonante (J 71) and
Scena (J 73), often allied with ‘rhythmically convulsive’ writing.
Single- or multi-movement structures juxtaposing contrasting
material predominate (Limina Lucis, J 61, the Piano Trio, J 65,
Fantasy, J 67, the Piano Concerto, J 74, may be added to the works
already mentioned). The greater simplicity of *Hymnus Ante Somnum* (J 69) and *Silentia Noctis* (J 75) anticipates some of the works of the 1990s on.


7. 1996 – present (J 87 – J 105). With *Night Fantasy* (J 87) and, especially, *Musica Aeterna* (J 89), Lewis embarks on a series of large-scale works that are implacable in their progress. Some build on the mosaic-like structure of *Threnody*, (*Sereno*, J 99, *Memoria Echoes*, J 104), others are single-minded in their systematic exploration of a particular idea (*Teneritas*, J 91, *Untitled (d)* for piano, J 101). Some of the choral works also fall into this category, including many of the *Sacred Chants*, J 97. Piled-up chords and rhythmically convulsive writing return in *Bellissima* (J 93) and *Risoluto* (J 98); *Recordatio* (J 92) demonstrates a profound and moving synthesis of many earlier tendencies, from the use of chant-like melodic lines to the
construction of an integrated but texturally varied single-movement span.

While certain ideas recur frequently, others are more transitory elements in Lewis’s active vocabulary, perhaps only characterising one of the above phases. A different taxonomy of Lewis’s output emerges by teasing out the various strands that are of particular importance to him:

Use of plainchant and chant-like melody: found first in works based on original examples (*Improvisation on the Compline Antiphon – Salve Regina*, written before 1961; the first of the *Two Medieval Sketches* of 1965), the contours and flexibility of plainchant become integrated into Lewis’s own melodic writing – both vocal and instrumental – early on. In *Carmen Paschale* (1981) and *Hymnus Ante Somnum* (1985), longer chant-like lines contrast with other choral textures; shorter phrases find their way into such diverse scores as *Sonante* (1986) and *Recordatio* (1999); several of the *Sacred Chants* (2003 – 5) are wholly based on chant-like figures.


Works characterised by a sense of implacable progress, often large in scale: *Night Fantasy*, *Musica Aeterna*, *Piano Duet (No 2)* (1997), *Untitled (d)* for Piano (2008). These single-movement, single-mood impulses ultimately derive from a quieter score, *Memoria* and also include *Recordatio*. The sense of ritual found in the regular pulsing of parts of *Litania* provides another aspect of the same theme. Choral works with obsessively repeating chords – for example, the last of the *Sacred Chants* – also fall into this category, as do the instrumental works that include piled-up chords, although here the


These are not the only categories one could devise – for example, the presence of passages of performer determinacy has been tracked in the chronological survey above, and one could create a long list of the pieces that use a rising major second as a significant component – but seen together these give a clear picture of the way that ideas resurface throughout Lewis’s career and different works explore varied combinations of those ideas. Preoccupations interleave from the outset, and Lewis is revealed as a composer who has drawn upon a wide repertoire of technical, thematic, structural and extra-musical ideas over the course of his career.

The scene is now set for a more detailed exploration of all these ideas in a series of analyses, concentrating in particular on six works from the period starting in 1978 with *Memoria*, characterised above as the second mature phase of Lewis’s compositional career. *Memoria* itself proves to be a particularly rich source of examples.
that clearly show how Lewis disguises and reinvents his existing techniques to suit best the new harmonic direction being taken by his music.
Memoria, commissioned by the North Gwent Festival, was composed between July and September 1978 and first performed in November of the same year by the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Boris Brott. It is dedicated to the memory of the composer’s mother. It has been performed more frequently than any of Jeffrey Lewis’s other orchestral scores, and, together with Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, it was the subject of what was for almost a decade the only available study of Lewis’s music in any form, a two-part article by Dalwyn Henshall published in the periodical Welsh Music.

Lewis’s mother died on 28 June 1978, and the composer started work on the piece shortly after his return to North Wales from Port Talbot in early July. The work was written quickly; as he has remarked, this was hardly a case of ‘emotion recollected in tranquillity’, despite the outward calm of the piece. In that same conversation, Lewis did not altogether reject the idea of the composition of Memoria being, at least in part, an element in the healing process following his mother’s death.

---

2 Dalwyn Henshall, ‘Memento Mori – An appreciation of Jeffrey Lewis’s recent orchestral music,’ Part I, Welsh Music, vi (1980), 61 – 70, Part II, Welsh Music; vi (1981), 32 – 40. These articles seem originally to have been intended to form a triptych describing Lewis’s recent ‘memorial’ pieces. The third was to have included a study of Elegy; it is not known whether this was ever written – it was certainly never published.
3 Conversation with the author, 27 March 2008.
By the time he started writing *Memoria*, Lewis had already completed a large number of instrumental, chamber and orchestral scores. Hearing the piece directly after three of its immediate predecessors – *Time-Passage*, *Esultante* and *Momentum* – one might be forgiven for thinking it the work of a different composer, or, at the very least, the product of a quite different stage of the composer’s life, so unlike those other compositions in both mood and harmonic language does it appear to be. *Memoria* seems to have been something of a watershed in Lewis’s output, a turning point in the use of the various elements that had made up his language to date. In its journey from near stillness at the beginning to an end point of total immobility and silence, sustained over more than twenty minutes with, for the most part, a very slow rate of harmonic change, it was, and in some respects remains, one of Lewis’s most radical scores; it was not until *Musica Aeterna* (1997) that he was again to pursue such a single-minded path though a large-scale work.

Since I have chosen to concentrate in this thesis on the works composed between *Memoria* and the Piano Trio and *Fantasy* (1978 – 1985), works representative of what I would consider the ‘mature’ Lewis style, it is important to attempt to define that style and explore its sources. The inevitability of a score like *Memoria* and its significance in Lewis’s worklist become clearer the more closely we examine the complexities of earlier pieces, particularly *Time-
Passage, Aurora and Duologue. Thus the even more radical nature of Memoria comes clearly into focus, and it is revealed as both the summation of his work up to that point and the moment of a crucial change of compositional direction.

3.1 Time-Passage: paving the way

Unlike Memoria, Time-Passage is essentially a chamber work, a nonet with the addition of two extremely active percussionists who play a range of tuned and untuned instruments. It gives the impression of being an intensely busy score, using complex multi-layered rhythmic activity, a dense harmonic language with a high dissonance count, and a reliance on motivic rather than melodic development. These impressions are quite different from those we take from Memoria, which is largely calm and still in mood. However, there are several passages of multi-layered rhythmic activity in the orchestral work too, some markedly similar to those in Time-Passage, and whilst the harmonic language of Time-Passage is more complex than that of Memoria, the methods of generating figuration and motifs from the basic pitch material are comparable.

The differences in mood disguise the fact that the harmonic rhythm of the two works is often equally slow, the apparent activity of the one and tranquillity of the other being a function of
the dynamic level and articulation of the surrounding figuration, rather than the rate of harmonic change itself. Concepts of foreground and background play a far greater role in *Memoria* than in *Time-Passage*.

The first broadcast of *Time-Passage* was preceded by a revealing introduction to the work:

> On one level the material is static partly as a result of limited pitch material employed – only eight notes of the chromatic scale are used throughout. The various harmonic and melodic implications of this mode are explored to the full... On another level the work is dynamic and the passage of time becomes apparent. After rhythmically symmetrical opening bars, an impetus is given to the material which it rarely departs from. The main contrasts to the active sections are interludes of completely static material but the two elements are combined at about the midpoint of the piece where active material for percussion is superimposed on static chords. A further reference to the title appears at the end of the work. This is so closely related to the beginning that it becomes obvious that the material has come full circle and could begin again.⁴

There is a clear acknowledgement here that any sense of the work’s activity is apparent rather than real, or perhaps rather that its sense of movement comes from the textural rather than harmonic qualities of the music. It is this fact that allows similar techniques – the superimposition of active material upon static chords – to produce a very different result in *Memoria*. The reference to ‘interludes of

---

⁴ Transcribed from a recording of the BBC broadcast of the first performance, 8 March 1977.
completely static material’, however, suggests one important difference between the two scores.

In *Time-Passage*, as in many of Lewis’s earlier scores, most notably *Duologue* and *Aurora*, there is a clearly audible contrast between movement and stasis. In *Duologue* this takes several forms – brief interruptions or frozen moments in the violence of the opening pages; later passages during the first of the work’s three sections where harmonic movement is relaxed; and the extraordinarily eerie stillness of the central panel where violin and piano shadow each other stealthily, outside any sense of real pulse, before the brief, fast final section enfold a telescoped recapitulation of the very opening of the work within its decisive conclusion.

*Aurora* follows a different course, but again there is a strong contrast between activity and its suspension: the often extrovert first half of the work – brass fanfares predominating – is succeeded by near immobility as slowly rising melodic curves emerge, again pulseless, and the otherworldly sound of the vibraphone colours the otherwise sparse orchestral timbres.

In *Time-Passage*, the sense of time being momentarily frozen comes from the removal of layers of rhythmic activity from the texture. These moments are brief, and the arrested movement is then kick-started again with loud, vigorous gestures. Despite the outward
similarity between these ‘freeze-frames’ and those at the opening of *Duologue*, the rate of harmonic change in *Time-Passage* hardly alters at these moments, the sense of stasis coming largely from the scoring of the work; in the violin and piano piece the sudden inaction mirrors an interruption in the harmonic rhythm. The idea that changes in texture – specifically the removal of a layer, or layers, of activity – can appear to alter our perception of the rate of harmonic change is of fundamental importance in *Memoria*, and these ‘folds in time’, invitations to meditate upon musical details, gradually take over its progress, particularly in its latter stages. The continual removal of these layers of activity gradually takes the listener to a final point of stillness, producing a musical shape closer to that of *Aurora* than *Time-Passage*, which, as the broadcast notes above indicate, has a circular structure with some affinities to *Duologue*.

The terms ‘circular’ and ‘circularity’ will recur at several points during this thesis. In one sense, of course, musical ‘circularity’ is a near contradiction in terms: a musical line can only travel in one direction, and, even on the page, only a certain type of musical palindrome, when combined with simultaneous inversion, is circular in appearance. However, Lewis himself has used these terms so frequently, both in reference to his own music and to that of other composers, that there is some justification in using them here too. They may describe a certain type of melodic shape – one that
returns obsessively to a particular pitch, exemplified by some of Stravinsky’s writing in *Le sacre du printemps*, *Les noces* or *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* – or refer to the structure of an entire work – Bartók’s *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*, for example, in which the sense of musical return in the opera’s closing bars mirrors the inevitability of the drama repeating itself in an unending cycle.

The musical fabric of *Time-Passage* is derived from its opening three chords, heard initially on the glockenspiel and vibraphone (Ex 1); not only do the pitches contained within the chords provide a reservoir of notes for the entire work, but the chords themselves have strong individual identities which generate melodic or motivic material. *Memoria* is a piece whose primary material is also chordal, and whose figuration and melody derives from those chords. Lewis employs a more consonant musical language here than in *Time-Passage* and (perhaps in consequence) a larger number of chords, but these too have a strong identity and there is consistency in their use throughout which contributes to a sense of the work’s integrity. The use of a cycle of chords underpins many of Lewis’s works, and as his language has become more modal, so these cycles have become more audible and are often presented outright at the start (*Threnody*, Piano Concerto, *O Mare*).
The motivic and melodic writing of *Time-Passage* and *Memoria* contains both important similarities and differences. There are upwardly thrusting lines in both pieces – indeed, they occur in various forms and with a range of functions throughout Lewis’s output. Most significantly, here they make explicit the contours of the underlying harmony. Thus, the string phrases of *Memoria* and the rising brass figure near the start of *Time-Passage* share a similar function, providing both memorable melodic shapes and a clarification of the harmony (Ex 2). There is no comparable development of the melody in *Time-Passage*, however, which contributes to the more unsettled, fragmentary atmosphere of the work.

Ex 2a *Time-Passage*, bars 22 – 24
Lewis makes frequent use of fast repeated notes in *Time-Passage*,
either to create an effect of rapid chordal repetition when they are
synchronised, or more rhythmically complex textures when the
repetitions are staggered. These latter repetitions are sometimes
slower and, in the wind, brass and strings, are often allied to rapid
crescendi and decrescendi. Such textures are almost completely
absent from *Memoria*, although a form of them might be observed in
the bell-like ‘tolling’ of the brass choir, rhythmically at odds with its
surroundings, towards the climax of the first half of the work, and
the brief echo of this passage near its close (Ex 3). The appearance
of the two scores at these moments suggests a correspondence that
is perhaps not immediately audible.

Trills, oscillations of minor and major thirds, and demi-semiquaver
groups are common currency for the wind players in both works.
They evolve into melody, or significant motif, in *Memoria*, but in
*Time-Passage* are of only fleeting significance (Ex 4).
Ex 3a *Memoria*, bars 165 – 166

\[ \mathfrak{f} = 52 \]

Woodwind

(All instruments at actual pitch)

Ex 3b *Time-Passage*, bars 135 – 137

\[ \mathfrak{f} = 104 \]

Clarinet
Trombone
Horn
Bass Clarinet
Cello

(All instruments at actual pitch)
Ex 4a *Time-Passage*, bars 116 – 121
Perhaps most unexpectedly, the last sound we hear in *Time-Passage* is a rising whole-tone, coolly presented on violin and cello harmonics rather than warmly expressive as it often is in *Memoria*.

Nonetheless, this motif connects *Time-Passage* not only with *Memoria* but with many other later works – the conclusions of *Stratos, Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* and *Scena* come to mind – providing further evidence of the consistency of Lewis’s language, processes and thinking over a considerable period of time.
3.2 Elements of disguise: timbre, harmony, melody and texture in *Memoria*

The most immediately striking thing about this twenty-one minute work is its profound tranquillity of expression, maintained throughout its course. That is not to say that it does not have moments of passion; nor does it unfold solely at a gentle pianissimo. Indeed, one of its most remarkable features is that it encompasses an outwardly wide emotional and dynamic range whilst maintaining an inner peace and serenity. These qualities have to do with the way Lewis paces and organises the work – what I have referred to elsewhere as its ‘structural slipperiness’.

It proceeds as if in a dream, one idea melting imperceptibly but inevitably into another, making the identification of articulation points and structural landmarks a difficult task.

The luminosity of the orchestration also plays a part in conveying the great stillness of the piece. The use of percussion is limited to marimba, vibraphone, glockenspiel and tubular bells (one player), the harp often joining those instruments as a further distinct ‘colour’. The wind and brass requirements are modest, and the constantly changing textures are often made up of solo lines juxtaposed against the various orchestral families, and copious use of divisi strings. There are clear echoes of the colouristic

---

orchestration of French composers. Debussy’s crotales near the conclusion of Prélude à l’après-midi d’un faune spring to mind as a comparable example of the bell-like highlighting of chords, as do the frequent changes of timbre, which, often illuminated by telling flecks of brilliance from the harp or glockenspiel, recalls ‘Jeux des vagues’ in La mer. One might also hear echoes of the woodwind figuration of the opening section of Dutilleux’s Météboles or, near the end of Memoria, a gentle allusion to Steve Reich in the repeating vibraphone patterns. Lewis’s admiration of Debussy’s orchestral scores may well have left a subliminal trace on his own style of orchestration, as has, even more strongly, Ravel’s orchestral writing; however, any similarities to Dutilleux are probably derived from a common source in earlier French music – Lewis has no great fondness for Dutilleux’s work – and the coincidence of repeating patterns occurring on a mallet instrument can be rationalised as a liking for both the sound of the vibraphone (hear its use in very different contexts in Aurora or Mobile II, for example) and for oscillating musical ideas, rather than as an overt hommage to Reich’s music.

The changes of orchestral timbre do not always coincide with points of harmonic change or musical articulation, another factor that makes Memoria’s structure intriguing, teasing the listener’s expectations and emphasising the sense of time being drawn out.
The consistently consonant harmonic language is a surprise after *Time-Passage*. However, Lewis has stated that he has ‘never set out to write dissonant music’.

*Memoria* is built on modes familiar to any listener who knows a range of French music from Satie, Debussy and Ravel to Messiaen. The chords that provide the primary material for *Time-Passage* are, by contrast, constructions that only become familiar during the course of the piece; they are harmonic ‘objects’, created specifically for that work. The aural reference point of a familiar mode or pitch-set immediately allows the listener easier access to certain horizontal ideas, thus creating a more obviously ‘melodic’ aspect to *Memoria* too, emphasised by the frequent stepwise movement. The process by which ‘melodic’ material is generated in *Time-Passage* is almost identical, however, despite the fact that the textural layering and rhythmic complexity of the earlier piece is of a different order.

I use the term ‘modal’ in preference to ‘pandiatonic’ in connection with *Memoria* for two reasons: one is the presence of a tonal centre and therefore a degree of functionality in the bass line and in the modes themselves, the other being the importance of and care in the selection of notes being used at any one time – an important aspect of the piece is the addition and subtraction of notes from the modes to build towards climaxes and lead to the quiet conclusion of the
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work. Lewis uses different transpositions of his modes and also ‘modulates’ from mode to mode in *Memoria*, creating a quite different effect from the modal stasis of works such as Giles Swayne’s *Naaotwá Lalá*, discussed below.

Texture, particularly rapid figuration and oscillations superimposed on a slow-moving harmonic rhythm, was an aspect of Lewis’s music that seemed to become increasingly important up to 1978. He takes this to its extreme in *Memoria*: indeed, hardly a bar passes without some use of ‘chord activation’, by which the illusion of movement is created by the repetition of groups of notes within the current chord or mode whilst the harmony itself remains static, sometimes for a considerable length of time. The addition or removal of textural layers, producing a constantly shifting orchestral palette, also characterises this technique, and Lewis frequently uses a variety of figurations simultaneously, as a glance at the build-up of woodwind textures between bars 9 – 17 quickly confirms (Ex 5). As a technique, this comes some way between the ‘freedom within fixed parameters’ favoured by composers such as Lutosławski and Penderecki, and the more explicitly rhythmic repetitions of Steve Reich. In *Memoria*, Lewis, like Reich, notates all his patterns fully, maintaining total control over the material, but the associations of modal writing and the orchestration itself strongly influence our perception of the work, creating a markedly more European than American effect. As I have already noted, the orchestral writing and
even the musical material often has a Gallic sensibility of the kind that also found its way into Lutosławski’s music (one thinks of *Chantefleurs et chantefables*, and his other settings of French texts), and the absence of any strongly rhythmic emphases or pulsing in the repeated patterns, or of any associations with popular music styles, further distances the piece from Reich and his countrymen. Compare the fluid orchestration of European composers – Dutilleux and Lutosławski perhaps most of all – with the predilection of American minimalist composers for blocks of orchestral sound scored by instrumental family (a generalisation, of course, but even so a broadly accurate one) and one can hear where the origins of Lewis’s orchestral style lie. In *Memoria*, there is a careful and complete notation of all figuration allowing background material to move to the foreground and back again wholly in the tempo of the work, in contrast to later pieces such as *Stratos* and *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, where notated foreground material is superimposed on a quasi-improvisatory textural backdrop and the notion of a constant pulse becomes less relevant.
Ex 5 *Memoria*, bars 9 – 17
Paradoxically, the precise moment when a melodic motif returns to the background patterns is far more ambiguous here, partly because the patterns themselves are often slower (for example, semiquavers within *Memoria*’s crotchet pulse of c 48 – 52, compared to *Epitaph*’s crotchet = c 96) and also because they are often so closely related to the most clearly melodic material. Because there is a nominally constant crotchet pulse – it is not explicitly emphasised, but is nonetheless a continuous subliminal presence – this textural flexibility has implications for the way the listener may perceive the temporal organisation of the structure, raising expectations of musical direction or of resolution that are often undermined in the short term, only to be satisfied at the end of the work.

To sum up – there are four elements at play in *Memoria*: harmony, melody, texture and timbre. They are, of course, inseparable, but there is a constantly shifting focus between each of the first three, periodically illuminated by specifically colouristic orchestration. The harmonic rhythm of the work – the element that gives *Memoria* its shape and overall trajectory – is, as has been implied, carefully disguised, even hidden, by the other elements. If its melodic, timbral and textural content are thought of as the work’s external aspect, then the harmonic rhythm is its governing factor, even though Lewis goes to some lengths to divert the listener’s attention away from it. The fluidity between foreground and background, between colour and essence, helps give the piece its characteristically dream-like
aura; this in turn contributes to its apparent structural unpredictability. It is difficult to divide up the music into smaller structural units; normal cues of ‘structural demarcation’ (changes of mode or variation in the rate of harmonic change; the introduction of new melodic or motivic ideas; changes in type of figuration; changes in orchestral timbre) are constantly being undermined or even contradicted, especially when textural changes are independent of harmonic or melodic articulation points.

3.3 A critique of Henshall’s article

The difficulties of making a convincing structural analysis of Memoria become immediately apparent when one turns to Dalwyn Henshall’s article. He divides the piece into thirteen sections of various lengths, sections XI and XII being further subdivided into three. These divisions are mostly made according to the type of ‘chord activation’ (what I have described as ‘texture’) and the type of melodic writing. In other words, he divides the work up by its more obvious external features rather than its underlying structure. In my view, such an approach displays a misunderstanding of the guiding principles behind the work’s composition and would, if translated into performance, misrepresent the work. The harmonic writing – the rate of change and type of chords used – is the single most important feature of the work, and Henshall does not take this into account at all in his tabular analysis (see Table 1).
Table 1: a sectional analysis of *Memoria* (with correction of misprints), from Henshall, ‘Memento Mori’ Part I, 65, compared with my own analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henshall</th>
<th>Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Memoria</em>: first half</td>
<td><em>Memoria</em>: first half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  bars 1 – 8</td>
<td>bars 1 – 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II bars 9 – 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III bars 19 – 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV bars 30 – 37</td>
<td>bars 30 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V  bars 38 – 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI bars 45 – 54</td>
<td>bars 45 – 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII bars 55 – 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII bars 66 – 78</td>
<td>bars 77 – 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX  bars 79 – 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X  bars 87 – 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Memoria</em>: second half</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI bars 101 – 116</td>
<td>bars 117 – 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bars 117 – 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bars 142 – 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII bars 152 – 162</td>
<td>bars 163 – 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bars 174 – 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bars 184 – 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII bars 187 – 226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Henshall and I concur that this 226-bar piece is divided into two unequal halves; we differ, however, in our placing of this crucial structural division. My reason for placing the break at the end of bar 116 rather than at bar 101 is the sense that bars 101 – 116 represent a gradual ebbing away of the tension of the preceding bars; in other words, they are a consequence of what has gone before, rather than a fresh start. This is emphasised by the *ritardando* and *lunga pausa* (bars 114 – 116) and the unmistakeable sense of homecoming (an echo of the scoring of the very first bar) provided by the upward harp scale on the downbeat of bar 117. The subsequent change in harmony (bar 119) reinforces the sense of new
beginnings, that these bars mirror the harmonic shifts heard at the opening of the work. By contrast, the only clear difference between Henshall’s sections X and XI is in dynamic and texture; ignoring the function of the harmonic language undermines the validity of Henshall’s analysis both here and elsewhere.

Henshall spends a great deal of his article looking for *Memoria*’s musical antecedents. He draws comparisons with works by Mahler, Berg and Stravinsky, comparisons which the composer himself feels are misleading. In particular, Henshall talks of the interval of the rising major second as ‘the interval of mourning’, drawing attention to the final movement of *Das Lied von der Erde*, the *Exaudi orationem meam*, *Domine of Symphony of Psalms* (perhaps forgetting that Stravinsky uses a minor rather than a major second there), ‘[Stravinsky’s] later almost exclusively ‘memorial’ works’ and Berg’s Violin Concerto. He adds: ‘for my own subjective reasons, I would [also] include Mahler’s Fourth Symphony.’ However plausible it may seem to make connections with these works on the common ground of a mood of grief or ‘last things’, (although tenuous in the case of *Symphony of Psalms*) one must also mention that these were core works on the Bangor University Music Department syllabus.

Henshall did not have to look too far to find pieces that chimed in with both the atmosphere and this single aspect of the musical
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7 Conversation with the author, 2003.
8 Henshall, ‘Memento Mori’ Part I, 66.
language of *Memoria*. My own first hearing of the work irresistibly reminded me of a very different musical connection, the Ravel of *Shéhérazade* – in particular the second movement, ‘La flûte enchantée’ – but one must always allow for simple coincidence when proposing correspondences between works. I still hear a Ravelian orchestral sheen in *Memoria*, and even an occasional reminiscence of *Daphnis et Chloë* (particularly in the piccolo phrase at bars 204 – 5), but the latter is surely better understood as a correspondence arising from the use of similar language rather than as a deliberate quotation. I might also point to a phrase in Vaughan Williams’ *Norfolk Rhapsody No 1* which anticipates one of the upward melodic gestures of Lewis’s piece. Furthermore, the Vaughan Williams is not dissimilar to the Dutilleux *Métaboles* phrase mentioned above: coincidence – nothing more (see Ex 6).

Ex 6a Vaughan Williams: *Norfolk Rhapsody No 1*, bars 11 – 12
3.4 Memoria compared to Naaotwá Lalá

It may be more fruitful to turn for comparison to a work by Giles Swayne, *Naaotwá Lalá* (1984), another BBC commission, this time for the BBC Philharmonic Orchestra and Edward Downes. Like *Memoria*, its harmonic language is modal and it is permeated by simple melodic motifs. It also has some non-Western musical
influence (in the case of Naaotwá Lalá, Africa; the influence of Indian music on Memoria will be discussed later). There are undoubtedly similar techniques being used here, related both to harmonic activation and minimalism, and the close proximity in composition date suggests a common ‘genetic’ origin. Swayne’s work, although attractive, has less sense of musical fluidity and far more straightforward repetition than Memoria. The ‘slippery surface’ of Memoria and its ever-changing levels of operation are absent; Naaotwá Lalá seems by comparison a simplified sketch which uses similar elements without the earlier work’s underpinning structural strength. An apt analogy might be made by comparing a Purcell chaconne with one by, say, Corelli: the latter well-written and of undoubted interest, but without the ear- and thought-provoking stimulation of the former.

There is no change to the tonal centre of Swayne’s thirteen-minute piece – it is permanently poised on a D\(^7\) chord – and this stasis is reinforced by an almost invariable rhythm in the repeated D of the bass line (Ex 7a). The smaller orchestra (two each of flutes, clarinets, horns and trumpets, harp and strings) is not treated in a particularly colouristic way, and the harp is given a concertante role throughout. From these bare facts one can already start to sense the differences between Naaotwá Lalá and Memoria, despite an underlying similarity in aim between the two works: a common sense of timelessness, a gentle opening and even gentler conclusion.
The verse-like structure of Swayne's piece is clearly articulated and signposted (even to the point of being shown by double bar-lines in the score – for example, see figure 3 in the full score, Ex 7b). The addition of melodic phrases above the harp part is often simple – even naïve – and to start with does little more than trace a melodic skeleton of the already uncomplicated harp writing. There are similarities between Swayne’s technique of generating melodic material and Lewis’s (see Ex 7c) but the lack of rhythmic flexibility in *Naaotwá Lalá* – note values are invariably simple within the 5/4 time signature, with nothing faster than a quaver – means that these melodies do not lift or advance the piece, or create any tension with the other musical material. In fact, the further into the piece we get, the less foreground and background contrast there is.

The closest moment of resemblance between the two pieces comes at four bars before figure 5 of *Naaotwá Lalá*, where flutes and clarinets set off a repeating pattern equivalent to that at bar 45 of *Memoria* (Ex 8). In Lewis’s piece, this marks a new phase and the texture evolves continuously up to bar 101. In *Naaotwá Lalá*, the promise of a new phase is short-lived; after four bars the flute and clarinet texture stops and a new harp variation of the ‘verse’ takes over again. Woodwind and upper strings continue to add new ideas to the harp writing, but these are now marked more by a sense of rhythmic playfulness than melodic interest. A *scherzando* mood would clearly be out of place in *Memoria*, but, as I have noted above, this rhythmic
pulsing à la Reich is entirely absent and the simple 3+3+2+2 quaver patterns at figure 9 of Swayne’s piece would certainly never be used unchanged by Lewis for so long. *Naaotwá Lalá*, from this point on, seems closer to the Reich of, say, *The Desert Music*, particularly that work’s second section: a function, perhaps, of a common interest in African music.

Ex 7a Swayne: *Naaotwá Lalá*, bar 1

Ex 7b Swayne: *Naaotwá Lalá*, page 4
Ex 7c Swayne: *Naaotwá Lalá*, 4 bars before Fig 4, pages 5 – 6

Ex 8a Swayne: *Naaotwá Lalá*, pages 7 – 8
What becomes clear as *Naaotwá Lalá* continues is that, whereas in *Memoria*, the similarly wide-spaced melodies are never the same twice, and – even more importantly – are not a constant presence, Swayne relies greatly on their rhythmic and melodic repetition, using the ideas continuously against an unchanging harmonic wash, and, as a result, the listener’s interest quickly wanes.

*Memoria’s* shape can be difficult to grasp on account of its very slow rate of harmonic change, but the variety in its melody and texture as well as the diversity of its orchestration makes *Memoria* a more intriguing and ultimately more rewarding score.
3.5 Lewis and Welsh music

Another relevant discussion point concerns the Welsh music being written, particularly by Alun Hoddinott and William Mathias, during the 1960s and 70s. When I put it to the composer that he had sought to escape the influence of those composers when he was a student he countered this with the observation that, along with many of his contemporaries at Cardiff University, he had simply not been interested in what was being produced in the principality at that time, and their music hardly entered his consciousness. Nonetheless, Hoddinott and his music would have been an inescapable presence at times, and his soundworld, even if it was of little interest, must have filtered through to Lewis’s musical subconscious. Is there, then, an aspect of Lewis’s musical language that might reveal a shared cultural background with these older Welsh composers? Lewis rejects any such idea; for him, his earliest and strongest musical roots lay in the Anglican church rather than the Nonconformist Welsh chapels; his musical education involved church and youth choirs, the organ, youth orchestras and the BBC; and he doesn’t speak Welsh. At the very deepest level, however, something of the imprint of the Welsh landscape, either natural or industrial, or the inflection of the spoken word, must be a part – even if only a very small, subconscious part – of Lewis’s inner life;
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9 Conversation with the composer, 19 February 2008. See also Chapter 2.2.
one cannot escape one’s history, one can only reject or disown it.
The music of Hoddinott or Mathias may be of little interest to Lewis, but a shared cultural ‘gene-pool’ might nonetheless produce a very occasional family resemblance.

In his setting of Dafydd ap Gwilym, Offeren y Llwyn (The Woodland Mass, 1976) – the first unexpected indication that Lewis could, if he wished, step away from a consciously ‘contemporary’ manner\(^\text{10}\) – the ‘Welshness’ of both text and harmonic language is offset by a refusal to linger over the text; the rather folk-like melodic lines are despatched with a certain abruptness. The brevity of the choral work, or perhaps the nature of the commission itself, did not encourage Lewis to explore the possibilities of its modal language and achieve the sense of timelessness he was to find in the more convincing dimensions of Memoria.

The technical lessons learned in Darmstadt, Kraków, Paris and London are retained in Memoria, but its language comes closer than in any of his earlier scores to that being used by some of his Celtic contemporaries. Curiously, those features that I identified as ‘French’ earlier – orchestration and use of modes – could also be pointed at as being characteristic of certain Welsh composers. Something of the soundworld of Hoddinott and Mathias might

\(^{10}\) The work was written for an amateur group, the Brythoniaid Male Voice Choir.
occasionally be recalled (for example, that of the opening orchestral timbres of Mathias’s *Requiescat*, written the year before *Memoria*, 1977, Ex 9) but the older composers’ adherence to more traditional structures, ‘functional’ harmony and a less flexible rhythmic language distances Lewis from them.

Ex 9 Mathias: *Requiescat*, bars 1 – 5
John Metcalf, born in 1946, whose student career at Cardiff overlapped with Lewis’s, has written in a consistently modal style since about 1990. Geraint Lewis has commented that ‘Metcalf has gone on to fulfil early expectations with a mature style of some individuality based on white-note harmony and intense lyricism,’11 a description that might, with qualifications, also apply to some of Lewis’s more recent work. Metcalf does not, however, seek to create tension between the various elements of his music; *Mapping Wales* (2001), for harp and strings, for example, is closer in its harmonic and structural concerns to *Naaotwá Lalá* than to *Memoria*. Metcalf occasionally introduces elements into his music that ‘give an unmistakeable Welsh identity to the sound-world’12 – his use of a wordless male-voice choir at the start of his 2004 *Cello Symphony* is a good example of this.

The idea that spoken language or landscape might have some influence on a composer’s development is barely entertained by Lewis. He prefers the flatness of the Fen Country to the Welsh mountains, and the light and climate of Italy to that of his homeland. Preference or choice, however, does not negate the power of our earliest memories. Lewis discussed the Welsh language in an interview with Colin Tommis as a possible source for the rising

major second that permeates so much of his music, particularly in
the rhythmic form of the trochee or, ironically, the ‘Scotch snap’. It
is, in the composer’s own mind, simply a fingerprint he cannot
escape, a part of his mental landscape. In the interview with Tommis
he vigorously refutes the idea of this fingerprint being Welsh, or
related to speech patterns or rhythms – Tommis refers to ‘the Welsh
tendency to put an accent on the penultimate syllable of a word’¹³ –
indeed, Lewis goes so far as to deny that any national identity could
be attached to a composer’s language.

I’m not too sure about things to do with one’s
nationality. Okay, we talk about Bartok being a
Hungarian composer or about Stravinsky’s Russian
background, about Debussy being a French
composer and so on... and we think we know what
we mean when we say ‘ah yes, that piece is French’... 
but it’s really very difficult to pin down. If you were
asked to write an essay on why Debussy’s music
sounds French you’d be hard put to fill one side of a
page... We know what we mean but we can’t explain
it. I feel it’s the same with one’s nationality, where
one is born, the society one lives in...¹⁴

Elsewhere, though, he has talked about certain of his more
fragmentary melodic ideas being folk-like (in *Dreams, Dances and
Lullabies*, for example, or *Scena*). These ‘imaginary’ fragments (as
with his more extended plainchant-like phrases, Lewis does not
quote from existing examples) often suggest a world or atmosphere
just out of reach, something both allusive and elusive. Whether this
world is in any sense Welsh is more open to question. William

¹⁴ Ibid., 26.
Mathias embraced the term ‘Celtic’ to explain both the darkness and light of his music, as his daughter Rhiannon has written: ‘the expression of a primal celtic consciousness pervades his instrumental works in their duality between dark, elegiac introspection, and passages of light, colour, and celebratory dance-like movement. His music is an imaginative, temporal vision, the creation of which arises from a profound psychic conflation of the present with a mythological past.’ Lewis is considerably more circumspect, preferring neither to generalise nor to commit himself to any single origin of his ideas.

3.6 Terms and titles

Lewis has on more than one occasion rejected a term or description of his music which he himself has earlier used, or would go on to use later, perhaps because he was concerned that the term might be misconstrued. For example, at the time of its first performance, John Turner described Dead Leaves as ‘a haunting little piece’, a description Lewis found rather wounding. I have more than once since then – admittedly rather diffidently – used the word ‘haunting’ myself, without any objection from the composer. In the case of Dead Leaves, however, the conjunction of ‘haunting’ with ‘little’ was almost certainly what diminished the validity of the first adjective.

together with, as the composer now admits,\textsuperscript{16} the tension of an impending premiere. In fact, given the title, quotations (from Debussy’s ‘...Feuilles mortes’) and dedication (‘To the memory of Debussy’s daughter, Chouchou’) the word ‘haunting’ is not inappropriate.

To give another example, when I wrote the programme notes for my recording of \textit{Musica Aeterna}, Lewis asked me to remove a reference to Messiaen, thinking that it might give the reader the wrong idea of the piece and create inappropriate associations. Interestingly, the references to Stravinsky’s \textit{Symphonies of Wind Instruments}, in connection with \textit{Litania} on the same CD, were allowed to stand. In the case of \textit{Litania} I had made a connection between Lewis’s title and Stravinsky’s famous description of \textit{Symphonies} as ‘...an austere ritual which is unfolded in terms of short litanies...’\textsuperscript{17} and then immediately described the differences in scoring and structure between the two scores. In other words, I had made a passing verbal, rather than musical, connection with a piece that was extremely familiar to Lewis, one that is part of his canon of model scores. My reference to Messiaen touched on something deeper; I had made a connection here between Lewis’s atheist notion of eternity and that of a composer whose work is inseparable from his Catholicism, albeit one whose music has been of constant

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] Conversation with the composer, 27 March 2008.
\end{footnotes}
fascination to Lewis. As such, Messiaen has inevitably left an audible impression on some aspects of Lewis’s music (occasional melodic turns of phrase, the use of certain modes, and above all a sense of timelessness in even the shortest pieces). Equally inevitably, especially in a rather experimental work, Lewis was keen to distance himself from any idea of influence, and perhaps unnecessarily anxious to avoid any close comparison between Musica Aeterna and any of Messiaen’s scores.

How far Henshall’s essay would have concentrated on drawing parallels between Memoria and the works of Mahler, Berg and Stravinsky had Lewis entitled his piece Mutations III (for example) is difficult to judge. Unlike Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, where there is a strong extra-musical element which could be said to generate the very fabric of the work,\(^\text{18}\) Memoria (despite its title and dedication, which seem to me to reflect rather than initiate the material of the piece) is an abstract work, albeit one that seems to express a world of deep tenderness. The word ‘memoria’ can be variously translated as memory, remembrance, recall or recollection; the similar-sounding English word ‘memorial’ would be rendered in Latin as ‘monumentum’. To complicate matters further, Lewis admits that the work was partially intended as a memorial to his mother and that his use of Latin titles both here and elsewhere is

\(^{18}\) See my discussion of its cryptogram in Chapter 4.3.
intended not just to introduce an element of emotional distancing, but also to convey a sense of timelessness and even ‘statelessness’, by which he means transcending geographical boundaries, something akin to universality. The difficulty with titles like Memoria, Epitaph, Elegy or Threnody is that to English ears they are already emotionally loaded before a note is played; the relative obscurity of words such as Teneritas or Recordatio means that although they may have similar meanings they do not carry quite the same automatic associative weight.

3.7 Cultural resonances and the passage of time

Some years ago, Lewis made a copy of a recording of Indian classical music for me, a recording he had taken from BBC Radio 3 in the 1970s. He was particularly impressed with an evening raga (Latangi rāgam) which, contrary to my expectations, was not a gentle, reflectively meandering piece but a work that increased in speed, dynamic and excitement as it went on.

Lewis has taken from his informal interest in Indian music – and Eastern philosophy in general – the concept of playing with musical time. What impressed Lewis most, it seems, about the Latangi rāgam was the idea of intense musical activity, a musical idea pushed to its limits, but without any sense of Western ‘development’, or goal-orientation – it could start or stop at any
point, existing as it did ‘in the moment’, rather than in relation to any other point in time. This seems a difficult, even alien, concept to listeners conditioned by Western musical thought processes, causing a barrier to comprehension or acceptance when adopted by Western composers. However, when seen through a different lens almost anything, be it a piece of music, a work of art, or the life of an individual, may be perceived as part of a much larger, ultimately unknowable pattern. To accept this, and live fully in the present, is to allow a saner, healthier perspective on life.

In the evening raga mentioned above there was a strong sense of cumulative excitement as the music became faster, but despite the continual melodic and rhythmic elaboration, the thrill of the introduction of percussion, and the presence of a broad traditional (Indian) performance structure, it was the inclination of the music towards a state of transcendent joy and ecstasy that propelled the piece forwards. I like to think that the reverse process is occurring in Memoria, that a state of transcendent calm is achieved through a process of simplification and distillation. There is, of course, more to Memoria than this; it is not simply a long diminuendo or deceleration, as the presence of moments of climax and textural change bear out. But the ease with which climaxes subside and overlap into new ideas without any necessity to complete them is more easily explicable if one views these climaxes not as goals in
themselves or even points on a longer journey, but rather as observable passing phenomena.

In 2007 Lewis composed *Beyond the Heavens*, a setting of lines from the Hindu spiritual texts, *The Upanishads*, reflecting on a Hindu interpretation and understanding of mortality. Some of the lines Lewis chose could stand perfectly as a description of Lewis’s aims in his many works which tend towards a vanishing point of silence: ‘There is a bridge between Time and eternity... There is something beyond our mind which abides in silence within our mind. It is the supreme mystery beyond thought... All beings arise from space, and into space they return: space is indeed their beginning and space is their final end.’

*Memoria* is the first of his scores that wholly inhabits this mystical space.

**3.8 Analysis**

The clearest indication of the structure of *Memoria* can be gleaned from examining its rate of harmonic change, and from identifying and investigating those passages where chords either thin out or intensify without the underlying harmony changing. More rarely, there are moments of more strongly articulated chord changes. The
movement of the bass line, that most traditional of guides, maps out the landscape of the whole piece (Ex 10).

Ex 10 *Memoria*, bass line

A few further points in clarification of Ex 10 follow:

(1) At bars 15 – 16 and at bar 152, the connecting arrows between the pairs of notes represent the relatively short time value of the first note; this, together with the simultaneous chordal movement above, briefly produces an effect of ‘functional’ harmony: a chord ‘progression’ rather than a slowly unfolding juxtaposition of chords.
(2) There are several places in the piece where the bass line appears to fall away: at bars 17 – 19 there are sustained chords in the brass, but the removal of the tuba’s low E and then the woodwind figuration creates a strangely empty effect, as if the bass line itself were missing. The lowest pitch of bar 18, A, then seems miraculously to change function and become transformed into a true bass note in bar 19 as the earlier texture reasserts itself. There are similar moments (although without the sustained chords) at bars 70, 74 and 81 – 83.

(3) In most instances where the lowest note simply changes octave (for example at the end of the final paragraph of the work, starting at bar 201) I have not indicated these shifts. The bracketed octave transpositions at bars 54, 87, etc coincide with important textural changes.

(4) I have indicated three major structural divisions of the piece (at the start of bars 30, 45 and 117) with dotted barlines.

Even when considering the bass line in isolation a note of caution must be sounded: whilst for most of the time the lowest pitch in the texture (most frequently heard in the double basses or tuba, occasionally in the bass clarinet) clearly functions as the bass, there are moments when, as a result of the properties of the orchestration, what is heard as the bass is not necessarily the lowest sounding note. For example, at bar 159 the lowest note, F sharp in the double basses, is countered on the third beat with a B sounding a fourth
higher in the tuba, as part of a sustained entry by the brass choir. For a moment one wonders whether in fact that is not the lower note, the echoing movement upwards to B in the double basses at bar 161 simply a confirmation. At these moments it is perhaps better to think of a chord as the superimposition of several textures with no single pitch taking precedence – not even the lowest – but, instead, a totality where the orchestration, the voicing of the sustained chords and the patterns of the swirling figuration all have equal importance.

The role of E as tonal centre is obvious from its prominence in the bass line, particularly in the later stages of the work. The fact that the other pitches heard most frequently at the bottom of the texture are A and B confirms this impression of a tonally conceived work, although the absence of any third or sixth degree of the scale here is an indicator of modality. The second degree of the scale, F sharp, makes four appearances in the bass, twice in the first half and twice in the second. In each case it is either preceded or followed by a B, providing one of the several points of correspondence between two sections which I shall explore further below. The sole appearance of the pitch D as a bass note in bar 3 is more difficult to explain, and retrospectively reinforces an impression of the opening bars as searching in character and introductory in function.
What happens above the bass line is less easy to pin down than the bass line itself. For a work that can sound so harmonically varied at times, Lewis uses a surprisingly small number of modes, and transpositions of those modes. At the points of the work where the harmony seems most ‘functional’ (bars 1 – 6, bars 15 – 16, bars 30 – 45, bars 117 – 119, bar 152) the changes of chord are, as Ex 11 makes clear, the result of a juxtaposition of telling transpositions of one or other of the two modes that predominate in the work. In their fullest form these read, given an E ‘tonic’, E – F sharp – G – A – B – C natural – D (implied but not completely articulated over bars 1 – 2) or E – F sharp – G – A – B – C sharp – D (in bar 3). A ‘complete’ mode is a rarity in Memoria, allowing harmonic ambiguity to create the impression that Lewis is using a larger number of modes or transpositions than is actually the case.

In Ex 11 I have again set out the bass line of those harmonically ‘functional’ bars referred to above, and other moments later in the work where significant harmonic shifts occur. On the middle stave I have shown (re-ordered within an octave’s range) the actual pitches used either in sustained chords, figuration or melody, in each case taking the bass note as the ‘tonic’ of the mode. Above that, each mode is transposed as if its starting note were E, the tonal centre of the whole work.

---

19 The other transpositions, at bars 45, 141, 161 etc, are isolated shifts that are then prolonged beyond a point where the following change is heard in temporal relation to the start of the previous period of harmonic activation.
Ex 11 *Memoria*, bass line with modes indicated

+ = note added to mode  ( ) = note removed from mode  □ = note changed in mode

Bar 1  Bar 2  Bar 3  Bar 4

Bar 6  Bar 15  Bar 16  Bar 30

Bar 31  Bar 32  Bar 33  Bar 34

Bar 35  Bar 36  Bar 37  Bar 39
This upper presentation makes it clear how rarely a change of mode occurs, that is assuming each chord we hear in these bars is interpreted as being in ‘root position’. Taken simply as chords, that would appear to be the correct reading; however, the implications of the melodic-motivic material (the rising tones that dominate the texture between bars 30 – 44, for example) sometimes creates more
than one possible interpretation of the harmony, another reason why the work seems at times to be slipping out of our (intellectual) grasp.

Another good example of tonal ambiguity is provided by the lengthy section from bars 45 – 116: the figuration and chords are always based on the same pitches (E – G – A – B – D, occasionally with F sharp added), but the bass line (see Ex 10) moves between A and E and, once, B. If our focus is on the figuration the modality seems unchanging; if we interpret the figuration through the lens of the bass line, so to speak, then the modality shifts as the bass changes. Other possible readings are introduced by the various melodic motifs and phrases used in this passage – for example, is the rising E – F sharp – G line at bars 75 – 76 best interpreted as degrees 1 – 2 – 3 over a ‘subdominant’ A or degrees 5 – 6 – flattened 7 over a ‘tonic’ A? Either is plausible; it is the absence of a raised seventh from both modes that causes the listener to hesitate over a definitive reading.

By far the greatest number of changes comes from notes being removed from or returned to a mode – enriching or thinning out a mode becomes an increasingly important feature of Memoria in the second half of the work, and it may indeed be considered a structural as well as a harmonic feature of the work, especially in the final phases of the work (bar 184 to the end).
I have already described the bipartite structure of the piece and given my reasons for placing the most important point of articulation at the end of bar 116. At the heart of the first part of the piece is a slow-moving series of seven chords, heard twice between bars 30 – 44 (Ex 12). These chords support the concentrated presentation of one of the two principal ‘melodic’ shapes in the piece – the simple two-note gesture of a rising whole-tone. This is, as has already been mentioned, an interval that recurs as a motif throughout Lewis’s output, whether rising, falling, or sounding together. The previous 29 bars prepare us for this expressive passage; retrospectively, however, there is a strong sense that, rather than being a resolution of the opening, bars 30 – 44 have themselves been ‘embedded’ within the longer paragraph which runs from the start of *Memoria* through to the end of bar 116. A parallel may be drawn here with a moment earlier on in the piece: if we examine the opening of the work more closely, we find a single bar (bar 18) where the increasingly active textures and, as has already been described, the bass line, suddenly fall away to reveal an uncluttered moment of sheer calm (Ex 13). As with bars 30 – 44, with hindsight one experiences this bar as a sort of fold in the material of the piece, a ripple on its surface: our perception is one of sudden stillness, a microcosm of the way we understand the later passage.
These folds also occur at other later points in the piece: bars 70, 74 and 81 – 83, where the bass momentarily disappears, and again at bars 183 and 185, where the texture becomes eerily still. They also provide a preparation for a more extended thinning out of the texture (bars 101 – 116, and generally from bar 173 to the end.) An aerial view, as it were, of Memoria reveals a surface seamless save for these few isolated events; the listener’s experience, on the other hand, is one of ever-changing variety, the result of the constantly shifting focus on harmony, melody and texture referred to above.

Ex 12 *Memoria*, bars 30 – 44, string parts only

![Ex 12 Memoria, bars 30 – 44, string parts only](image-url)
Ex 13 *Memoria*, bars 17 – 19
At a ‘cellular’ level, a blurring of outlines is apparent from the very start. The harmony itself is sometimes sustained in block chords (strings, brass) or presented in ‘activated’ form (woodwind, harp, vibraphone). Melodic motifs can, retrospectively, be identified within the figurations of these often dense textures; recognition of these
motifs as melodically significant, however, is gradual, occurring after we have heard the simpler textures of bars 30 – 44.

The luminosity of Lewis’s orchestration is especially noteworthy, and is as integral a part of Memoria as the harmonic structure underpinning the whole work. It is worth commenting here on the subtlety in the voicing – and the re-voicing on repetition – of the chords between bars 30 – 44, which could only come from the exercise of a very acute ear (see Ex 12 above). Comparison of bar 30 with bars 37 – 38 demonstrates this clearly: in both cases the strings predominate, with each section divided a 2. In bar 30, the chord is distributed over two octaves plus a perfect fourth, with cellos and basses duplicating the low E. Intervals generally become smaller from the bass up. The same principle is true for the scoring of bars 37 – 38 although the bass note is now on the basses alone, undivided, and an octave lower than previously. The next pitch, reading upwards, is a twelfth above, producing a characteristic sonority, often found in Lewis’s piano writing but probably originating in his experience as an organist and in the use of pedal notes. The range of this full presentation of the chord is now five octaves, a solo quartet stretching the chord upwards with octave doublings. Note the placing of these, particularly the three interlocking Es and As which, together with the very fine orchestration, give maximum clarity to the texture.
Memoria does not give up its secrets easily. The modal language often leads the listener to expect the music to take a simpler path than it does, and the reasons for this sense of disparity are partly to do with the relationship between bass line and mode, examined above, and partly to do with our expectations that a certain type of musical structure will unfold, based on an association of aural cues. Lewis continually confounds our preconceptions of how an introduction, recapitulation or coda should proceed, and how each relates to the overall scheme of the work. The use of such traditional terms in the context of Memoria is perhaps unexpected, but there can be no doubt that there are elements of each at key moments in the piece, albeit used in unusual ways.

The very opening provides a good example of this: the first six bars have an introductory feel: they search harmonically for stability, hint melodically at things to come, the orchestration of the long held chords (muted strings with multiple divisions, highlighted by the harp and the slow pulsation of the vibraphone) contributing to the sense of one hearing a musical preface. After bar 6, however, the music changes tack: the harmony ceases its explorations and instead is sustained without change over the next ten bars or so; the focus turns instead to the gradual transformation of the sonority of the held chord from strings to brass, with a parallel gradual accumulation of figuration, mainly in the woodwind, later in the horns as well, again coloured by harp and vibraphone. For the
listener, it is as if our expectations of an introduction, influenced by what has been heard in the first six bars, are suspended, and we are instead invited to examine more closely both the chord we have reached (built up over the ‘tonic’ E) and the ever-expanding orchestral palette. This passage leads us to the ‘fold in the texture’ of bars 17 – 18, which could be perceived as the next stage in the process of distancing the listener from any traditional concept of introduction. Another ten bars, this time poised over a ‘subdominant’ A in the bass, return us to the more functional harmony of the chord sequence of bars 30 – 44. The listener refocusses, and the almost regular changes of harmony, together with the more explicitly melodic wind and brass lines and the removal of figuration from the texture, give an impression that this is what the ‘introduction’ has been leading towards. As has already been remarked, however, the way in which the more active textures at bar 45 restart immediately put bars 30 – 44 in a different perspective, as if they too are embedded within a larger shape. The interpretations now open to the listener are either that the ‘introduction’ has been leading us to this passage (bar 45 on), that there was only a very short, six-bar introduction, or even that there was no introduction at all, and it was simply our preconceptions and associations that led us to form inappropriate conclusions.

Nicholas Cook writes, in A Guide to Musical Analysis, about ‘Some problem pieces’, citing compositions by Chopin, Schoenberg and
Stockhausen as examples of works which obstinately refuse to submit to the usual analytical methods.

“These pieces are all difficult to analyse satisfactorily; ...it is difficult to find any unified analytical approach that shows them to be coherent. This does not necessarily mean that there is anything wrong either with the music or with the analytical approach, as some people seem to think. They think this because they believe music to be a rational activity.” The difficulty with Memoria, the problems that it presents the listener (or analyst), are largely to do with deciding whether the piece should be heard as a narrative structure in the traditional Western sense – one with a beginning, middle and end – or whether the influence of Eastern thought (or more avant-garde Western ideas about manipulating time in music) should encourage us to listen in a less goal-directed way. The question raised by the example above – do we hear introductory qualities in the first five, or twenty-nine, or forty-four bars (or not at all)? – is also applicable to moments of climax later in the work, as well as to questions of the identity of structural junctures which would traditionally be called ‘recapitulation’ and ‘coda’.

The high-point, dynamically, of the first part of the work is undoubtedly the climax of the passage in which the brass choir play a sequence of bell-like chords (bars 87 – 100). The dynamic rises to

21 Ibid., 335.
an accented fortissimo for the final chord, held over bars 99 – 100, but harmonically the entire passage is quite static, the sense of excitement coming from the addition of notes to the mode being used and changes in the voicing of the chords (the brass choir gradually comes together to form a single unit, finally reinforced by violins, double basses and bassoons). The next sixteen bars are, in effect, a pianissimo variation of this passage, a mirror image from another world. The long-awaited harmonic release only occurs at bar 119, still pianissimo, with an exquisite change of chord and bass note. The placing of this change of harmony is, however, tied up with the strong sense of return that we experience at bar 117, where the scoring, dynamic, texture and mood refer back to the very start of the work. The sense of release two bars later therefore has a dual function – as catharsis after the long previous passage, and as an echo of the similarly beautiful chord change at bar 3. Just as in the ersatz introduction, however, any sense of harmonic exploration is rapidly stilled and there is no further chord change until bar 141.

There are several other points of correspondence between the two parts of the work which add a layer of cohesiveness to the overall structure. As well as the quasi-recapitulatory echo of the opening at bar 117, and the similarity of process by which the – relatively speaking – initially active harmonic movement becomes static, this passage (initiated by the flute in bar 118) is also a backdrop to the melodic fragments (mainly rising major seconds) which are being
passed around. This suggests a simultaneous parallel with bars 30 – 44, the first extended exposition of that motif. The figuration which continues in the woodwind, occasionally varied and briefly brought into the foreground (bars 132 – 136) mirrors that which is heard almost without interruption in the first part between bars 45 and 100. The variations that occur (notably the falling major seconds at bars 139, 161 etc) are more in the nature of a commentary upon the first part of the work than development. The return at bar 147 of the other primary melodic gesture, the rising violin figure first heard at bar 55, is approached in such a way as to make one aware that these ascending shapes are, when heard in this form, extended versions of, or prefaces to, the rising major second: a musical unification made possible by the fluidity with which the melody was presented in the first part of the work.

Harmonically, too, there is a resonance from the first part to the second: the chord progressions at bar 152 and then at bars 161 – 163 mirror those at bars 35 – 36 and 43 – 44, both in the sense of being a reversal of the chord progression and of being the only points where F sharp is heard in the bass. The brass choir’s bell-like sonorities from the first part of the work are recalled in both the brass and woodwind at bar 163; the sense of ‘last things’ introduced by the vibraphone at bar 173 is analogous to the pianissimo suspension of activity of the first part heard at bar 100.
There is the feeling of descent about the entire second half of the work from bar 117 to the end. The trajectory of the first part has been towards a dynamic high point at bar 100; the harmonic resolution is delayed over the suspended passage between bars 101 and 116. The dual release of bars 117 and then 119 is satisfying enough to allow us to accept the remainder of the work without any further climax, although there are smaller peaks at bars 141 and 152.

The introduction of a new figure at bar 173 (vibraphone) heralds the final stage of the work, twice suspended by further embedded folds (bars 182–3, 184–6). Curiously, the re-entry of the vibraphone at bar 187 is in faster note values – semiquaver quintuplets – but the effect of the sound of the instrument at this speed is hypnotic and the ear quickly focuses upon the ever-thinning textures around it. There is a sense almost of the temperature dropping and life ebbing away from here to the end. However, Lewis introduces a further contradictory note shortly after the vibraphone commences its slow oscillation at bar 173: how are we to respond to the extended oboe melody at bars 176–181, the longest single phrase in the entire work? Surely it is unusual to place such an idea in a passage which appears to have coda-like qualities? One possible interpretation is that having suggested the idea that the work is now entering its final phase, Lewis can now afford to introduce a more expansive melodic shape, leaving the moment of final realisation that nothing of
substance remains to be said nebulous. Not inappropriately, the work ends with a succession of absences and farewells.

3.9 Conclusions

Was Lewis’s adoption of a simpler and more accessible language in *Memoria* and its relative lack of complexity in comparison with the works immediately preceding it the result of a change of aesthetic direction? The harmonic lucidity of *Memoria* may easily be understood as the composer approaching the task he had set himself with the most suitable means available to him; the activity and relative dissonance of *Time-Passage*, for example, would clearly be inappropriate to the artistic aims of *Memoria*. Whether those artistic aims amount to a change of aesthetic direction is a more difficult question to answer. The composition of *Memoria* marks a moment of crucial change in direction, in that the juxtaposition of activity and stillness so common in earlier scores is from here on frequently separated out into works that wholly feature one or other of those qualities. He was certainly neither reacting against the complex elements in his own earlier music nor taking an aesthetic stand against harmonic, textural or even conceptual complexity in general.

Lewis has never lost interest in the music of his former teachers, Ligeti and Stockhausen. Perhaps in *Memoria* he took his cue from
Stockhausen himself who – particularly in more immediately attractive scores such as *Stimmung* – gave composers the confidence, the permission, to tend towards greater economy and consonance in their work and allowed them to move without any sense of contradiction between complex and uncomplicated scores.

Lewis’s compositional techniques in *Memoria*, as we have seen, remain very similar to those he engaged with in *Time-Passage*. So, far from rejecting any aspect of his earlier language, he is, rather, making a close study of a single feature of it – the extension of a moment of tranquillity into motionlessness – a feature which, at that particular point in time, interested him deeply.
4. EPITAPH FOR ABELARD AND HELOISE

*Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* dates from 1979. It was first performed in November of that year by principals of the (then) BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra as part of a concert at the Chapter Arts Centre in Cardiff, which had recently come under the direction of Lyell Cresswell. It is scored for flute doubling alto flute, clarinet, violin, cello, piano and one percussionist playing vibraphone, glockenspiel, two suspended cymbals (medium and large) and tam-tam. It is a single-movement span of some seventeen-and-a-half minutes’ duration.

The story of Abelard and Heloise has fascinated Jeffrey Lewis for many years. A long-standing ambition of his has been to create a music-theatre piece based on their exchange of letters; this ambition almost came to fruition in the mid-1990s in a projected collaboration with the Anglesey-based artist Mick Brown at the Ucheldre Centre, Holyhead – an appropriate venue, since it is a converted Catholic convent chapel. Illness prevented any work on the project at that point, but discussions started again in 2000 – 01. The scoring – piano, cello and clarinet (players to be drawn from the ranks of Ensemble Cymru, a resident ensemble at the University of Wales in Bangor) – and the number of voices required – two soloists plus a small chorus – were established, and the possibility of turning the project into a multi-media collaboration with an electro-
acoustic composer, Robert MacKay, was raised. The application for funding for this scheme was only partially successful, however: only £5000 was raised. When I made an application for a variation of the same project for performance in 2003, not even this amount was available. On that occasion, the projected scoring had been altered to piano, flute and clarinet, with percussion, narrator, two vocal soloists (Abelard and Heloise) and small choir. The electro-acoustic element was dropped. Discouraged by yet another failure to secure funding, either from the Arts Council of Wales (ACW) or the Performing Rights Society (PRS) Foundation, Lewis abandoned – one hopes, temporarily – plans for the piece, leaving Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise as originally conceived, a free-standing work. It may yet, however, form an epilogue to the dramatic work Lewis would love to write.

In his programme note for Epitaph, Lewis takes great pains to make it clear that the work is not a piece of programme music. Although its subject matter would make tempting fare for a composer whose

---

1 In information provided in an email to the author, 29 July 2009, Robert MacKay adds: ‘Pwyll ap Siôn was on board as a composer as well, but later I was brought in to produce electroacoustic elements with a live female chorus (members of the Bangor University Chamber Choir). I completed a suite of three pieces (mainly consisting of parts of the libretto which were dream sequences). The new Libretto was written by Tania ap Siôn.’ Pwyll and Tania ap Siôn were not, however, involved at the same time as Lewis; they contributed to the project at some point during the period 1996 – 2000 when Lewis had temporarily withdrawn from the venture.

2 Apart from the addition of the two vocal soloists, this is an identical scoring to that of Epitaphium – Children of the Sun (1967).

3 Robert MacKay (email, 29 July 2009) recalls that the collaborative nature of the project was still a possibility until quite near the point when I applied for funding: ‘After moving to Scarborough I remember having several conversations with Jeff over the phone about the possibility of producing the project in one form or another. He even mentioned the possibility of using singers from the Royal Northern [College of Music].’ By the time I made my application, however, the plan was to use more modest forces.
inclinations take him in that direction, Lewis prefers a more symbolic approach. His creative response is directed more towards a representation of moods and emotions rather than towards the specific events related in the history of the two protagonists; his use of musical metaphor – considered in detail below – dictates the structure of the work far more significantly than does the chronology of events in the lives of Abelard and Heloise.

Their relationship dated from the years 1115 – 16, when Abelard was in his mid-thirties and Heloise was about twenty (although some scholars have argued an earlier date of birth for her than the generally accepted 1095, on the grounds of her fame and scholastic accomplishments). At this time, Abelard was Master of the School of Notre Dame and a famed, if controversial, philosopher. Heloise, the niece of one Canon Fulbert, was already a skilled writer when she started to study with Abelard. Their affair resulted in the birth of a son, Astralabe, and a secret marriage; the violent end to their relationship came in 1117 with Fulbert’s bloody vengeance upon Abelard. A prolonged period of separation followed, and it was not until 1132 that Abelard wrote the long autobiographical letter which found its way to Heloise, now Abbess of the Paraclete, an order founded by Abelard ten years earlier. Over the next four years the couple exchanged a series of passionate and anguished letters. These, together with the appearance of their story in Roman de la Rose (1275), helped to create the legend of two lovers which has only
been the subject of more serious historical research over the last century.\footnote{Information drawn from James Burge, *Heloise & Abelard*, London, 2003. This readable but well-researched book gives much background material on the period, and summarises some of the most recent scholarship on the subject, particularly the work by Constant J. Mews on the controversial ‘early’ letters, whose authorship was attributed to Abelard and Heloise only as recently as 1999.}

Rather than recounting events in sequence, Lewis, in his original programme note, starts by describing the emotional upheaval of the relationship of Abelard and Heloise from a point in time long after their affair had ended: ‘As their letters reveal, they [Abelard and Heloise] found a path through tragedy and self-pity into acceptance of a changed but lasting relationship.’

The correspondence between the pair dates from more than a decade after the end of their sexual relationship, and Lewis seems to be asking us to listen to the piece from the perspective of familiarity with their entire story. In other words he immediately discourages us from taking a chronological or narrative view of *Epitaph*. The tragedy he refers to is the breakdown of their relationship after Abelard’s castration at the hands of the henchmen of Heloise’s uncle, Canon Fulbert, who was deeply opposed to the union between a scholar with a reputation for unorthodoxy and the young girl in his (Fulbert’s) charge. Lewis avoids any reference in his notes to the castration itself, perhaps fearing that the violent later stages of the work might be too literally taken as an illustration of that horrific
event. Indeed, he makes no mention of violence whatsoever, perhaps an indication that those passages represent psychological dislocation rather than physical damage.

It is not difficult to hear the ‘path through tragedy and self-pity into acceptance’ reflected in the last pages of the work, as tranquillity is finally achieved through adversity. The title, however, seems to imply that the work is more a memorial to the pair than a depiction of their final years of epistolatory friendship. Far more relevant, however, to Lewis’s preoccupations as a composer is his third paragraph:

In their passionate interest in problems of faith and morality, they are representative of their time, but their dilemma is of timeless interest, created by the circumstances of two complex personalities, torn between allegiance to dogma and resulting self-reproach.

Tension between chastity and sexuality, ritual and freedom, seems to be at the heart of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, as it is in many of Lewis’s more recent works. These tensions have taken different forms over the last thirty years. Their most recent manifestation can be found in the second and fifth of the *Sacred Chants* (2003 – 5), in which choral lines reminiscent of plainchant in their melodic contours and rhythmic flexibility combine with an organ part based on the *Liebestod* from Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde*: an unearthly meeting of asceticism and eroticism. The transformation of material from the ostensibly spiritual *Carmen Paschale* (1981) into the
exultant and delightedly sensual *Limina Lucis* (1982) also
demonstrates this tendency. Abelard and Heloise’s dilemma, or,
more accurately, the musical metaphor which arises from it, is
clearly of great interest to Lewis.

Chastity was not a requirement of Medieval clerics, and marriage
was permitted, if not actively encouraged. Yet the persistence, over
centuries of spiritual teaching, of notions of the superiority of sexual
purity dates back to St Augustine and it is easy to see how feelings
of self-reproach and guilt could be ascribed to two lovers giving
sexual expression to their feelings for each other, especially under
the difficult circumstances of their being teacher and student. Lewis
symbolises the supposed incompatibility between sexual love and
devotion to God – a continual subject of philosophical debate for
Abelard and Heloise – by means of different modes and the
contrasting rhythmic treatment of those modes. The reconciliation of
the various musical ideas and, by implication, their origins in the
ideas debated by the protagonists, can thus be seen as a strong
driving force behind the work.

Lewis’s lengthy quotations from Heloise’s letters on the subject of
her sexual desire for Abelard provide a further clue to our
understanding of the more expressive phrases of *Epitaph*:

---

5 Ibid., 51 – 52.
...it is clear that [Heloise] felt no vocation for the religious life, and was tormented by frustrated sexual love – “the pleasures of lovers which we have shared have been too sweet – they can never displease me, and can scarcely be banished from my thoughts. Wherever I turn they are always there before my eyes, bringing with them awakened longings and fantasies which will not even let me sleep”.6

At the time when Heloise was writing those words, she was Abbess of the Paraclete, and she had a reputation as a scholar and thinker of some distinction. More than a dozen years after the end of the affair, in the same letter from which Lewis has quoted, she describes in still more graphic terms the ‘torment of frustrated sexual love’: ‘Even during the celebration of the Mass, when our prayers should be purest, lewd visions take such a hold upon my unhappy soul that my thoughts are on their wantonness instead of on my prayers.’7

There is no sense of regret for their shared past, simply an acknowledgement that it shapes her present. Lewis chooses not to quote these lines, but they certainly feed our perception of Heloise as a woman of considerable sensual power. This is a perception clearly shared by Lewis – the erotic charge of much of the earlier part of Epitaph should not be underestimated.

Lewis’s final paragraph seems simultaneously to state his aims in writing Epitaph and to raise as many questions as it answers:

The work deals primarily with the universal, timeless aspect of their relationship. For the most part the

---

6 Heloise: Second Letter, quoted in ibid., 205.
7 Quoted in ibid., 205.
music is gentle, and the symbolic interrelationship of material portrays their separate characters and unified existence. This is reflected in the ascending melodic figures which pervade the work and culminate in the final section, and the use of cryptograms derived from the musical equivalents of the letters of their names, which appear as individual melodic ideas, and more significantly as a composite theme. This recurs at various stages ‘as a call from the distance of time and space’, assuming the function of a musical and emotional echo.

Lewis’s punning use of the word ‘timeless’ is significant: he transforms the idea of the continuing resonance of a relationship over almost nine centuries into one of his own musical preoccupations, that of changing our perception of the passage of time as we listen to his music to such a point that time seems almost to stop. The remainder of the paragraph, however, requires a little unpicking.

Firstly, it is hard to reconcile the avowedly non-programmatic nature of *Epitaph* with Lewis’s use of the phrase ‘...portrays their separate characters...’. Neither Abelard nor Heloise is given a theme of their own and there is certainly no attempt to characterize their personalities; Lewis’s use of cryptograms gives equal weight to each letter (pitch) used, whichever name it is drawn from – there is never a sense that an E, for example is the E in Abelard rather than in Heloise, or vice versa. The ‘pure’ forms of the cryptograms based on
their names (see Ex 3a below) are rarely used in their entirety, but instead are moulded according to their surroundings. The combined musical letters of their names, the ‘composite theme’ formed from the cryptograms (Exx 3e and 3f), approaches a portrayal of their ‘unified existence’, a pool of notes from which the various melodic fragments have been fashioned.

Secondly, as we shall see, the ascending melodic figures are not drawn from this pool; in fact their symbolism seems to depend upon the fact that their pitch-sets contradict the pitch-sets of the cryptograms and the surrounding modal writing.

Finally, the ‘call from the distance of time and space’ is a poetic but rather nebulous phrase – poetic, in the sense that it conjures up that image of the timelessness I have described above, but unhelpful to the listener since there is no single form in which the cryptogram appears that could be labelled as its primary Urform. Rather, the final form of the cryptogram (that heard at bar 123) has evolved from melodic fragments which are initially introduced quite unobtrusively.

---

8 The musical letters of Abelard’s name, but not those of Heloise, appear in full, first at bars 46 – 47, and then again at bar 123.
4.1 From *Memoria* to *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*

The continuous melodic variation and evolution of the cryptogram provides just one example of Lewis’s compositional flexibility over the course of the work. His use of modes, particularly with regard to the control of long term tension, is similarly fluid, and he uses a wider modal/harmonic vocabulary here than in *Memoria*. As a whole, *Epitaph* displays a shift away from the structural tendencies of *Memoria* and a refinement of those found in the intervening work, *Stratos*.

*Stratos* dates from some six months earlier and contains a first exploration of many of the musical ideas which are developed in *Epitaph*. The melodic and harmonic language of the two pieces is closely related; indeed, there are passages of *Stratos*, particularly in its second part, which find their way virtually unchanged into the later work.

*Stratos* is a shorter work than *Epitaph*, lasting about twelve minutes. The scoring of the two works is similar, although there are no flutes in *Stratos* and the percussion is limited to vibraphone and glockenspiel. A major difference is the inclusion of an important part for electric guitar, an instrument for which Lewis has a great fondness: he had also used it in his early *Chamber Concerto*. Its sound creates associations far removed from the cloistered world of
Abelard and Heloise, but the sometimes angular patterns he gives it anticipate some of the more jagged lines of the later stages of *Epitaph*. (See Ex 1 – note the chromatic pool of notes which start in a straightforward minor mode, the contradicting major sevenths and minor ninths, and the wide, three-octave range.)

Ex 1 *Stratos*, bar 33, electric guitar part only

The proportions of *Stratos* are quite different from those of *Epitaph*: there is a clear division into two sections, the second of which is about a third the length of the first. The first section explores the sort of textures which provide the backdrop for what I shall term the ‘fourth wave’ of *Epitaph*. The second section is a study in rising lines based on a variety of modal and intervallic patterns. It is this second part which is repeated, in an abbreviated and refined form, at the conclusion of *Epitaph*. The absence of melodic material in the first half of *Stratos* (excepting some fragments which are introduced partway through but not developed further) gives the piece a curiously experimental air; the textural writing too is less continuous than that of *Epitaph*, and the constant frustration of the musical progress – in contrast to the seamless writing of *Memoria*, or
the carefully paced wave patterns of *Epitaph* – contributes to a sense that one is hearing a series of sketches, a first draft rather than a finished composition. This impression is supported by the rather hastily written score, legible but less of a work of art in itself than the scores of either its predecessor or its successor.

The second section works almost as a free-standing movement by itself, perhaps suggesting that it is rather too long for its position in *Stratos*, and emphasising the absence of any organic link between the two parts of the work. On its own terms, however, it is a beautifully crafted passage, and one can hear why Lewis reused it in the more sophisticated context of *Epitaph*. Despite the fact that *Epitaph* is almost half as long again as *Stratos*, Lewis cut this passage down to exactly half its original length, retaining its imaginative touches and expressive essentials but intensifying its effect.

Melodic and harmonic ideas from *Epitaph* were also to find their way into later pieces. The first such self-quotation was to come in the second movement of *Tableau* early the following year.⁹ Some of the textural experiments of both *Stratos* and *Epitaph* – modified for choral forces – as well as the underlying structural principles of the later work underpin *Carmen Paschale* (1981).

---

⁹ See Chapter 5.3 for a full discussion of the connections between the two works.
4.2 Analysis

The structure of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* may be summarised as a sequence of four musical waves which reach a crisis point, resolved in a concluding section that incorporates the elements of a vestigial recapitulation and a coda within a telescoped reminiscence of the opening and a personal valediction (see Table 1).\(^{10}\)

Table 1: *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, tabular analysis

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 23</td>
<td>Introduction (1 – 6) and first wave (7 – 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 32</td>
<td>Second wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 67</td>
<td>Third wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 – 103</td>
<td>Fourth wave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dividing line between texture, motif and melody in *Epitaph* is even more blurred than it was in *Memoria*. Where in *Memoria* a particular texture might predominate for a significant length of time (eg repeating woodwind patterns; the accumulation of bell-like brass and woodwind chords), in *Epitaph* the textures are constantly being varied, and may flow effortlessly into each other or even be superimposed, creating a more complex surface, despite the smaller number of instruments being used. This gives the music great

\(^{10}\) All of these descriptive phrases are my own.
fluidity and, especially in the fourth wave, a sense of improvisatory freedom. Paradoxically, although a single texture may be maintained unchanged for longer in *Memoria*, the structural articulation points (pauses or rests) are clearer in *Epitaph*, and modal changes are similarly clean. This structural organisation into waves rather than unbroken musical tissue will recur in *Carmen Paschale*.

The various textures and types of motivic-melodic writing Lewis uses in *Epitaph* may be summarised as follows:

1. Slow oscillations, usually between two notes, rhythmic fluidity emphasised by the unobtrusive alternation of quavers and triplet quavers, hemiolas and frequent ties from beat to beat.

2. More rapid, continuous figuration in semiquavers, and quintuplet or sextuplet semiquaver groups. Four, five or six pitches may be used, but not in precisely repeating patterns.

3. Decoration – grace-notes, acciaccaturas, etc – enriches these textures further.

4. Isolated fragments of figuration which may take on a motivic-melodic character. Four- or five-note groups, often ascending patterns which articulate a segment of the predominant mode, are given melodic significance by their dynamic, scoring and expressive rhythmic profile: the final note or pair of notes is often elongated and then fades back into pianissimo oscillation and figuration.

Single held notes may also take on similar significance; later on in
the piece, rising or falling tones (echoes of *Memoria*) become more frequent, as do terse rhythmic figures (waves 3 and 4).

5. Longer and still more expressive ‘modal melodies’ may grow from the shorter melodic fragments just described. Often given to the alto flute, these sensuous lines are found particularly in wave 3.

6. A chromatically-inflected melody articulates fragments and variants of the Abelard and Heloise cryptogram.

7. An ascending figure in regular quavers, presented on the piano and vibraphone. The rhythmic rigidity and marked chromaticism (like the cryptogram, it is quite independent of the underlying mode) give this a character unlike that of any other figure in the work.

Underpinning all this material is a pedal note, initially a low C on the piano, occasionally reinforced by a cello pizzicato or coloured by the resonance of untuned percussion. This pedal note is introduced during the first six, introductory, bars of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*. Unusually for Lewis, these bars are, at the most obvious and audible level, scene-setting. Lewis generally prefers the first sounds we hear to be expository rather than introductory, even when they are gentle and seem to emerge from silence (see, for example, *Memoria* and *Carmen Paschale*). Here, Lewis perhaps felt a need to ease the listener into *Epitaph*’s uneasy landscape.

The single quiet strokes on the tam-tam and suspended cymbals immediately awaken associations of ritual, ‘bells and smells’, especially for the listener conscious of the subject matter of the
piece. The piano’s first low C (bar 4; Lewis marks it to be played ‘like a tam-tam’) simultaneously echoes the deep bell-like sonorities of the first three bars and starts to suggest a pitch centre.

There is a secondary layer in these six bars which is probably inaudible to the listener ignorant of the notation of the score – an example of Lewis’s obsessive instinct for controlling all the elements of his material. These bars are written without time signature, with a single event placed at the beginning of each bar, which is then also given its own pause. These pauses are given a precise time value – bar 1 lasts ten seconds, bar 2 nine seconds and so on. Bar 6 has the expected duration of five seconds and then bar 7 is given a time signature of 4/4 at crotchet = 60, thus leading seamlessly from the introduction into the first forward-moving wave of music.

The four waves that carry the music towards the moment of crisis at bar 104 are each based around the activation of particular harmonic fields, and a sense of organic growth is achieved by careful timing of the accumulation of pitches, and the textural and melodic activity within each one.

The use of modes in the four waves of *Epitaph* is uncomplicated and quickly summarised (see Ex 2).
Ex 2 *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, modes used in bars 7 – 103

The white-note mode of the first wave is replaced at the start of the second by an inflected variant which then underpins much of the third wave and the start of the fourth. It will be clear that Lewis uses similar, if fewer, modes in *Epitaph* to those found in *Memoria*, and he changes modes in a similar manner, again using pivot notes to
ease the movement from one to another. The bass, however, hardly changes over the course of this part of the piece, echoing the latter stages of *Memoria* rather than its first part. From bar 104, the crisis point of the piece, underlying modality (and the more-or-less constant background texture of oscillation and figuration) gives way to a series of unpredictable, fragmented gestures whose harmonic foundations are constantly shifting. Each of the four waves has its own distinct character and function, reflected in the choice of mode(s) used and the differences in predominating textures.

### 4.3 Wave one

The initially expository role of the first wave gives way to increased textural density, growth and acceleration, towards an abrupt break at the end of bar 23. The pedal notes from the introductory ‘countdown’ continue to impart a spacious time perspective even as the texture becomes more active. The slow oscillations are introduced by the violin in bar 9, an alternating A – B, or, more accurately, A – H: the initial letters of the two lovers’ names are thus symbolically incorporated into the fabric of the piece from the very beginning. These are taken up by alto flute (bar 12) and clarinet (bar 13), further pitches (D – E) from the mode being introduced by the clarinet at bar 15. Lewis seems to be carefully gauging when it is appropriate to release a new pitch into the texture; similarly, the accumulation of activity at first occurs drop by drop, then at a much
faster rate. Waves and droplets: the metaphor of the movement of liquids, hinted at in words such as fluidity, is hard to resist.

The two wind instruments also present motivic-melodic fragments which then swiftly sink back into the oscillating background. In this context, even a single held note may have melodic significance. Those of the alto flute (bar 11) and clarinet (bar 13) also have colouristic significance, emphasised by their detailed dynamic markings, and the decorated oscillations of these instruments present the listener with Eastern musical associations when combined with Lewis’s modal writing – the sound of the shakuhachi, perhaps, or the music of Japanese composers such as Tōru Takemitsu (Towards the Sea and Quatrain II) or Hifumi Shimoyama (Ichigo No Tsukikage). George Crumb’s Vox Balaenae provides an even closer point of contact – the decorative flute writing at the opening of Crumb’s score and the repeating triplet figures later in the same section are both echoed in Epitaph – see Ex 5 below.

The violin presents the first version of Lewis’s Abelard and Heloise cryptogram (bars 17 – 18). Its various transformations during the four waves are set out in Ex 3. It maintains an emotional distance, coolly expressive, on each appearance. The gradual emergence of a full statement of the musical letters of the two names may be observed over the course of the whole piece.
Ex 3a the names of Abelard and Heloise in cryptogram form

Ex 3b *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, cryptogram at bars 17 – 18

Ex 3c *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, cryptogram at bar 32

Ex 3d *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, cryptogram at bars 41 – 42
Ex 3e *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, cryptogram at bars 46 – 47

Ex 3f notes from Ex 3e, and at bar 123, showing their place within the cryptogram

Ex 3g *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, cryptogram at bars 74 – 5 (for comparison with Ex 3c)

The climax of the first wave accompanies the first statement of the ascending quaver figure (bar 22), although there are two previous attempts to launch this at bars 13 and 16. As with the cryptogram, there are varied presentations during the first large phase of the work, up to bar 103 (see Ex 4). Each variant offers a ‘note-row’ of differing lengths, some starting within the surrounding mode but quickly moving away from it and contradicting it. There is an air of intransigence about these partial note-rows – a refusal to fit in with the prevailing untroubled white-note modality – which, alongside
their rhythmic inflexibility, suggests that they could easily symbolise the oppressive religious disapproval that Abelard and Heloise faced. Certainly their severity brings about the sudden conclusions of the first two waves, and their insidiously disguised rhythms at bars 80 – 81 and 95 – 98 precipitate the crisis of bar 104.

Ex 4 *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, presentations of ascending phrases

[Music notation images]
The steep crescendo that concludes the first wave is brought about when flute, clarinet, violin and cello move from oscillation and melodic fragments to more continuous, purposeful figuration: by the end of the wave all four instruments are playing and together they accelerate towards a sudden break. The start of the second wave is then announced by a quietly sinister chord on piano and vibraphone.
that introduces the new mode and also creates a sense of heightened tension.

4.4 Wave two

The second wave is more succinct than the first; despite the difference in mode, there is a sense that order is being restored after the previous abrupt curtailment. Oscillations are less tentative, more notes are activated simultaneously. There is a greater sense of expressivity in the melodic figures, which comes both from the use of semitones in the mode and their dynamic and scoring (violin and cello phrases echoed by the vibraphone in bars 26 – 27 and 29, for example). Lewis introduces new colouristic elements in this wave: the opening piano and vibraphone chord is echoed and sustained by the wind and strings; tremolos and harmonics provide a discreet chiaroscuro to the texture. Generally speaking, Lewis eschews extended techniques, preferring instead to derive the maximum colour from ‘traditional’ means. Here, long held notes and chords echo the soundworld of earlier pieces such as Mobile II, where lines are drawn out almost to a point of stillness.

Lewis again embeds just one variant of the cryptogram figure, although this time it emerges out of the ascending quaver line (bars 31 – 32). The latter is presented unannounced and seems to shock this wave into silence.
4.5 Wave three

The third wave is a longer (more than the length of the two previous waves combined) and more intense phase, advancing the sense of dramatic narrative, especially when modal ambiguity threatens its later stages. There is greater emphasis on melodic writing, a symbolic concentration on sensual pleasures, perhaps; the cryptogram figures appear twice (see Exx 3d and 3e), and the short melodic fragments from the earlier waves are extended into longer lines for the alto flute. At first (bar 35), one of the modal segments is drawn out and given a more flexible rhythmic profile (the reverse process of that which transforms the fragments in wave one into the more continuous figuration that concludes it); at bars 61 – 63 and 65 – 67 this new lyrical idea gains ground, until the dam finally bursts and we are taken into the fourth and final wave.

Before this, however, Lewis has subtly introduced a dark cloud, a fold in the musical texture that recalls similar structural moments in *Memoria*. The pedal C that underpinned the first wave (occasionally coloured by the E a tenth above) continues through the second (the E natural darkened by the new modality to E flat) into the third. Now the pedal notes start to become smudged: the C momentarily shifts to D at bar 49, returning to C two bars later. From here, however, the stability of the mode above falters; the clarinet starts an aggressive tremolo between two ‘foreign’ notes, C
sharp and E and the consonant cello trill G – A of bar 50 contracts to a ‘dissonant’ G – A flat. At bar 53, the vibraphone trills between D sharp and E creating a further level of ambiguity – do we hear the D sharp as an enharmonic E flat, fighting the foreign E, or should we understand the D sharp as a ‘foreign’ raised D natural, the first three notes of the old mode now all lifted by a semitone? Lewis’s fondness for pivot notes allows for musical punning of this sort, as can also be seen in the next bars.

At bar 55, a C and C sharp an augmented octave apart are heard in the deep bass of the piano, closely followed by the E flat that has shadowed the pedal notes since the second wave. Again, a punning role may be discerned, the minor tenth already familiar (and a Lewis fingerprint, particularly in this register of the piano – it will reappear in Tableau and Sonante, amongst other scores), the rising ‘whole-tone’ (C sharp – E flat) recognisable from its appearances in Memoria and many other scores. We have already heard the interval in a different guise as the tail of the cryptogram variant in bar 32 and it will assume still greater importance as the piece progresses.

Figurations continue to use both D natural and D sharp/E flat, creating a sour and baleful atmosphere; the chromatic cluster is completed with C sharp, E natural and the pedal C natural. The E natural becomes ever more insistent (clarinet, violin and cello, bar 55 on) leading to a fold within a fold at bars 58 – 59 – a tiny
reminiscence of the percussion strokes of the opening ‘countdown’,
coloured by a soft, wide-spaced piano chord (C sharp now as its
bass, D sharp and F sharp above)\textsuperscript{11} – a reminder, perhaps, of the
spiritual duty of Abelard and Heloise, which has been neglected in
favour of more immediate gratification.

The pianissimo trills and tremolos of bar 60 bring the original (C – D
– E flat…) mode back into focus just as they did in \textit{Memoria}, bar
19,\textsuperscript{12} and prepare us for the alto flute’s extended melodies, all the
more languorous after the earlier tension. An uneasy textural
undercurrent persists, however, in the sparse but telling piano
writing and continuing trills and tremolos; an association between
these textures and an increase in harmonic tension seems to have
been formed during the preceding anxious bars.

There are far fewer simple oscillations in this wave, and none of the
authoritarian rising quaver lines. The tendency to colour ideas as
vividly as possible is developed further – pizzicato glissandi, flecks of
light from the glockenspiel, sudden sharp accents disappearing to
nothing: all these illuminate without distracting from the
momentum of the music.

\textsuperscript{11} There is a rare error – a missing treble clef – in the following bar (59) of Lewis’s otherwise
immaculately penned score; in the piano part, the correct note should be the E natural above middle
C.

\textsuperscript{12} See Ex 13 in Chapter 3.8.
One notable new development in this wave is the addition of acciaccaturas to the figuration, adding rhythmic character where before there was mellifluous continuity. The figuration takes on a Stravinskian quality, recalling the Introduction to Part One of *Le sacre du printemps* or the Russian folk material in *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*, perhaps (Ex 5 – alto flute and clarinet parts).

When these phrases are combined with even, repeating patterns in the vibraphone and the outlines become blurred (Ex 5 – piano and vibraphone parts), the association shifts to the opening of Crumb’s *Vox Balaenae*.

Ex 5 *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, bars 37 – 38

4.6 Wave four

The fourth wave seems, in retrospect, to be the goal of the three preceding waves, a musical consummation after the exploratory gestures of the earlier phases of the piece. The listener seems to be
launched onto a very different sort of wave here: the sense of
musical pulse becomes much more elastic and there is now true
rhythmic independence between background texture and foreground
events. Much of this wave consists of free bars, bars with no time
signature whose length, as in the earlier part of Stratos, is
determined by the conductor’s placing of events within each bar by
signals.

The textural activity itself is much more uniform: repeating patterns
of semiquavers (the speed of these groups set at crotchet = c.96)
create a backdrop in the predominant mode. The changes of mode
(see Ex 2 above) are mostly clean, that at bar 72 announced with a
small dynamic emphasis, for example.

The foreground is more fragmented than earlier, isolated events ‘out
of time’ suspended against the whispering background texture.
Some elements are already familiar: single accented notes, held
notes with a bell-like accent at their start, chords, either percussive
or sustained, a wide-ranging, decorative melodic phrase in the
clarinet (bar 70) and alto flute (bar 87) ending with long-held notes
fading to nothing, melodic motifs and figuration describing a
segment of the mode. There are again pizzicato glissandi articulating
rising or falling tones, and a fleeting return (bar 83) of the untuned
percussion as the wave moves towards its first danger point.
New to this wave are the slower triplet figurations (bar 87) in vibraphone and piano, reminiscent of the closing pages of *Memoria*. Abruptly rhythmic gestures in the wind instruments (bars 77 – 79) and then also with the violin (bar 82) are particularly close to ideas found in *Stratos* (see Ex 6); here they assume greater significance for being so rare, and so different from the surrounding material. These jagged shapes will become still more important later.

Ex 6a *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, woodwind figures, bars 77 – 9

Ex 6b *Stratos*, clarinet figures, bars 20 and 40

The ascending quaver figure now achieves its fullest form (twelve notes, twelve different pitches at bars 73 – 74; the form of the cryptogram we heard earlier at bar 32 again emerges from its conclusion), and it is then presented, slightly varied, in the rhythmic
disguise of the alto flute’s earlier sensuous phrases (bars 80 – 81). This infiltration follows the chilling change of mode and pedal note (to E) at bar 76. As in wave three, the shift in the bass signals disquiet, and the first warning of impending crisis takes us, via accelerating repeated notes in alto flute and piano, to a fortissimo at the end of bar 84, damped down by a magically scored decorated falling tone and semitone and change of mode. The trills and held chords again echo *Epitaph*’s bar 60 – another *Memoria*-like fold. The blurred scoring of the first part of this bar, alto flute, piano and vibraphone smudging and obscuring each other, suggests a mysterious portal through which the listener must pass. The new mode is, in fact, a filled-out transposition of the mode at bar 68, E now its root.

From here to the crisis itself, despite relative textural calm, the blissful serenity of bar 68 has been lost; after a final statement of the twelve-note ascending quaver figure (bars 95 – 98), ending with a yearning rising tone from the violin, the piano again insists upon a repeated, accelerating single note. This gets faster and louder, until viciously silenced by percussive chords from piano and vibraphone. The crisis point has been reached, irrevocably.
4.7 Crisis and Resolution

The remainder of *Epitaph* follows quite a different structural trajectory to that of the four waves already described, most obviously because of the greatly increased fragmentation of the material. Despite two previous attempts to derail the musical process, and three other clear articulation points, there has been a sense of musical continuity, partly derived from the slow underlying harmonic rhythm and partly from textural homogeneity. The rapid changes of texture we encounter from bar 104 on are as disturbing as the dramatic change in mood from sensual tranquillity to sharp attack. Ideas are barely established before being interrupted or left hanging in the air. Also striking is Lewis’s use of silence, or textural stillness (single notes or chords left resounding): he creates calm from the almost constant background activity up to bar 104; the removal of this textural murmurung produces a much more unsettled soundworld.

In Table 1 above, I subdivided the ‘crisis’ bars into seven subsections, according to textural and harmonic considerations. These may be summarised as follows:

1. Bars 104 – 111: based around sharply accented piano and vibraphone chords, mostly on a pedal C.
4. Bars 124 – 128: based around a single chord, on a pedal E flat, articulated by the entire ensemble.

5. Bars 129 – 136: based around a single chord (pedal notes D – A flat – D) again articulated by the entire ensemble.


7. Bars 150 – 157: figuration becomes more continuous; melodic reminiscences introduced.

Looked at from a dramatic viewpoint, subsections 1 and 2 both move the narrative forwards by a series of fragmented gestures, curtailed by the still centre of the whole work, subsection 3, the ‘call across time and space’ that Lewis referred to in his programme notes. A piercing woodwind scream kick-starts the momentum of the piece again, only to be abruptly curbed by the whimpering that starts subsection 5. After a cadenza-like climax, earlier elements of the piece – textural, melodic and harmonic – start to return in the hallucinatory soundworld of subsections 6 and 7, seen now from the distorted perspective of violence and tragedy.

A further level of subtlety is revealed by considering the registers used in this passage: bass resonance is almost entirely removed in subsection 2, eventually leaving only the single line cryptogram – an intense and yet ethereal concentration on the upper register.

Subsection 4 exploits instrumental extremes, while subsection 5
starts to rein them back in; the reminiscences of earlier material are again all treble-oriented, and like subsection 2, end with a high, long-held clarinet crescendo. These pitch ranges do not precisely mirror the dramatic activity; rather, they provide an alternative profile – the bass line twice cut away – to the more obvious dynamic shape of the passage.

The final statement of the cryptogram in long held violin harmonics at bar 123 is presented out of time as a sequence of paused notes, *ppp possibile lontano*. It bears the weight of being the psychological climax of the work; like Debussy in *Pelléas et Mélisande*, Lewis whispers rather than shouts his protagonists’ declaration of enduring love. The ordering of the notes is as it was in bar 46, the final E of Heloise still absent. The pitches used consist of two chromatic clusters a fifth apart: D – E flat – E natural and A – B flat – B natural.

The troubled passage (bars 104 – 122) leading to this inverted climax gradually prepares these chromatic collections and eliminates the other pitches from the texture. The persistent F – F sharp trill that runs from bars 112 – 121 (a texture signalling danger from the third wave on) accompanies fragmentary ideas taken from the fourth wave – the terse woodwind gestures of Ex 6 – as well as aggressively colouristic effects (pizzicato glissandi, sudden dynamic
changes) and treble-only versions of the sharply accented chords from bars 104 – 111 (Ex 7).

Ex 7 *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, harmonic skeleton of bars 104 – 122

The contradiction between pitch sets in the treble and the middle and bass registers at bars 104 – 111 is replaced by the chromaticism of bars 112 – 122, now concentrated exclusively in the treble register (only C and G – the bass focus of the earlier bars – are omitted). The rapid succession of ideas, mostly violent, that permeate this passage ensures that the cryptogram itself, although
harmonically prepared, is a complete sonic contrast. At the start of bar 123, another ‘magic portal’, the vibraphone and piano delicately brushing against the notes of the two chromatic clusters, takes us into a completely different world; time is suspended, the picture frozen.

The listener is awakened from this moment by a woodwind shriek (bar 124) – this, and the subsequent whining of bar 129, seems to contradict the composer’s insistence that his is not an illustrative work. Minor thirds and tritones predominate (in contrast to the earlier glimpse of quintal harmony), again articulated by sustained notes and sharply accented chords. A lyrical fragment of octatonic scale in the violin makes sense of the otherwise battling pitch elements of piano and cello against woodwind: as is so often the case with Lewis, chromatic displacements at the octave once again create the maximum tension (Ex 8).

Ex 8 *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, harmonic framework of bars 124 – 129
The next section (bars 129 – 136) is gradually activated through a written out polyrhythmic acceleration. The pedal note slips from E flat to D (alternating – tritones again – with an A flat); again the passage is concerned with the elaboration of a single chord (Ex 9), although now the instrumentation is fluid and the brief melodic fragment (piano and vibraphone) is concealed in the middle of the texture. Up to five rhythms play against each other at any one time during this extraordinary passage; detailed dynamic instructions draw the ear from one instrument or register to another; the introduction of decoration (bar 133) drives the music to its cadenza-like climax (flute and clarinet). If this music has a precedent, it is – appropriately enough for an ‘invention on a chord’ – Act III Scene 4 of Wozzeck, which depicts the aftermath of violence.

Ex 9 Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, harmonic framework of bars 129 – 136

Extraordinary scoring is a feature of the final two subsections. The ‘out-of-phase’ piano and vibraphone (bars 137 – 140, 144 – 148) create the effect of a tenuous grasp on consciousness; the figuration of the earlier waves is now warped beyond recognition. The texture once more recalls the earlier Mobiles: each instrument circles
around its own pitch set, rhythmically independent despite the precise notation (Ex 10). The bass register is again avoided, creating a weightless texture. This is not the only reflection echoing from the other side of the cryptogram bar; the earlier upward movement from B flat to B natural at the top of the treble register is reversed here too.

Ex 10 *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, pitch sets used in bars 137 – 148
Perhaps most significant of all is the shape of the vibraphone pattern at bars 144 – 148 after it has been re-ordered: this represents a new form of the ascending phrase shapes of Ex 4, and whilst this pattern is heavily disguised, its interval construction will recur many times in _Epitaph_’s final bars.

A further cadenza, this time for piano and vibraphone, leads the listener (again via a single, culminating note, this time a vibraphone F, bar 149) to more specific modal, as well as textural, recollections.

Although recalling the accelerating figuration at the conclusion of the first wave, the final subsection returns to the mode used at bars 72 – 75 transposed down by a semitone. This return to modality represents the final stage of ‘normalisation’ after the earlier chromatic disruption. Rising melodic lines (first presented by the violin, bar 151) are superimposed on the murmuring textures, again homing in on an upper B flat and then the F above – an echo of the violin and cello harmonics at bars 147 – 149, a ‘correction’ of the distorted violin phrase at bar 121, and a resolution of the very first cryptogram phrase at bars 17 – 18. The music has almost come around full circle, and it is at this point that the music truly becomes an _Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise._

Lewis’s very personal comment on the drama that has just been played (recalling _Wozzeck_ again!) takes the form of a chord sequence
similar to that which opened *Memoria* – the aspect of remembrance, perhaps, causing an association of ideas from one piece to the next.\(^\text{13}\) The first two chords are based on the same mode, transposed and enriched, that was used between bars 23 – 71; chromatic inflections add increasing darkness to the remaining chords (Ex 11), the final pitch sets coming close to the chromatic clusters of the cryptogram.

This ‘benediction’ dovetails with the telescoped ‘recapitulation’ that so exquisitely brings the work round full circle. Lewis needs only to make the merest allusion to notes, textures, instruments – the low pedal C from the piano, an ominous F – F sharp trill, high sustained quintal string harmonics – to suggest the earlier stages of the work. There is a softened memory of the cryptogram (bar 163), referring back to a ‘whole-tone variation’ at bar 115, the notes already in place at the top of the chord in bar 162; and a reference to the sensual woodwind melodies, coloured by gentle vibraphone chords and again ending with a drawn-out rising whole-tone. A final reminder of the tam-tam and cymbal strokes that opened the work and the minor tenth, deep in the piano, that underpinned so much of it, usher in the valedictory rising phrases.

---

\(^{13}\) The opening of *Threnody* is based on a similar chord sequence, as is that of the Piano Concerto. Lewis has never mentioned any associations with loss or remembrance in connection with the latter work, however.
This transformation of severe quaver lines into a mystical, heavenward ascent was described by the composer in his spoken introduction to the work for a BBC broadcast in 1993 as approaching a state of transcendence, lending, by association, credibility to the various descriptive labels I have given to other phases of the work.

It is tempting to look for a hidden order in these lines – a ruling
pattern of intervals, of pitches, of numbers. There are suggestive
leads, but none is carried through to the end of the work. Even the
regular alternation of vibraphone and piano phrases is broken near
the work’s conclusion. Consecutive bars are never the same length,
and they contract and expand irregularly. The starting note and
register of each ascent is unpredictable, as is its instrumentation
and colouring. Certain interval patterns recur, however, most
significantly that which opens the first phrase: minor third, tone,
major third, tone, minor third, tone. Whether extended by further
major seconds or used in whole or only in part, this shape recurs
many times and can be related to the pitch collection given to the
vibraphone at bars 144 – 148 (Ex 10).

The symbolism of the music, however, is unmistakable: the
monastic rule that oppressed and separated the two lovers in life is
now the path to a union in eternity. The concluding notes – an
otherworldly rising whole-tone disguising the tritone that completes
the last, twelve-note, ascending vibraphone phrase – also complete
the cryptogram, twice left unfinished. The ‘missing’ E of bars 46 – 47
and 123 is finally restored before disappearing into infinite, blissful,
peace.
4.8 Anticipations and influences

Despite my assertion that the story of Abelard and Heloise would make good material for music theatre, surprisingly few composers have been tempted to create such a work. Elizabeth Maconchy’s *Heloise and Abelard* (1977) is the most distinguished entry to be found listed on a German website dedicated to the music, art and literature inspired by the two lovers.\(^{15}\) It is described as a ‘dramatic cantata for soprano, tenor and baritone soloists, chorus and orchestra’. The close proximity of composition dates for *Epitaph* and Maconchy’s piece (in a conversation Lewis claimed ignorance of its existence\(^ {16}\)) probably indicates nothing more than a general quickening of public interest in the subject around that time. This was due in the main to Sir Ronald Millar’s notorious 1970 stage adaptation of Helen Waddell’s novel *Peter Abelard*,\(^ {17}\) which starred Diana Rigg and Keith Michell, notorious because there was a brief nude scene, rare at that time on the British stage. The same play was adapted as the book for a musical (by Tom Polum) in 2003.

Although Lewis saw Millar’s play, his interest in the story predated that adaptation. He was already familiar with Waddell’s novel, and the subsequent appearance of Betty Radice’s scholarly historical account of the lives and backgrounds of Abelard and Heloise,

\(^ {16}\) 10 June 2005.
\(^ {17}\) Helen Waddell, *Peter Abelard*, London, 1933.
together with her translation of their letters, was also a significant source of information.\(^{18}\)

More recently, John McCabe has written a large-scale scena for mezzo-soprano and piano, *Heloise to Abelard*.\(^{19}\) It ‘recounts the four stages (love, passion, tragedy and acceptance) of this most extraordinary of love stories from Heloise’s perspective’.\(^{20}\) McCabe has also, like Lewis, set verses from Waddell’s collection *Medieval Latin Lyrics*: his *Notturni ad Alba* for soprano and orchestra (1970) includes two texts later set by Lewis (in *Hymnus ante Somnum* and *Silentia Noctis*).

Over the course of the analysis, I have mentioned the possible origins of the various musical ingredients that Lewis uses in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*. One can attribute certain characteristic sounds or shapes to Ravel, Stravinsky or even Takemitsu. However, as with *Memoria*, such passing similarities must be treated with caution. If we are occasionally reminded of Stravinsky *et al.*, it is only because Lewis’s music inhabits the same controlled, rather stylised world as that of these composers. Meaningful comparisons may be drawn once again with the music of Ravel: the undercurrent of violence in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* mirrors that found

---


\(^{19}\) The first, private, performance was given on 9 June 2005 and then repeated publicly on 18 June 2005.

throughout Ravel’s output, in works from *Shéhérazade* to the *Piano Concerto for the Left Hand*; for both composers a vein of expression runs deep, but it is when violence erupts that it is most clearly articulated. Similarly, it is as important to Lewis as it was to Stravinsky to keep a tight control over the musical material, even if this is made audible less by a Stravinskian rhythmic ticking than by the way the contents of the pitch-sets are gradually released, like a drug, over the course of the work. Any affinity with Oriental music has more to do with timbre and specific instrumental colours than with harmony or (in this work) structure. Whilst these timbres (the repeated patterns on vibraphone in the fourth wave, for example) are being used to emphasise the more expressive aspects of the work, they also serve to distance and ritualise them, as exemplified by the opening tam-tam, piano and pizzicato cello count-down.

Musical symbolism to Lewis is appealing, I suspect, because a symbol may carry a large burden of emotional weight whilst keeping the musical content free from any unwanted associations that might constrain the listener’s experience. The composite theme that permeates the entire work – an amalgam of the two names in cryptogram form – is not in itself an emotionally ‘loaded’ melody. It is neutral, a sequence of notes that could almost be said to predate the piece, since the musical letters found in Abelard and Heloise’s names were always there. The very act of using the letters in this way, and Lewis’s choice of order (and omission), could almost be
seen as a mystical act of transfiguration, or even transubstantiation. Hidden from the listener, its quasi-secret significance is not dissimilar to that found in Schumann’s *Carnaval* or Berg’s *Lyrische Suite*: a deep emotional impulse (deeply personal in the cases of Schumann and Berg) transformed into an art that can be appreciated with or without knowledge of a solution to its riddles.

### 4.9 Postscript

Peter Abelard died in 1142, Heloise in 1163. On Heloise’s death, Abelard’s tomb at the Paraclete was reopened for the interment of her body. In the words of an anonymous writer of 1204, ‘her husband, who had died long before her, raised his arms to receive her, and so clasped her closely in his embrace.’\(^{21}\) Lewis, in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, has created as haunting a memorial for them as that nameless thirteenth-century scribe. Almost eight centuries of legend were started with those words, so obviously fantastic but no less resonant for that. Lewis’s achievement is to produce a fantasy that lingers in the mind every bit as much as those ancient lines. Each note of the piece has expressive significance, its gripping shape provides an unusually persuasive alternative to a straightforward narrative structure, and the wide repertoire of techniques Lewis uses ensures contrast within a

---

\(^{21}\) Quoted in Burge, *Heloise & Abelard*, 276.
cohesive whole and above all a sense of inevitability to match the
events he commemorates.
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5. TABLEAU

It is difficult to imagine a greater contrast to the quiet, controlled, patient unfolding of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* than the ferocious pianistic attack with which *Tableau*, Jeffrey Lewis’s next work, opens. Dedicated to Jana Frenklova, who commissioned the work, it was completed in January 1980 and first performed by its dedicatee at the Purcell Room, London; the first broadcast performance was given at the University of Wales, Bangor. Jana Frenklova became Pianist-in-Residence at Bangor University in January 1979, after several years in a similar position at Lancaster University.¹ *Tableau* was the first of a number of works, including *Fantasy* (1985) and *Threnody* (1990), both for solo piano, and the Piano Concerto of 1989, written for her. The Piano Trio (1983) was written for the University College Trio of which she was the pianist.

*Tableau* is in one continuous movement, lasting almost twenty-seven minutes, divided into four distinct sections. Each section has a clear identity of its own. The first and third share similar material, approached from different angles; they are built up from dynamically and texturally juxtaposed musical fragments. The second and fourth are texturally more consistent and musically more continuous. No single section is so self-contained that it would be possible to call it

¹ Her inaugural recital, which included Schumann’s *Phantasie*, Op. 17, was given on 11 January 1979.
a movement, even though, unusually for Lewis, there are clear articulation points signalling the end of one section and the start of the next. Structurally, *Tableau* has much in common with two later works, *Sonante* (1986) and *Scena* (1988), which are written without any divisions into labelled sections but whose transition points from one type of material to another are still clear. More obviously, it shares with *Trilogy* (1992), which is divided into three numbered parts, a scheme of discrete but related sections.

The markedly aggressive and dissonant language of *Tableau* – at least in its first and third sections – seems to signal a return to a pre-*Memoria* mode of expression. However, there are several points of contact between *Tableau* and *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, which suggests a closer relationship between the two pieces than might at first appear to be the case, not least of which is the fact that the second section of *Tableau* is a reworking of a substantial portion of the chamber work. Just as there are unexpected connections between *Time-Passage* and *Memoria*, and a certain consistency in the treatment of the material in both works, so there are frequent harmonic references in *Tableau* to *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*.

Note the singular form of the title – *Tableau* rather than *Tableaux* – which emphasises the composer’s concern for unity and continuity from section to section. Its translation is probably better rendered as
'scene' rather than 'picture', an interpretation reinforced by the composer's programme notes for the first broadcast: 'it is a portrayal of a dramatic scene, stimulated by visual and dramatic imagery. Musically, it is a study of different perspectives of a harmonic sequence, contrasting overtly dramatic elements with moments of static, mobile-like material'.

The drama referred to is left unspecified (as is also later the case with Scena) but the reworking of material from Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise seems to imply at least a tenuous connection with the subject matter of the earlier chamber work. The visual element could equally refer to the composer's own imaginings of a 'dramatic scene', whether between Abelard and Heloise or not, or a reference to the idea behind the three Mobiles, written between 1968 and 1971. These take their inspiration, at least in part, from Erik Satie's early piano works, including the familiar Gymnopédies and Gnossiennes, in which similar musical material is reworked, rather as if admiring a sculpture from several different angles. In Lewis's Mobiles there is a sense of gradual transformation over the course of the pieces, as if it is the object itself that is slowly, almost imperceptibly, rotating, rather than the viewer shifting position.

The overtly dramatic elements of Tableau include sharp dynamic contrasts and juxtapositions of different types of material, both in the short and the long term, both within and between sections; the
music associated with the second and fourth parts presents the listener with a more covert but nonetheless compelling drama. Bold gestures continually punctuate the work. These are most clearly heard in the first and third sections, particularly at the start of the whole work. It is also worth noting that as well as being overtly dramatic, the work is conspicuously pianistic, in that it uses the full range of the keyboard and a wide range of different textures, placing greater demands on both the virtuosity and control of the pianist than in any other of Lewis’s works. This in itself adds a further exciting theatrical dimension to the piece.

Static, mobile-like material takes over the whole of the second and fourth sections; it also infiltrates the latter parts of the first and third sections, although the continuing dynamic contrasts and moments of rhythmic ‘punctuation’ in these passages appear to be closer to a ‘stream of consciousness’ than to stasis. The composer has urged caution in using that particular term. A stream of consciousness suggests to him something less controlled than we find in the music of Tableau, although he accepts that a combination of the absence of a strongly discernible pulse and a harmonic language approaching polytonality creates some curiously detached and unreal music.

The broadcast introduction continued: ‘[The second movement] moves characteristically on two time levels; a slow rate of harmonic
movement beginning with an oscillating minor third figure [...] is gradually articulated by fast repeating figurations.’ The reworked material from *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* comes from the ‘wave’ preceding that work’s cruel climax, that is to say, bars 68 – 103. In the original, the fast repeating figurations are free; here they are fully and precisely written out: a good example of a practical composer using the notation that is most appropriate for his forces.

‘A circular framework – again the image of the mobile – is apparent both in overall structure and within its individual sections.’ The sense of a need to return obsessively to earlier material is strong in *Tableau*. Extended repetitions are often re-ordered, and the various omissions, interpolations and other more subtle changes propel the music forward. In this respect there are structural connections with the much earlier *Two Cadenzas* and *Duologue*, as well as with *Sonante* and *Scena*.

‘The fourth and final section ends with a series of quiet, rotating bell-like chords in the manner of a slow procession. As this section contains the main harmonic material of the work it also refers back in a circular way to earlier moments and to the beginning but now transformed from the original dramatic level to a static image as an

---

2 Again, taken from the introduction to the BBC broadcast.
emotional and acoustic echo.'\textsuperscript{3} The description of ‘quiet, rotating bell-like chords’ recalls memories of Stravinsky – the final pages of *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* and *Symphony of Psalms* in particular – and anticipates the conclusions of several of Lewis’s later scores: the Piano Trio, *Night Fantasy*, *Teneritas* and *Litania*. The evocation of bells and gongs in Lewis’s piano writing is frequent and suggestive, creating a complex web of associations around ritual and the church, and allusions to both Asian and Western instrumental timbres.\textsuperscript{4} These associations often signal the passing or stilling of time, just as the bells of the ‘real’ world did in the not-too-distant past, and still do in some religious settings. The reference to an ‘emotional and acoustic echo’ recalls the moment in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* (bar 123) referred to by Lewis as an ‘echo across time and space.’ That moment is one of especial purity and stillness, suggesting that Lewis was striving to achieve a similar state in the final bars of *Tableau*.

If the musical origins of the gentler pages of *Tableau* are to be found in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* then what are the seeds of its violent opening paragraph? We appear to have journeyed a long way from the chamber work, written only months before, and the tranquil world of *Memoria* has been left far behind. The start of *Tableau* seems instead to hark back to earlier scores. Closer

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{4} Such evocations are not confined to his piano writing; see Chapter 3.1 for a description of the brass choir’s suggestion of pealing bells in *Memoria*. 
inspection, however, reveals several connections with the violent episode in *Epitaph* (bars 105 – 157). It is as much a matter of scale, timing and context as of musical content: *Epitaph* unfolds at a leisurely pace, and the climactic passage under consideration occurs in the latter stages of the work. Despite earlier moments of unrest and dissonance, the effect of this violent music is the shock of the unexpected – and the resolution which follows is so complete and profound that the residual impression of the whole work is one of serenity and reconciliation. On the other hand, to open a composition by throwing angular fragments about at a predominantly loud dynamic with a highly percussive attack creates an initial mood and tension that persists in the listener's mind through the greater part of the work. The slightest hint of the return of this troubled material in even the most unruffled of the following pages will provoke a warning response. One might almost consider *Tableau* as the dark counterpart to *Abelard and Heloise*, less an *Epitaph* than an enactment of the tragedy itself: a fanciful idea, perhaps, but the evidence of the quotations and reworkings, as well as the implications of the title, suggests that *Tableau* is a shadowy reflection of the earlier work.

### 5.1 The building blocks

The opening paragraph of *Tableau* (bars 1 – 18) consists of a sequence of twelve musical fragments, or gestures. None is repeated
identically, but two are close enough to be considered variants of earlier ones. Ex 1 presents these in order of appearance, and several points will be immediately obvious. The contrast of dynamic and attack, most clearly shown in the difference between Gesture 1 (fff, pointedly accented) and Gesture 2 (ppp) continues throughout, creating a sense of action and reaction, which in turn creates a form of coherence in the absence of functional harmony. We perceive these often quite disparate ideas either as responses or interruptions, and create from them a dramatic sequence of events, subconsciously drawing upon associations with verbal or physical gestures. For example, tone of voice and character can be represented by dynamic and articulation, rhythmic patterns may correspond to movement, attitude or mood.

The extreme diminuendi (Gestures 3 and 5) and crescendi (4, 8, 9, 10 and 12), ritenuti or ‘braking’ gestures (3, 5, 7) and accelerandi (4, 8, 10) also contribute to this sense of each gesture reacting to the previous one.

The first gesture includes all twelve notes of the chromatic scale, as do the combined pitches of Gesture 2 and the first chord of Gesture 3. This does not strictly govern the subsequent ordering and unfolding of pitch material; however, it is a way of organising the intervals and smaller chordal units that to a greater or lesser extent
Ex 1 *Tableau* section I, bars 1 – 18, showing gestures

The attack *sff* must always be as loud and as short as possible. The pedal when depressed immediately afterwa should catch the resonance of each chord.
achieve autonomy later on. On examining the opening fragment, for example, we find the first part of this three-chord gesture consists of two superimposed minor thirds. The extreme depth of the chord almost gives it the quality of a cluster, but we find either this divided tritone or a single minor third in several of the other gestures (right hand of Gesture 2, left hand, C sharp – E, of Gesture 3 etc). The second, middle-register chord consists of more superimposed thirds, a combination of minor and major intervals, not quite alternating. This chord can, of course, be quarried to produce triads and both major and minor sevenths, all of which are to be found in subsequent gestures. The high right-hand note that concludes this fragment (enharmonically a compound minor third away from the top of the middle chord) ensures that a spread of notes across the range of the keyboard is being used.

Different pitches may be associated with different parts of the instrument; thus, the F sharp major triad hidden away in the first
middle-register chord stays there in the timid echo that is Gesture 2; the F sharp itself remains in place for Gesture 4. Lewis has spoken of the unique quality of a pitch in a particular register of an instrument, insisting that octave transpositions of chords produce new chords. One can understand why serial writing would have so little relevance to him.

Other ideas in this ‘exposition’ become more significant later on in the piece – the repeated single notes of Gesture 4, the repeated single chords (Gesture 9), the slowly repeating superimposed fifths (5), the melodic shapes (8 and 10). The first extended gesture (6) combines a new textural idea (individual, sharply punctuating chords, rhythmically unpredictable, whose resonance is caught by the sustaining pedal) with chords already heard – the first example of structural circularity in the piece. Harmonically, Gestures 8 and 10 take us in a new direction by being based, if not wholly reliant, upon the octatonic scale. The rhythmic flexibility of the right hand of Gesture 8 becomes the foundation of much of the ‘stream of consciousness’ music heard later in this section (a similar ‘written out’ accelerando can be seen in Gesture 12) and the not-quite-repeating right hand patterns of Gesture 10 form the basis of the whole of the second section. Gesture 11 is unusual in having little rhythmic relation to any other material, although harmonically it articulates the relationship between the octatonic- and tritone-based material; each hand returns to its starting point, D in the right
hand, E flat in the left, again emphasising the circularity of the melodic shape of the gesture.

The paragraph concludes with a rhythmic reprise of the opening – no longer twelve-note (there is no D sharp), and no longer predominantly built up of superimposed thirds. The rhythm, however, provides a clearly audible sense of return; the circle is now fully formed.

5.2 Fantasy and freedom

The remainder of the first section of *Tableau* (bars 19 – 80) consists of a free fantasy which also contains, between bars 41 and 71, a second fantasy based on some of the gestural material presented in the opening paragraph. The larger fantasy (bars 19 – 80) also uses gestures that have their origins in the first eighteen bars but which here take on a life of their own, in particular the repeated notes of Gesture 4, now transformed into trills, oscillations and tremolandos. The rhythmically free fantasy material becomes ever more decorative and progressively incorporates filigree ornamentation; in parallel with this textural change, the harmonic axis of the music, always ambiguous, shifts.

The harmonic material of this section is ‘terraced’ on three levels. There is, at least to start, an underpinning fixed bass, a low B and
the D sharp a tenth above. From bars 19 – 40 these pitches are unchallenged in this register. In the middle register, two tritone-based chords (C sharp – E – G – B flat; A – C – E flat – F sharp) alternate freely: by raising the F sharp of the second tritone to G and pulling up the rest of the chord by a semitone after it they are able to ‘modulate’ from one to the other. In the upper register, the harmony is based around an F minor triad, predominantly with an E or an F at the top, although this is at times modified to an E flat. Occasionally the A flat of this chord becomes an A natural, and at one point (bar 24) the root is raised to F sharp (Ex 2).

The fluidity of the harmony is matched by that of the rhythmic writing – triplet quavers, semiquavers and tuplet groups of five, six or seven semiquavers flow seamlessly from beat to beat, any sense of pulse being temporarily suspended. I used the word ‘polytonality’ earlier; as will now be apparent, this is a wholly inadequate term to describe the kaleidoscopically shifting superimpositions of different, third-based, chords. There is relative stability in the B major of the bass and F minor of the treble, but this is offset by the unstable tritone distance between these two pitch centres.
Decoration is another important feature of this whole passage: there are acciaccaturas, pairs of grace notes and longer, expressive appoggiaturas.

The middle register chord of bar 17 is the most frequently recurring feature of the second, quasi-recapitulatory fantasy. Between bars 41 and 49 there is a gradual increase in tension, elements of that chord tossed around either in strongly articulated rhythms that allude to the opening paragraph, or presented in quiet, free figuration, which reinterprets this ‘new’ harmonic material (the chord was not used between bars 19 – 40) in the now predominant vein of fantasy. There is a pause at the end of bar 49, and then, at bar 50, the original, expository circle is re-entered, now interleaved with free material. The following passage may be summarised as follows (Table 1):
Table 1: the opening paragraph of *Tableau* and its return later in the section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars 50 – 51.</th>
<th>Differences – the upper note of bar 17 is not played in bar 50; the second chord of bar 18 is not repeated in bar 51.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to bars 17 – 18, which in turn refer back to bar 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 52.</td>
<td>Differences – now on F – C rather than B – F sharp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to bar 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 53.</td>
<td>Differences – the two bar gesture is now condensed to one bar and is presented <em>ff</em> rather than <em>pp</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to bar 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 54 – 58.</td>
<td>‘Fantasy’ material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 59 – 63.</td>
<td>Differences – the final chord of bar 9 is not played in bar 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to bars 5 – 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 63 – 65.</td>
<td>‘Fantasy’ material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 65.</td>
<td>Differences – a single statement of the second chord only; a backward-looking reference, placed within the ongoing ‘fantasy’ material, which from this point becomes ever more ornate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to bar 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 66 – 70.</td>
<td>‘Fantasy’ material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 71.</td>
<td>Differences – again, a single statement of the second chord only; a final backward-looking reference, again placed within the ongoing ‘fantasy’, which then continues to the end of the section, bar 80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to bar 17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material from bar 17 (and, by association, bar 1) thus both starts and concludes this ‘section within a section’, creating another musical circle. The left-hand notes of the chord gradually take on the distinct contours and rhythmic character of the ‘fantasy’ material and this finally supersedes the tritone-based harmony with which the section opened at bar 19. There are, of course, two tritones within the bar 17 chord (F sharp – C in the left hand, B flat – E in the right) but both are softened by the presence of the other notes within the chord and it is this softening process that underpins the whole passage. To reinforce this sense of a harmonic
journey, the B – D sharp in the bass, which underpinned so much of
the start of this fantasy, becomes relegated to a secondary role and
is not heard again after bar 69. Ex 3 summarises both the harmonic
progress and the textural metamorphosis of bars 41 to 80.

Throughout this section there have been reminiscences of textures
and ideas heard in Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise. Repeated notes
and trills are common currency in Epitaph, and, between bars 112
and 121 of that work, the long trill is frequently punctuated by piano
and percussion chords and decorated with woodwind figuration,
comparable to the equivalent pianistic textures in Tableau between
bars 63 and 66. One can look both backwards and forwards to other
works for other passing resemblances, from the written-out
oscillations and repeated notes in the piano cadenza that concludes
the first section of Duologue to the figuration that saturates the outer
panels of Trilogy. However, it is the spirit of Epitaph that informs this
music, just as the letter of that earlier score infiltrates the next
section.
Ex 3 *Tableau* section I, bars 41 – 80, harmonic skeleton and textural changes

(harmonic material of the opening paragraph varied in rhythmic style of free fantasy)

(New extension of free fantasy using chords from bar 17 into an upward flourish)

(New shape anticipating the final bars of section I)

(Transition towards the reprise at bar 50)

(Free fantasy texture over punctuating left hand chords)

(Reprise of opening)

(Bars 54–8, derived from harmony of bar 50, now in rhythmic character of the fantasy material and especially the shape from bar 45)
5.3 ‘Interlude’

The reworking of material from *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* in the second section only comes fully into focus part-way through, when the repetitive figuration, heard from the first bar, starts to combine with other musical ideas from the earlier work. From this point, the figuration follows exactly the harmonic course of the paragraph or wave of *Epitaph* immediately preceding the brutal pages to which I referred in connection with the first section of *Tableau*. In Ex 4 I have laid out the harmonic profile of the movement, from the simple opening slow oscillation of the minor
third, C – E flat, through the seven modes used during the course of
the section, to the final slow minor third, still oscillating but now on
E – G. Alongside them I have noted the parallel passages in Epitaph.

As in Memoria, the changes from mode to mode are often disguised
by a continuation of similar textural patterns, whilst clearly audible
changes in texture or rhythmic groupings do not necessarily signal
important harmonic shifts, particularly in the earlier part of the
section. As well as variation in note values (there may be two, three,
four or five notes per crotchet beat) or in the perceived pulse (a
consequence of the fact that the number of notes in the patterns
does not always coincide with the number of notes per beat) we also
hear twos against threes, threes against fours and fours against
fives – again, mainly in the earlier pages of the section – creating
greater aural complexity than might be expected from the page. The
gradual paring away of any excess notes towards the final minor
thirds recalls a comparable process of purification at the end of
Memoria.

The melodic material from Epitaph which is heard here is also set
out in Ex 4; again, given its simplicity, it is remarkable how strong
an emotional connection these fragments make with the earlier
work. The low minor tenth creates a clearly audible point of contact
between this section of Tableau and the first one, and the octatonic
collection that constitutes the first mode suggests a further relationship between the two parts.

Ex 4 Modes in *Tableau* section II and comparison with *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*

Bar 1 expands outwards to

Bar 13: transition towards new mode E flat becomes D

Bar 14: new mode

Bar 15: further transition, addition of E flat changes the sense of the mode again

Bar 18: new mode

* Bar numbers refer to *Tableau*

Bar 26

Fragments taken from *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*

Bar 27: new mode

Equivalent to *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* bar 68

Fragments taken from *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*
Are these harmonic bonds enough to ensure musical unity between this section and the rest of the work? Lewis has hinted at *textural* unity by introducing some repeating figuration in the gestures of the opening paragraph, section I, particularly in the one labelled Gesture 10. The relative stability of section II, however – rhythmic, harmonic and dynamic – is a considerable and surprising contrast to the turbulence of the first section. This juxtaposition seems to reverse what happens in *Epitaph* itself – there, a violent passage is placed within a predominantly calm environment – but the dramatic progress of that work seems to pull the listener irresistibly towards its *dénouement*. In the second section of *Tableau*, however, we almost seem to be in a different piece entirely; even by the
conclusion of the whole work, this passage seems, despite being mirrored emotionally by the equally calm fourth section, to have been more akin to an interlude than the inevitable consequence of what has gone immediately before.

5.4 Return

The repeated bell-like A that concludes the second section also provides the link to the third, which opens with an accelerating repetition of that note. Further repeated notes hint at and finally describe elements of the melodic contour heard in Gesture 8. The quiet chords underneath these fragments allude to, without directly repeating, the similarly spectral chord in bar one of the first section. Then follows a long progression of repeated six-note chords (the texture again alluding to the opening paragraph of the whole work), intensity constantly increasing as right-hand semiquaver quintuplets over left-hand semiquavers creep chromatically upwards. The obsessive quality of the music at this point, its single-minded determination to work through a process to the end, echoes and anticipates similarly compulsive passages in Momentum (1978) and Musica Aeterna (1997). The progression itself is given in outline in Ex 5, with the quiet opening chords shown for comparison.

At its climax, the sequence of resonating chords (Gesture 6) from section I bars 5 – 9 is repeated, and the circularity of the work is
resumed: the sense of homecoming is strong, and from here to the end of the section other elements of the ‘exposition’ are reordered and in some places extended (Table 2).

Table 2: comparison of Tableau section I: 1 – 18 and section III: 38 – 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section III</th>
<th>equivalent passage in section I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars 38 – 42</td>
<td>Bars 5 – 9 (There is one additional chord in III:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 43</td>
<td>(A variation of I: 9, bouncing here off the chord from I: 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 44 – 46</td>
<td>Bars 10 – 12 (III: 46 extended by one beat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 47 – 48</td>
<td>Bars 13 – 14 (III: 48 extended by one beat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 49 – 50</td>
<td>Bars 15 – 16 (III: 50 extended by one beat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 51 – 53</td>
<td>Bars 17 – 18 (III: 52 – 53 an extended elaboration, spread over two bars, of I:18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stream of consciousness ‘fantasy’ section returns at this point, not quite as an identical reflection, but rather as if the mirror is now ‘crack’d from side to side’ (Table 3).

Table 3: comparison of Tableau section I: 19 – 80 and section III: 54 – 103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section III</th>
<th>equivalent passage in section I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars 60 – 61</td>
<td>Bars 68 – 9 (or, alternatively, bars 68 and 25 – the latter is identical to bar 69; therefore III: 60 may either be interpreted as a single interpolated bar in an otherwise literal recapitulation, or III: 60 – 61 may be interpreted as a leap forwards which then returns to its rightful place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 78 – 84</td>
<td>Bars 45 – 51 (ie three bars of I are omitted).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 85 – 89</td>
<td>Bars 54 – 58 (ie two bars of I are omitted).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 90 – 95</td>
<td>Bars 64 – 69 (ie five bars of I are omitted).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bars I: 68 – 69 have already been heard, creating a further level of circularity. Here, bar 69 is extended by a dramatic three beat silence.

Bars 96 – 101

Bars 35 – 40 (ie a repeat of six bars that have already been heard, but with a different approach and a different continuation.

Bars 102 – 103

As can be seen, there is, unusually for Lewis, a quite considerable amount of literal repetition of material from the first section here; so much duplication could have proved problematic without reorganisation, addition and omission. Even so, a lingering suspicion remains that the composition of this part of Tableau was an expedient compositional solution, certainly in comparison with either the much abbreviated ‘telescoped recapitulation’ of Sonante or the bar-by-bar re-composition of the first panel of Trilogy which is its third part, both of which carry greater conviction despite similar repetitive elements.5

5 The speed of composition is also reflected in the fact that, unusually, Tableau’s score was not printed from the usual immaculate transparencies but copied from a fair manuscript – perfectly legible but without the orthographic finesse of, for example, Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise or Memoria: the bars are less carefully spaced and note heads and stems are less well-formed. Furthermore, and returning to the second section, several bars of figuration have had repeat marks inserted, as if the original length of the passage-work was found to be too short at some stage between the work’s composition and its first performance.
Ex 5 *Tableau* section III, bars 9 – 36, chord progression, and a comparison with chords in section III, bars 2 – 8 and I, bars 5 and 10.
5.5 Suspension and distillation

The fourth and final section can be further divided into two, reflecting the two very different textures. The first moves slowly, dreamily, through a final, concentrated presentation of the ‘fantasy’ material of sections I and III; the dynamic is now consistently quiet, the rhythm mostly even and unbroken, and because of this the sense of a stream of consciousness is even stronger here than earlier in the work. This is the part of Tableau that comes closest to some of Lewis’s earlier scores, especially the central panel of Duologue and the final pages of Aurora. The curious feeling that one is experiencing music in slow motion, or observing an object through the wrong end of a telescope, is common to all these works; the sensation here comes from the absence of any strong, accented beats, despite the regular quaver pulse, and from the independent circling of groups of notes in different registers of the keyboard, harmonic particles held in a state of suspended time.

Ex 6 shows both the textural change and harmonic relationship between the two halves of section IV. Ex 6b sets out in order the eleven most frequently occurring pitches of the first twenty bars, almost all of which are found in the short extract shown in Ex 6a; those same pitches are then transformed into the cycle of chords that makes up the remainder of the movement (bars 21 – 35). In Ex
6c, the chords labelled A, B, C and D are, in descending order, those which occur most frequently in the final section of the work.

Ex 6a Tableau section IV, bars 1 – 3

Ex 6b Tableau section IV, showing the order of pitch occurrence frequency in bars 1 – 20

Ex 6c Tableau IV, bars 21 – 23, which also shows the four most frequently occurring chords of bars 21 – 35

*grace-note chords: slow
This second part of section IV presents the ‘bell-like procession’ referred to in the programme notes for the work. Twenty-two slow, regularly-spaced chords make up this passage, mostly underpinned by slow bass grace-note chords, again consisting of the major tenth B – D sharp. Once (second chord, bar 22), the lowest note changes to a B flat; in the eighth chord the interval shrinks to a minor tenth to great expressive effect, not least because it momentarily recalls the second section of the work and beyond, to memories of Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise. The bass of the twelfth and thirteenth chords moves down to the lowest register of the piano, the dense diminished chord, A – C – E flat (which refers back to the cluster-like opening of Tableau) producing an effect like a muffled drum. After this sinister and unexpected change the grace notes take a moment to settle again: although the true bass reverts back to B (now a permanent return), the interval above it moves from a major sixth (B – G sharp), via a major, then a minor, tenth before finally resting on the original major tenth, B – D sharp.

The upper chords circle above this relatively constant sonority. There is one chord, which starts and ends the procession – circularity again – before disappearing into a fade and blackout and which occurs six times in all, not including its gradual disappearance (Chord A, Ex 6c). The three notes taken by the left hand occur no less than eight more times, in combination with two other, subtly different, right hand chords, echoing the terraced
harmonic hierarchy of the first section (Chords B and C). Yet another chord (Chord D) appears on two occasions. Together, these four chords account for sixteen of the section’s twenty-two chords.

The work has now come full circle: chord A is virtually the same as that which concluded the opening paragraph of section I and out of which (in conjunction with the major tenth B – D sharp in the bass) the free fantasy material emerged. Chords A and D also articulate the two independently circling elements of the fantasy material; still circling now, but rhythmically grounded (compare Ex 6c to Ex 2). There is a sense of distillation about these final bars; it is as if the fine sediment still present in the preceding slowly spaced quavers has gradually sunk to the bottom of the glass, leaving only pure water behind.

5.6 Reflections and Conclusions

*Tableau* is best understood as a score of consolidation rather than innovation. This should not be taken to imply criticism; it simply places the work in a different category from works such as *Memoria* and *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, where new structural concepts achieve maturity, or from *Stratos*, which is more frankly experimental. In *Tableau*, Lewis revisits earlier techniques, particularly in finding ways to generate material, and reinvents them
in the context of a language which has been steadily evolving over a decade or more.

The fragmented exposition, which was the starting point of Duologue back in 1971, and Time-Passage in 1977, returns in Tableau. Whilst in Duologue the opening consisted of a series of pithy and concise gestures, and in Time-Passage a short sequence of chords, the scale of the opening of Tableau is more extended, giving it a sense of being more self-contained. This is accentuated by the return of the opening gestures at the end of the ‘exposition’, which also set up the image of circularity maintained throughout the score. The contrasted textures of the more continuous section which follows further emphasises the independence of the opening eighteen bars. Tableau offers the listener a lot of material in its opening paragraph, perhaps even too much, so wide-ranging is it in dynamic, texture and harmonic density. In later works adopting similar structural principles (Sonante and Scena, for example), Lewis has refined the process so there appears to be a greater sense of musical logic and continuity without sacrificing any of the extreme contrasts of gesture.

Turning to the larger structure, Lewis again refers back to Duologue, a continuous work in several linked but distinct sections. Tableau is
the first piece in almost a decade to be similarly constructed.\textsuperscript{6}  
\textit{Esultante} was in three movements with silence between them, but elsewhere Lewis has stressed the importance of continuity, the unbroken trajectory of a work. This was taken to its extreme in \textit{Memoria} where there is just one breathing-point in over twenty minutes of music. In \textit{Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise}, Lewis used wave-like gestures, paragraphs that break off as another starts, creating continuity of a different sort. It was another twelve years or so before Lewis attempted another work in linked sections – \textit{Trilogy}. This, however is a special case, given the way the first and third panels reflect each other so precisely. The works immediately following \textit{Tableau} – the Piano Trio and the \textit{Fantasy} for piano – are, like \textit{Esultante}, in three separate movements, and we should look to later scores such as the Wind Quintet, \textit{Sonante}, \textit{Scena} and \textit{Night Fantasy} to see how Lewis modifies the \textit{Tableau}-like idea of large blocks of material being juxtaposed but forming a single whole.

The conclusion of \textit{Tableau} is, in common with many of Lewis’s earlier scores, a meditation on what has gone before it. The idea of a work disappearing into silence is absolutely central to Lewis, and on the rare occasions when this does not happen (\textit{Sonante} is good example of this) endings tend to be brutal and abrupt. New to \textit{Tableau} are the ritualistic chord repetitions, the slow, regular,  

\textsuperscript{6} A curious feature of \textit{Tableau} is that the links between each part are notated as silently depressed, pedalled, notes or chords – barely audible musical cobwebs connecting the four sections of the work.
hypnotic pulsing of an unchanging harmony that signals a final point of repose.\textsuperscript{7} This type of ending now starts to take over from the more expressive melodic shapes that conclude \textit{Stratos} and \textit{Epitaph}, reaching its most concentrated form in the final bars of \textit{Litania} where the chords are audibly spaced according to the Fibonacci series.

The final section of \textit{Tableau} is arguably the finest part of the work, creating a new and hitherto unsuspected sense of discipline from material that earlier seems immune to such careful organisation. Nonetheless, its success must be judged not in isolation but in relation to the rest of the piece, and the fact that it works so well must indicate that the timing and placing of this section result from expectations which have been raised earlier. There are, however, questions and difficulties about \textit{Tableau} that will inevitably occur to the commentator examining the score, if not necessarily the listener using only his ears.

For example, whilst the analyst will readily observe the considerable amount of repetition between sections I and III, the listener will almost certainly be unaware of the extent of the duplication. A precise memory of the sequence of events leading to the final bars of the first section is, I would suggest, almost impossible to hold onto,

\textsuperscript{7} Lewis has, however, pointed to \textit{Epitaphium – Children of the Sun} (1967) as an early example of this sort of conclusion – see Chapter 6.6.
and so any notion of making a detailed comparison during a performance with the similar sequence in the third section becomes meaningless. Conversely, a greater sense of connection will probably be felt between the final section and the harmonically dissimilar second section – by virtue of a shared dynamic level, pulse and mood – than between section IV and the harmonically-related ‘stream of consciousness’ music from the first and third sections. Despite Lewis having created a harmonically unified and structurally cohesive work – reading the second section as an interlude to heighten the sense of ‘return’ at the start of section III – it is the visceral impact of Tableau’s gestures and emotional contrasts that makes the strongest impression.

The drama of Tableau is raw and impulsive. Compared with the finesse of Epitaph, its content and manner lacks refinement; heard beside the already structurally enigmatic Memoria, its form may at times appear obscure and baffling. In subsequent works, Lewis will present more polished solutions to the problems he sets himself in Tableau; however, one feels that by allowing this particular child to run wild the composer achieved a significant act of imaginative liberation.
6. CARMEN PASCHALE

Surrexit Christus sol verus vespere noctis,
Surgit et hinc domini mystica messis agri.
Nunc vaga puniceis apium plebs laeta labore
Floribus instrepitans poblite mella legit.
Nunc variae volucres permulcent aethera cantu,
Temperat et pernox nunc philomela melos.
Nunc chorus ecclesiae cantat per cantica Sion
Alleluia suis centuplicatque tonis.
Tado, pater patriae, caelestis gaudia paschae
Percipias meritis limina lucis: ave.

Sedulius Scottus

Last night did Christ the Sun rise from the dark,
The mystic harvest of the fields of God,
And now the little wandering tribes of bees
Are brawling in the scarlet flowers abroad.
The winds are soft with birdsong: all night long
Darkling the nightingale her descant told,
And now inside church doors the happy folk
The Alleluia chant a hundredfold.
O father of thy folk, be thine by right
The Easter joy, the threshold of the light.

translated by Helen Waddell

Jeffrey Lewis has written for choral groups of various types
throughout his career. His choral music is therefore of importance
not only in itself but also in reflecting various compositional pre-
occupations at different stages of his development.

Thus, the early a cappella settings of Psalm 81 (Sing We Merrily)
(1963) and Samuel Daniel's Care-Charmer Sleep (1964) are, whilst
not without interest, more representative of the work of a gifted
University music student, well-versed in the choral music of Walton, Britten, even Maxwell Davies,\(^1\) whereas the more experimental use of voices found in *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun* and *Mobile I* demonstrates a lively imagination starting to move away from provincial academic composition by looking at models from Eastern Europe.

Between these ‘prentice works and *Carmen Paschale* in 1981, Lewis used voices on only four occasions – two settings in Welsh (*Gweledigaeth* for SATB choir and soprano melodica, 1968, and *Offeren y Llwyn* of 1976, written originally for male voice choir with piano, and later arranged for accompanied SATB choir) and two works involving solo voices – *Mobile III* (mezzo-soprano and mixed ensemble, 1971) and *Dream Sequence* (countertenor, cello and harpsichord, 1972). Lewis’s concentration on instrumental music in the period 1968 – 1981 should be seen as the result of the large number of orchestral and ensemble commissions he received rather than any lack of interest in writing for the voice. Nonetheless, these few vocal offerings provide clues to the direction of Lewis’s musical and extra-musical thought at this time. The relative simplicity of *Offeren y Llwyn*, for example, in comparison with other scores written around the same time, has already been discussed in

---

\(^1\) See Chapter 2.2.
connection with an anticipation of the harmonic language of
Memoria.²

Gweledigaeth is a short (four and a half minutes) setting of verses
from Chapter 4 of the Book of Revelation, describing the moment
when John comes before the throne of God.³ The imagery of the text
– trumpets, rainbows – must have been attractive to Lewis in part
because of its associations with Messiaen, but Lewis does not
attempt a descriptive setting, rather creating a sequence of contrasts
in timbre through the movement of chords and clusters. There are
some carefully judged shifts in register, but most of the piece lies
above middle C, even when the tenors and basses are singing,
creating an airy, sometimes ethereal texture. The use of the soprano
melodica⁴ is both practical (notes for the choir are helpfully
anticipated) and distinctively characterised: it gives sharply accented
stabs, interrupting passages of vocal calm, and attempts to bring
about moments of harmonic release and resolution against the
points of harmonic tension in the choral writing.

Given the brevity of the piece, it is hardly surprising that the
relatively large range of vocal techniques used – chord activation

² See Chapter 2.5 and Chapter 3.5.
³ By a curious coincidence, the CD on which Lewis’s Dreams, Dances and Lullabies appears is
entitled Sea of Glass, a phrase which occurs later in the same chapter, at verse 6.
⁴ Lewis encountered its close relative, the alto melodica, when he took part in a performance
with the Leonardo Ensemble of David Bedford’s 1965 work, Music for Albion Moonlight, in
1968, during the same concert in which Lewis’s own Stanzas for mixed ensemble was given its
first public performance. The concert date – 27 January – precedes the completion date on the
score of Gweledigaeth by just one day.
through oscillation between notes and around short melodic phrases, rhythmic chanting, speech – creates an impression of a choral ‘study’ rather than a self-contained act of creative expression. Set against that, however, are the carefully disciplined ‘release’ of pitches in the opening phrases (anticipating the first wave of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* and the opening bars of *Carmen Paschale* itself), the serene soprano octaves held against dense clusters below, and the almost cinematic cutting away of one texture to another at climactic moments.

The direction of the piece and the movement from cluster to cluster seem to be governed more by textural concerns than harmonic ones (octatonic collections provide most, but not all, of the pitch material); the sense of space, of music unfolding at an unhurried pace, present in *Mobile I* and *Mobile II*, is absent in *Gweledigaeth*, partly because Lewis’s thinking in those later works is linear. After the opening, a sense of structural uncertainty descends – the ending of the work is upon us unexpectedly quickly, as if text and therefore music stop in mid-flight.\(^5\)

A sensitively paced performance would doubtless minimise the ‘foreshortening’ effect and concentrate instead on the timbral beauties and other felicities of the work. Interestingly, the closing

---

\(^5\) In Chapter 2.5 I referred to a similar sense of structural ‘breathlessness’ in Lewis’s other Welsh-language setting, *Offeren y Llwyn*. 
bars, in which the basses disappear into silence, provide just one of several examples of correspondence between Gweledigaeth and Carmen Paschale: other points of contact include free, independently-moving oscillations between notes to create ‘activated’ chords or clusters; rhythmic chanting placed in the upper registers of the voices; a moment of quiet spoken text, every voice again independent of the others. A short excerpt (Ex 1) includes all these textures, and may be compared with the end of Ex 2 below, which shows the opening eleven bars of Carmen Paschale.

It is unlikely that Lewis referred to or even thought of Gweledigaeth during the composition of Carmen Paschale, but it is instructive to see certain ideas resurface more than a decade later, just as the instrumental and compositional techniques of complex pieces such as Time-Passage are carried over into more transparent scores such as Memoria. What has changed in the years between Gweledigaeth and Carmen Paschale is that technique is now fully at the service of the music, which, whilst in turn expressively serving the text, describes a completely satisfying structure on its own terms.
Figures in circles represent the order of signs from the conductor in each bar

= time-keeping downbeat

```
Ex 1 Gweledigaeth, bars 12 – 17

Yr hwn oedd yn eistedd, oedd yn debyg yr
(Spoken rhythmically free by each singer)

* Lewis's spelling of this word is 'fange'
```
One of Lewis’s very earliest extant compositions, the organ

*Improvisation on the Compline Antiphon – Salve Regina*, which dates from the composer’s schooldays, takes as its starting point the kind of melodic writing which pervades much of his choral music from

*Carmen Paschale* onwards. The origins of this early work are
something of a mystery to the composer. Plainchant was not used at his spiritual – and musical – alma mater, St Mary’s Church, Port Talbot, and it was therefore not a staple part of his early musical diet. Nonetheless, the experience of singing in a church choir from an early age and subsequently joining the Palestrina Choir at Cardiff University were of great importance both in fixing a choral sound-world in Lewis’s inner ear and understanding the practicalities of writing for singers.

Glimpses of a passing interest in Medieval music can be seen in other early scores, notably the Two Medieval Sketches for harp (1965), based respectively on plainsong and a Dufay chanson. Quotation, transformation, distortion and allusion all have a place in Lewis’s language, and in making reference to musical prehistory (as it must have seemed in the 1960s) he was also creating an effect of emotional distance and objectivity between the music and its audience. Lewis’s increasing use of Latin titles from the early 1970s onwards also illustrates this tendency, akin to the effect Stravinsky famously wanted to create in Oedipus Rex:

The idea was that a text for music might be endowed with a certain monumental character by translation backwards, so to speak, from a secular to a sacred language. ‘Sacred’ might mean no more than ‘older’, as one could say that the language of the King James Bible is more sacred than the language of the New English Bible, if only because of its greater age. But I thought that an older, even if imperfectly
remembered, language must contain an incantatory
element that could be exploited in music.⁶

Lewis’s Latin titles are intended to create certain expectations and a
certain type of receptivity in his audience as much as they are
designed to divert attention away from unwanted associations. For
example, the title of the vocal piece Lewis completed after Carmen
Paschale, Pro Pace, would carry a quite different weight of audience
response had it been rendered in English (For Peace), particularly
given its date of composition (1981), the year of the foundation of the
Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp.⁷

*Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* may be viewed as a key work in
concentrating Lewis’s thoughts back towards the Middle Ages. The
musical language of that work, however, was not affected by those
thoughts, growing as it did from a piece with very different origins
(Stratos) and containing no musical reference to plainchant. Nor did
any Medievalisms find their way into *Epitaph*’s successor, *Tableau,*
with which it shares some material. A year later, however, *Carmen
Paschale* emerged, and whilst many of Lewis’s harmonic and
textural pre-occupations from those three earlier pieces (and
*Memoria*) are still present, the melodic contours found here are

---

⁷ It should be added that *Pro Pace* has nothing to do with the peace movement; even though the
text shares some lines with that of Lewis’s ‘Vietnam’ piece, *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun,*
the literary allusions are – with the exception of Okamoto Jun’s ‘We pray/ That the fire-rain
never again fall on the world’ – far less specific. Indeed, a significant proportion of the text is
taken from the Requiem Mass.
different from anything we have experienced in Lewis’s output up to this time.

6.1 Analysis

*Carmen Paschale* may be said to exhibit the harmonic tendencies of *Memoria* and the structural tendencies of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, whilst forging for itself a new type of melodic language. The harmonic tendencies may be summarised as a mode-based language, the structural tendencies as a series of waves reaching ever more intense moments of climax. Harmonic events are carefully controlled and spaced (as in *Epitaph*), and coincide with changes or transpositions of the modes. Unlike *Epitaph*, however, there is no disintegration of the modal language and subsequent transcendent reformation; *Carmen Paschale* exists in an almost wholly ecstatic world, picking up the tranquil thread of *Memoria* but imbuing it with eroticism.

*Carmen Paschale* was written for, and dedicated to, an amateur group, the University College Singers at Bangor University, which was then conducted by the noted Purcell, Blow and Elgar scholar, Bruce Wood. Although the composer could depend on a reasonable level of musical literacy from the group, consisting as it did principally of music students, only a small proportion of the choir were first-study singers. This is a more straightforward score to
perform than perhaps it first appears; pitches are relatively easy to find, and the oscillating effects are both simple and effective, given enough singers. Indeed, the number of divisions is the only factor preventing the piece being taken up by any good chamber choir: sopranos are divided into four, altos and basses into two. The work was performed by John Poole and the BBC Singers in the 1980s and revived by the same group, under the direction of Stephen Cleobury, in a live broadcast from the University of Manchester in 1996.

*Carmen Paschale* takes about nine minutes to perform; it is notated over 102 bars of varying lengths, some of which are paused and whose duration therefore depends upon the conductor’s timing of events. A tabular analysis of the principal articulation points provides a helpful starting point:

Table 1: *Carmen Paschale*, analysis of articulation points

| Bars 1 – 47 | First wave |
| Bars 48 – 51 | First climax |
| Bars 51 – 64 | Second wave, ending with second climax (with moment of stillness at bar 60) |
| Bars 65 – 91 | Third wave ending with third climax (with longer ‘fold in the texture’ at bars 74 – 83, overlapping with restart at bar 82) |
| Bars 91 – 102 | Fourth and final wave |

The first wave is separated from the first climax simply because there is a clear build-up of tension towards the bar-line at the end of bar 47, at which point Lewis inserts a comma. The tension is
resolved with almost four bars of fortissimo choral exultation. The second wave concludes with a climax that grows organically out of the wave itself; the climax of the third wave, the most extended of the piece, is initially superimposed (sopranos) upon its harmonic material (in altos, tenors and basses) before being taken up by the whole choir. The fourth and final wave is almost entirely pianissimo and harmonically static, returning to the mood and sound world of the opening of the piece.

This varied approach to tension and release ensures that there is a structural playfulness here of a different order to that found in either Memoria or Epitaph. In Memoria, sections imperceptibly melt into each other; in Epitaph clear articulation points mark the end of each wave and the start of the next. In Carmen Paschale, Lewis abruptly cuts off climaxes to allow the next wave to swell up from underneath, the music overlapping. It is therefore closer in structure to Epitaph than to Memoria but less clear-cut.

6.2 First wave

The male voices provide the harmonic backdrop for the opening: the first chord (B flat (pedal) – A flat – B flat) is present throughout the first fourteen bars, gradually enriched by other pitches. The plainchant-like melodic line is introduced by the tenors in bars 5 – 6, and Lewis uses a widely varied textural palette to cloak the
harmonic and melodic material. One quickly recognises the tied
duplet-triplet patterns, familiar from Epitaph, and notes their transformation into independent oscillations (altos, bar 5); the melodically significant rising whole-tone (A flat – B flat) – Memoria – emerges naturally from the opening chord and provides the first two notes of the chant-like phrase; the sopranos’ rising quintuplet (bar 10) will become more important later but for the moment it serves to extend the pitch range upwards to a top F. Bar 11 superimposes a rapid monotone chanting (sopranos, still on their F) onto the block chords given to the rest of the choir as a written-out accelerando – this rhythmic idea (familiar from Lewis’s piano writing – see Tableau section I, bars 2 and 16) recurs at the climax of the wave, bars 48 – 51. It is thus already possible to see some of the pieces of the mosaic (Ex 2), embedded shards whose importance will increase later as the significance of the opening chant-like melody gradually fades. It is also worth noting that these chant-like phrases are fractured, discontinuous; the only real constant is the opening chord itself.

At bar 15, there is a sudden change in dynamic (pianissimo again, the texture thinning briefly to altos and tenors alone) and a rearrangement of the notes (now A flat – B flat – D flat, the basses pedal F introduced in the next bar). This shift – a textural retreat – prepares us for the start of bigger waves to come without quite meriting identification as the start of a new wave in itself: the
Ex 2 Carmen Paschale, bars 1 – 11
Sol versus vespere noctis, surgit et hinc
domini mystica messis agri

Sol versus vespere noctis, surgit et hinc
domini mystica messis agri

Sol versus vespere noctis

Sol versus vespere noctis

Sol versus vespere noctis

Sol versus vespere noctis
sense of the music is still expository, since the first fourteen bars have been based entirely upon one chord, and there is a strong feeling that new ideas are still being embedded. This new chord changes constantly in the background up to the middle of bar 39 (see Ex 4 below).

The slowly moving block chords of bars 15 – 18 recur, however, to introduce each of the other waves, as indeed in an embryonic, static, form they open the whole piece. It is fascinating to compare the different senses conveyed by the chord at bar 15 and the same chord, in exactly the same scoring, at bar 51. Bar 15 does not attempt to address or resolve any of the material introduced so far; as a consequence of what has gone before it is musically neutral. By bar 51, however, a glorious climax has been achieved and the chord is full of vigour and hope; the music can now move on.

Lewis introduces moments of word-painting here and elsewhere in Carmen Paschale. The often busy Latin text (rendered in a more leisurely fashion in Helen Waddell’s English translation) is as much a picture of nature as a piece of Christian or mystical verse. Lewis’s setting (and his is not the only one – he was preceded by both Harrison Birtwistle in 1965 and William Mathias in 1976) unfolds in something of the same unhurried manner as Waddell, lingering over words and phrases such as, in translation, ‘the little wandering tribes of bees/are brawling in the scarlet flowers abroad’. Lewis
translates the energy of the Latin original at this particular moment (there are many more plosives on these two lines than in Waddell) into musical form by his use of independent oscillations – whilst the harmonic activation magically conjures up the image of a swarm of bees, lazily motionless until observed at close hand. Similarly, the opening line – ‘Last night did Christ the Sun rise from the dark’ – is not so much set as illuminated: the use of the men’s voices and the mixture of vowels create an initially undefined soundworld; this is darkness, and out of and above it the chant-like phrase rises with all the hope of light and resurrection.

Given Lewis’s penchant for introducing an element of hommage into his scores, I do not think it is too fanciful to draw attention to the similarities between this dawn and a much-admired example by Debussy, the opening pages of La mer. The obscure lower register rumbling at the opening, the rising second given a characteristic dotted rhythm, the introduction of upper voices into the texture when the principal melodic material enters: all are common to both. Compare the contours and rhythm of the tenors’ melody in bar 5 of Carmen Paschale with Debussy’s muted trumpet and cor anglais at bar 12 (Ex 3).
Ex 3a *Carmen Paschale*, bars 5 – 6 (tenor line)

Ex 3b Debussy: *La mer*, movement 1 (‘De l’aube à midi sur la mer’), bars 12 – 17

The tonality of the opening of *La mer* is centred on a pedal B, but by the start of the 6/8 section (9 after Fig 2 in the Durand edition) it has established itself as D flat major. Lewis poises the opening of *Carmen Paschale* on a pedal B flat which, in these opening pages, functions as the submediant of D flat. Even the vocal oscillations have a counterpart in Debussy’s second violin semiquavers at the start of the 6/8 section.

It would be wrong to read too much into these similarities. Intimate familiarity with both scores does not necessarily lead one to hear any connection between them; there is no direct quotation involved as there is in *Mobile II* (and, later, in *Dead Leaves*) where the
opening progression of ‘...Feuilles mortes’ appears. Any Debussyan homage is working at a much deeper level, one of which the composer himself may not have been conscious. Every element I have drawn attention to above has been thoroughly absorbed into the Lewis idiom; the rising second is, as has already been noted, the Lewis fingerprint *par excellence*. I prefer to think of these opening bars as a translation, or even a parallel text at the side, of Debussy’s masterpiece.

I have already given some idea of the shape and structure of *Carmen Paschale* in the table above; it remains to hold up to the light the skill with which Lewis times crucial moments of harmonic change and structural articulation points. So, the climax of the first wave (bars 48 – 51), which coincides with the first overt use of a pedal D flat (the implied key centre of the opening bars), is achieved by means of an elaborate side-step eight bars earlier onto a foreign-sounding pedal A. As in both *Memoria* and *Epitaph*, the general absence of movement in the bass throughout the course of the work is hardly noticeable, since the sonic surface is so rich in incident. Unlike those two earlier scores, however, the harmonic goals here coincide, or almost coincide, with the structural articulation points, therefore posing fewer problems for the listener more used to functional harmony: the very slow harmonic rhythm in no way diminishes the power of the climax when it arrives. Ex 4 shows a harmonic ‘map’ of the work.
Ex 4 Carmen Paschale, harmonic map

Primary chord out of which the entire piece grows.

Notes added to primary chord, bar 5

Melodic reservoir, bar 10

Bar 11, harmonic resting point

Chord at bar 14

Melodic reservoir, bars 13 - 14

Notes added to primary chord, bar 8

Bar 15, first wave grows from three-note chord

Melodic reservoir, bar 45

Bar 48, climax of first wave

Bar 41 Bar 42 Bar 44

Notes added to chord

Notes added to chord

Bar 26, harmonic resting point

Bar 34, harmonic resting point

Bar 37, build-up of chord in approach to climax of first wave

Melodic reservoir, bar 55

Bar 59, harmonic resting point

Bar 60, build-up of chord in approach to climax of second wave

Bar 63, climax of second wave

Bar 62
We should note in passing at bar 35 the chant-like melody from bar 5 taking on the rhythmic character of the soprano semiquavers from bar 10, and the spoken, then whispered, fragments of text (bars 41 – 3). The latter effect is quite magical, almost the winds ‘of another planet’ soft with birdsong. It is another example of one of those
Lewisian ‘folds in the texture’ we encountered in *Memoria*: the
surroundings suddenly freeze and one is invited to concentrate on a
very small, particular detail.

One line of text is barely set at all: *temperat et pernox nunc philomela
melos* is spoken, pianissimo, by the tenors, half-hidden by other
voices and other words. The single word *philomela* (nightingale) is
taken up by the sopranos (bar 45) in a chromatically altered echo of
their semiquaver phrase – a rather nice conceit, given that the
nightingale nests near the ground, hidden away in dense bushes, its
song rising while the bird itself remains invisible. The chromatic
alteration serves to maintain the tension set up by the basses’ rogue
A back in bar 40 before D flat major is achieved (detail included in
Ex 4).

### 6.3 Central waves

The second and third waves of the piece, starting at bars 51 and 65
respectively, have much in common, at least to start. Both use parts
of the same line of text – *nunc chorus ecclesiae cantat per cantica
Sion* – and both grow to a climax from simple held chords that recall
the pianissimo chords at bar 15. At bar 51 the dynamic is mezzo-
forte, but the voicing and tonality is the same as earlier; at bar 65
the dynamic has taken a step back to piano and the chord is now
transposed up by a tone. From these similar starting points the
music then takes slightly different paths. At bar 54, the rising and falling tones from bar 3 return, within a confidently pentatonic modality. At the parallel moment at bar 68 we hear not a rising tone but an even more expressive (in this context) semitone, making explicit the shift towards an Aeolian/Dorian modality (the sixth degree of the mode is not used). The melodic semiquavers, first announced at bar 10 and briefly heard again at bars 35 and 45 – 46, come into their own at bars 55 (outbursts on the words cantat and cantica), 61 (chorus ecclesiae...) and 69 (a more sustained ascent, again on cantat), taken mainly by the sopranos over held chords from the rest of the choir. Each patch of semiquavers takes us to a peak where block chords and ascending and descending major seconds are united. The climax at bars 63 – 64 is crowned with an alleluia and underpinned by an unexpected harmonic shift led by the basses. It is this change that prompts the start of the third wave at bar 65.

The peaks at bars 59 – 60 and 73 – 74 both suddenly cut away and the music retreats, harmonically and dynamically. At bar 60 this is for a mere half bar, and the dynamic takes only a small step back, to mezzo-forte. The approach to the main climax is then immediately resumed. The fold in the texture at bar 74 is much longer. Altos, tenors and basses remain on held chords, but with less stability than before since the bass line alternates between C and G, abrupt dynamic changes are followed by sustained crescendi and
diminuendi and even the text is more fragmented. On top of this, the
sopranos gently return to their oscillations. The timing of these bars
is in the hands of the conductor, emphasising the sense of this
passage’s being somewhat apart from its surroundings, an effect
that is intensified when the sopranos are left by themselves in bars
80 – 81. When the lower voices resume their lines at bar 82, the
sopranos make a steep crescendo and end abruptly. The final climax
is now approached, via rising semitones (bar 83) and tones (bar 85)
and a final glorious alleluia, which is repeated not quite ‘a
hundredfold’, but with enough divisions and rhythmic interplay to
produce an effect of polyphonic splendour. This is the most varied
simultaneous presentation of musical ideas in the whole piece, block
chords, rising tones and flexible chant-like rhythms coming together
for the first time. Lewis has added a direction to perform the alleluia
bar three times and my bar numbering reflects this repetition.

A final climax on the words Tado, pater (bar 89), even stronger than
that of the preceding bars, clinches the piece, harmonically
speaking: the bass rises to E flat and returns firmly to C, providing a
strong foundation for the fortissimo block chords and melodic major

---

8 The repeat signs were clearly added after the work was completed; as with similar
modifications in Tableau, section II, it is possible that they were added during the initial
rehearsal process. Repeating the bar certainly allows for a much more gradual, sustained
crescendo, and the proportions match the scale of the ‘free’ bars (75 – 81) more appropriately.
9 Tado was the Archbishop of Milan for whom Sedulius Scottus is thought to have composed his
University of Richmond (Accessed April 2009),
seconds. Abruptly, this final climax is cut off, as if a door has closed on the sound of the choir, only an echo in the air remaining.

6.4 Final wave and silence

From here to the last bar of the work, the composer gradually strips the music bare, returning to the opening chord and from there to its bass alone. Even here though, there are surprises: at the words *percipias merits limina lucis* (bar 96) the whole choir chants on a gorgeously voiced minor ninth chord, while a solo baritone intones a variation of the opening melody. The ninth disappears at bar 97, although the speech-rhythm chanting continues (a gentle echo of bar 11, perhaps); there is a last glance at the dotted rising second (bar 99), and *Carmen Paschale* ends, quietly and reflectively, evaporating into the silence from which it first emerged.

The baritone’s chant-like intonation strikes a new note: even though it is closely related to the opening phrases, the very fact that it is given to a solo voice suggests a new beginning – the phrase seems to offer possibilities that are left unsaid as the final *Ave* fades into silence. This ending anticipates the still more ambiguous conclusion of *Recordatio* almost two decades later, in which the tenors intone a phrase which in its modality – or rather the particular transposition of its modality – seems to contradict the direction of the whole of the rest of the work.
An interesting structural parallel can be drawn here with a poetic device found in Chinese poetry. Arthur Cooper, in the introduction to his Penguin translations of the poems of Li Po and Tu Fu, draws attention to the poetic form chüeh-chü – a type of quatrain – which he describes firstly as ‘like a little sonata-form’ and then as ‘like the composition of a painting’. Lewis’s fondness for making connections between musical and cinematic techniques makes the latter comparison particularly apt, since a chüeh-chü is, for Cooper, like a painting, a moment frozen in time, despite the necessity of its existing, as a poem, with line and momentum in time to make its effect on the reader (listener):

Like painting, the beginning of such little poems usually represents in some way a background; while the end concentrates the senses on some often painfully sharp detail...; from which, as it were, they explode when the poem is finished into what students of Ch’an (Zen) Buddhism in the West call by its Japanese name of satori, Awareness.¹⁰

My suggestion is that Lewis is as interested in the resonance produced by his music in the mind of the listener after it has died away into silence as by the more physical response of active listening, and in Carmen Paschale (and later in Recordatio) he takes the listener in these final bars on a journey with a surprising twist which serves to illuminate the whole of the earlier part of the work with an unexpected shaft of light. As discussed in connection with

Memoria, aspects of Lewis’s aesthetic may be compared with non-Western examples, despite his use of Western modes of expression.

6.5 The threshold of the light

Lewis returned to the line of text that inspired this final moment of musical illumination for the title of a major orchestral work commissioned by the BBC and first performed in 1982. Illumination is a singularly appropriate word here since the composer described the initial emotional stimulus for Limina Lucis as being ‘the fundamental image of light’.

It stands in the same relationship to Carmen Paschale as does Tableau to Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise: some material is shared between the two works but the medium and the structure are quite different. The work has more in common with Memoria; I have described it elsewhere as a ‘celebratory adjunct’ to that much calmer earlier work.

A short example will illustrate the relationships clearly, and also reveal how Lewis develops the climactic material of Carmen Paschale.

---

11 See Chapter 3.7.
12 Programme note for the first performance.
A rising whole-tone – an interval common to all three pieces – crowns bars 269 – 271 of *Limina Lucis*, these bars being a straightforward orchestration of bars 89 – 91 of the choral work. In that piece, however, Lewis cuts away to a sudden pianissimo, the final bars based on a gentle harmonic shift away from what is, essentially, a C minor chord with an added ninth to B flat minor with an added ninth (see Ex 4). The voicing and timing of the passage make the shift barely perceptible: the timeless, hovering pivot notes (B flat and C) of bar 92, the absence of the ninth (D natural) from the end of bar 91, and the long delay before a D flat is finally introduced (bar 96) to define the new chord all contribute to the sense that the harmony is returning to a less functional role. In *Limina Lucis* (see Ex 5) that gentle harmonic shift is replaced by a much firmer, more unanimous presentation of the same chords (bar 271 – 73, via a flattening of the ninth to D flat), now surmounted by another rising whole-tone, and an immediate return to the C minor ninth chord (bar 274). From bar 275 to 277, Lewis throws in two contrasting, conflicting, chords for the climactic battle, the first based around a mode consisting of C sharp – D – E – F sharp – G sharp – A – B; then, via a pivot (G sharp – A – D, the C sharp now a C natural), a second, straightforward F sharp minor eleventh, a chord as far from C minor as it is possible to get. The element of struggle is conveyed as much through the orchestration as the harmony: orchestral families stick together, fighting to come to the fore, or retreating only to surge forward with renewed energy.
Ex 5 *Limina Lucis*, bars 269 – 281 (short score)
From this point, harmonic stasis returns: the F sharp root now remains in place as far as bar 326 – almost fifty bars. Given that F sharp is the tonal centre of *Limina Lucis*, a parallel with *Memoria* is readily apparent: many bars of the earlier work are similarly based on an unchanging ‘tonic’ E, although there the harmonic shifts drive the piece on with less vigour and dynamism.\(^{14}\)

Passages such as bar 269 onwards in *Limina Lucis* make one regret that Lewis is not by nature attracted to writing harmonically fast-moving music. Even when the notes move quickly, they tend to elaborate static or slow-moving chords; one might single out the second movement of the *Fantasy* for piano, parts of *Sonante* and *Scena*, and a brief passage before the closing section of the Piano Concerto as the rare exceptions to this general rule. Lewis dislikes the word ‘argument’ in connection with music, and is hardly more enthusiastic about ‘development’. The idea of a meditation on a chord (for example) is more important to him – indeed central to his aesthetic – than its use in generating harmonic conflict. The use of functional harmony in the midst of longer passages of chord activation in *Memoria* (to create structural landmarks) and *Limina Lucis* (to create points of unexpected tension) can be confusing to the listener who expects a uniform mode of harmonic progress through a piece. As I noted in the chapter on *Memoria*, any goal-

\(^{14}\) That the orchestration and changing textures appear to propel the music forward (rather than the work’s harmonic structure) is undoubtedly what caused Dalwyn Henshall’s analysis of *Memoria* to founder, a point discussed in Chapter 3.3.
directed way of listening must be suspended and the listener must accept both the activity and stasis of Lewis’s harmonic writing. In *Carmen Paschale*, one is carried almost imperceptibly from one state to another by its waves, just as in the earlier stages of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*. That Sedulius Scottus’ poem is mirrored so beautifully by the textural detail of the choral writing only serves to add a further layer of aesthetic enjoyment to one’s experience of the work.

6.6 Texts

Leaving aside his *Westminster Mass* and the two settings of the *Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis*, Lewis has in recent years shown an increasing tendency in his vocal music towards setting a selection of words, lines or phrases from a poem or other source, rather than a complete text as he does in *Carmen Paschale*. Even when, as in *Silentia Noctis*, he is setting a series of poems, he has no qualms about omitting occasional lines. In that song cycle, his word-setting is predominantly of the English translation, but Lewis intermittently adds Latin words and phrases from the original texts to provide a breathing space in the structure.

In the vocal quartet commissioned by the Hilliard Ensemble, *Lux Perpetua*, he sets only a very few phrases of the Requiem Mass, and in this respect the work anticipates the series of *Sacred Chants*
started a decade later, whose texts are drawn from a variety of
sources, and whose musical scale is quite independent of the
quantity of text being set. The centre-piece of the series, *Aeterna
Christi Munera (Chant VII)*, is one of the longest but only uses those
three words; similarly the *Ave Maria (Chant IX)* only sets the first two
phrases of the prayer. The concentration on a gradual musical
unfolding rather than text setting *per se* again reminds one of the
sacred choral music of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance;
despite the difference in language, the motivic construction of the
*Ave Maria*, an extended piece of two-part writing, recalls the opening
and closing movements of Byrd’s great *Mass* for four voices.

Those *Sacred Chants* that set only isolated words or phrases possess
a sense of intense contemplation and concentration, of having
passed beyond mere illustration or illumination. It is a state that
Lewis has often attained in the final pages of his instrumental
pieces, but in these *Chants* the meditative mood is achieved
immediately.

In *Recordatio*, Lewis echoes the structure of his instrumental works
and achieves a state of hypnotic calm only in the final pages. In this
work he assembled his own text, drawn largely from *Medieval Latin
Lyrics*, which ranges from single words and short phrases to more
extended lines and verses, all on the theme of remembrance. The musical structure in some ways reflects this selection: the single words, sometimes broken down into their constituent syllables or vowel sounds, are used, as in the *Sacred Chants*, to weave a meditative tapestry upon which more extended musical ideas, based on the longer texts, are superimposed. These emerge from the texture in much the same way that each wave of *Carmen Paschale* grows from a simple chord; its sense of seamless continuity has more in common with *Memoria*, however. There is a leanness about *Recordatio* which contrasts sharply with the orchestral work: an inevitable function of the choral medium (although Lewis uses a wide range of textures and spacings over the course of the work) but more specifically an effect of the concentrated opening, a compressed ‘exposition’ of the sort we have seen in instrumental works of a similar scale, which sets up expectations of musical rigour that the more luscious opening of *Memoria* does not.

The conclusion of *Recordatio* recalls two earlier works with composite texts – *Pro Pace* (1981), for four solo voices and electronics, and *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun* (1967), for narrator, flute, clarinet, piano, percussion and small SATB choir. The similarity between *Recordatio* and *Pro Pace* extends to the way the earlier work superimposes longer passages of text (sometimes

---

15 See the Catalogue for full details of the texts and sources.
spoken) upon a tissue of Latin texts taken from the Requiem Mass. The final pages, like those of *Recordatio*, consist of repetitions and decorations of a simple melodic shape which are finally reduced to a single oscillating interval (Ex 6).

Some of the texts used in *Pro Pace* had already been used in *Epitaphium* – lines from Dick Wilcocks’ *Her Song Reached Out*, and from Okamoto Jun’s *Under the hazy, blossom-laden sky* are common to both. Lewis has pointed out that the final section of *Epitaphium* is possibly the earliest example in his music of a repeating, rotating chord sequence, and the powerful effect of this passage is due in no small measure to the contrast between the declamation of Jun’s powerfully emotional text, and the simultaneous musical ritual being enacted by piano and percussion (Ex 7).

Ex 6a *Recordatio*, bars 175 – 178
Ex 6b Pro Pace, bars 219 – 232

a tempo \( \frac{1}{2} \times c. 52 \)

Soprano

\[ \text{pp sempre} \]

Li - be - ra \[ \text{pp sempre} \]

ae - ter - na

Mezzo-soprano

\[ \text{pp sempre} \]

a - ni - mas

lu - ce - at

Tenor

Bass

Electronics
Reverb. - high
Amp. level - slightly above the prevailing \text{pp sempre} dynamic level

S. \[ \text{libera pace in diee} \]

M-S. \[ \text{demorte aeterna pp sempre} \]

T. \[ \text{demorte} \]

B.

S. \[ \text{illa tremendda} \]

M-S. \[ \text{paeco paeco aeterna} \]

T. \[ \text{aeterna in diee illa} \]

B.
This contrast between emotion and objectivity is surely an early anticipation of the pull of opposing forces, whether they are extremes of violence and stillness (Duologue, Aurora) or the spirit and the flesh (Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise). Carmen Paschale also builds on contrasting elements – from harmonically static bars of purely textural activity to the climactic chord progressions achieved at the top of each wave – but here the polarity between the objective and subjective has been integrated, just as, almost a quarter of a century later, plainchant-like lines and Wagnerian-Messiaenic fervour – the chaste and the erotic – will come together in the Sacred Chants. In such works as these, Lewis’s emotional seesaw finds its point of equilibrium.
Ex 7 *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun*, bars 169 – 170

**Narrator**

*Molto calmo - static*

(Very slow and relaxed)

Under the hazy, blossom-laden

**Flute**

**Clarinet in B♭**

(soft pedal, sempre)

**Piano**

To suspended cymbals (with soft sticks)

**Vibrphone**

**Xylophone**

(*

sky new building goes on.

Our ears tuned to the
detonations under the

**Pno.**

**Vib.**

3 suspended cymbals

(soft sticks)
hazy, blossom-laden sky, We pray that the fire-rain never again fall on the world

Very slow (almost whispered) We pray that the fire-rain

never again fall on the world

molto rall.
7. PIANO TRIO AND FANTASY

Jeffrey Lewis’s Piano Trio and his Fantasy for piano share many common features and it is therefore logical to discuss the two works together. Both were composed for performance at the University of Wales, Bangor. The Piano Trio was written for the resident ensemble at the University; Fantasy was, like Tableau five years earlier, written for the ensemble’s pianist, Jana Frenklova. Both works are in three movements, broadly speaking slow – fast – slow, and both, particularly in their opening movements, place considerable emphasis on melody.

The Piano Trio was composed between July and November 1983 and first performed in February 1984. A second performance, in 1985, was recorded and broadcast a few days later on BBC Radio Wales, alongside an interview with the University College Trio’s violinist, Edward Davies. Fantasy was composed between October 1984 and January 1985 and premiered in April 1985. Unlike the Piano Trio, Fantasy has not yet received a second performance.

The tempo indications and expressive markings clearly demonstrate the similarities between the two works:
Table 1: tempo indications of the movements of the Piano Trio and *Fantasy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano Trio</th>
<th><em>Fantasy</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i Sostenuto, sempre espressivo</td>
<td>i Flessibile e tranquillo, sempre espressivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii Con anima</td>
<td>ii Volatile, sempre ben in tempo e ritmico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii Lento possibile e sostenuto</td>
<td>iii Calmo e tenero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One oddity about the Piano Trio is that the score contains two alternative endings for the second movement. The second, slightly longer version is, in Lewis’s own words, a ‘safety net’, and was written in case the University College Trio found coming to a unanimous (and quiet) conclusion difficult. The longer version adds a few beats of repeated notes and a crescendo and ends, rather crudely, on a fortissimo A spread over five octaves. Lewis has since withdrawn this ending, and, in the event, the ensemble successfully performed the work with the original, preferred conclusion.

### 7.1 Chaconne

Only one work was written between the completion of the Piano Trio in November 1983 and starting work on the *Fantasy* in October 1984. This was the short *Chaconne*, written for inclusion in the *Festschrift* for Sir Michael Tippett compiled by Geraint Lewis for publication to coincide with Tippett’s eightieth birthday in 1985.¹

---

Scored for flute, clarinet, harp and string quartet, this miniature is based, characteristically, on the musical letters of Tippett’s name: C, B, A, E, E. There are three numbered ‘variations’, (the five-note ‘Tippett theme’, although not intended to be played, is quoted at the head of the score) and each one contains several repetitions or variants of the cryptogram given by the harp and wind instruments. In the first variation (crotchet = 60), the stark presentation of the motif is initially supported by contrasting, warmly sustained string chords (Ex 1) before the quartet joins the other players in rhythmic unison (now at crotchet = 104), the Scotch snap here possibly representing the spoken rhythm of Tippett’s name, as well as being, by happy coincidence, one of Lewis’s own most recognisable fingerprints.\(^2\) The second variation follows a similar two-part scheme, the underlying pulse starting at quaver = 120 (motif in harp) and then increasing to crotchet = 132 (motif passed to the woodwind). Moving into the third variation at this tempo, the woodwind tick away furiously in quavers with irregular interjections from strings and harp before movement is arrested in the fifth bar. The pulse then slows again, to crotchet = 104, and the harmonic movement becomes much more drawn out; woodwind and strings swell and fade on long-held notes, and the harp articulates the changing pitches of the flute and clarinet, before finishing the work with a solo statement of the ‘Tippett’ motif.

\(^2\) See Chapter 3.5.
Ex 1 *Chaconne*, bars 1 – 8, chord sequence played by string quartet

The diminutive scale of the piece recalls Stravinsky’s late memorial pieces, as does its ritualistic conclusion; at less than a minute and a quarter, however, *Chaconne* might have been expanded into a more substantial work to allow the music space to find its voice. Looking forward almost a decade to *Litania*, a similar dynamic pulsing to that of the final bars of *Chaconne* may be observed in its two piccolo parts, the harp again overseeing the ceremony, in a work of more convincing and satisfying dimensions.

There is a sharp contrast between the concentrated brevity of *Chaconne* and the expansive vein of lyricism tapped in large parts of both the Piano Trio and *Fantasy*. The absence of any expressively flexible rhythmic writing in *Chaconne*, together with the precisely marked tempo changes, helps to create the impression of tight musical organisation, an impression partially disguised by the richness of the writing for the strings, whose opening chords appear to have been conceived more intuitively. By the end of the work
strings and wind almost come together – the timing of chord and
dynamic changes never quite coincide – with the harp sitting
somewhat apart from the rest of the group and having the final say.
The contrast between the intellectual terseness of the Tippett tribute
and emotional generosity of the two large-scale works perhaps
reveals early signs of a polarity appearing in Lewis’s work between
the abstract and the expressive.\(^3\) Where the worlds of all three
pieces coincide is in the formalisation of emotion in their closing
moments – a tendency already observable in both *Epitaph for
Abelard and Heloise* and *Tableau* – and in the mining of new, rich
seams of harmonic ore, even if, in *Chaconne*, these are barely
exposed before the piece is over.

An examination of the four string chords shown in Ex 1 reveals that,
as in much of *Tableau*, the interval of the tritone, appearing either
through the superimposition of two common chords (here, B flat
major and E major) or through the use of the whole-tone scale, lends
a degree of consistency to the harmonic writing. In *Chaconne* it also
gives the music a Berg-like flavour, hardly surprising when one
compares Lewis’s second chord with the first of the three chords
upon which Berg bases the *Rhapsody* of Act 1 Scene II in *Wozzeck*,
or, even more strikingly, the obsessively repeated piano chord of the
last of the *Vier Stücke* for clarinet and piano, Op 5 (Ex 2).

\(^3\) See Chapter 2.5 for a discussion of this emerging polarity in the next two works in Lewis’s
catalogue, *Hymnus Ante Somnum* and the Wind Quintet.
Ex 2 Chords from Berg’s *Wozzeck* and *Vier Stücke* Op 5 for comparison with *Chaconne*, Chord 2

First of the three chords upon which Opening chord.
the scene is based.

Ex 3 shows the two variants of the initial four-chord progression.
Octave transpositions create markedly different chords: the second chord loses its Bergian associations in the first variation through some simple re-voicing, and the much wider compass of the third, whole-tone, chord in its final form seems far less comfortably rounded.

Ex 3 *Chaconne*, bars 12 – 19 (first variation); bars 29 – 42 (second variation)

It is not too fanciful to hear a link between the string chords in *Chaconne* and the chord sequence which permeates the opening

---

4 This is a reminder of Lewis’s statement to this effect, referred to in my discussion of the opening gestures of *Tableau*, section I.
movement of *Fantasy* (see Ex 5 below). The chords may now be voiced over the full range of the keyboard, but there is a similarity in both the harmonic vocabulary being used and the way the chords are varied over the course of the movement.

**7.2 Piano Trio and *Fantasy* – an introduction**

Although both the first movement of *Fantasy* and that of the Piano Trio place considerable emphasis on melody, the structure of each movement and the way the melodies evolve is quite different in each work. In *Fantasy*, the melodic line is a gradual accumulation of small units progressively covering more and more of the keyboard, alternating with variations on a chord sequence; in the Piano Trio, there is a long, slowly unfolding string line, followed by a variation, and, after a short central interlude incorporating elements of further variation, a second string melody with its own variation.

The second movements of both works contain scherzando elements, although now it is that of *Fantasy* which is more continuous, consistent in texture and single-minded in direction. Semiquaver triplets are the predominant rhythmic groups here; in the Piano Trio there are passages of semiquaver sextuplets, but paired quavers are equally important, and the structure of the Trio’s second movement is more complex, fractured and discontinuous. Both movements outline a ternary form and finish abruptly, as if cut off.
The third movements of both works are slow and aim towards a final state of resolution or, at least, of poise. At the end of the Trio, there is a return to the material which concluded the first movement; the opening of the third movement of *Fantasy*, on the other hand, picks up where the first movement finished and then takes the music off in a new direction.

I shall explore the various ways both works look forward to *Sonante* and, to a lesser extent, to *Silentia Noctis* and *Teneritas*; *Fantasy* also anticipates *Dreams, Dances and Lullabies* and *Threnody*, and looks back, via *Tableau*, to *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*. A lengthy passage in the Piano Concerto proves to be a re-orchestration of the closing pages of *Fantasy*. The Piano Trio revisits the closing pages of *Tableau* and thus also anticipates *Cantus*; the earlier movements of *Tableau* are also fleetingly suggested. Amongst other composers invoked in the Piano Trio and *Fantasy* are Knussen and Debussy.

**7.3 First movements...**

Exx 4 and 5 show the openings of the two works, the first six bars of the Piano Trio being just the first phrase of this long-breathed melody, extending over three octaves and twenty bars. By contrast, the first seven bars of *Fantasy* appear to demonstrate a far more gradual approach to the process of constructing a melody. This passage certainly has more obvious connections with the openings
of, say, *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* or *Carmen Paschale*, where the musical ‘nuts and bolts’ are set out, ready for assembly, before our eyes and ears. And yet, is there such a difference between these two approaches? In both *Epitaph* and *Carmen Paschale*, the gradual release of the elements that are used in the construction of the pieces is in itself part of the compositional scheme: the scene-setting, the atmosphere of both works, is dependent upon the way that the process is slow and audible. The explicitly melodic opening to the Piano Trio immediately reveals a difference in oratorical style, but the manner of melodic construction itself – the use of intervals, the modulation within and between modes – is very similar to that found in the earlier pieces. One could also point to similar overtly melodic moments in *Epitaph* (the alto flute phrases) and *Carmen Paschale* (the rising semiquaver accumulations) as well as the passage in *Memoria* from bars 30 – 44 where melodic fragments and an expressive cycle of chords combine to produce one of Lewis’s most powerfully effective pages.

Just as the rising minor third plus major second provide the initial building blocks for the Piano Trio, a simple rising major second provides the first melodic element of *Fantasy*. Melodic element, because even before we hear the D flat – E flat, we hear a low pedal C, lending – as it did in *Epitaph* – both atmosphere and a sense that the tonality for what follows has been defined. Immediate contradiction, both by the melodic motif and the grace-note chord...
Ex 4 Piano Trio, movement 1, bars 1 – 6

sostenuto, sempre espressivo \(_\text{d}\) = c. 60

\textit{sul G} \quad \textit{sempre legatissimo}

Violin

Cello

Piano

\textit{pp} \quad \textit{lascia vibr. sempre}

\(\text{mf} \quad \text{poco}\)

\(\text{mf} \quad \text{poco}\)

\(\text{mf} \quad \text{poco}\) (uguale)

\(\text{pp} \quad \text{f} \quad \text{sf}_2 \quad \text{pp} \quad \text{pp} \quad \text{pp} \quad \text{pp} \quad \text{pp}\)
which precedes it, in no way diminishes the feeling that the low C provides the listener with a musical anchor. The melodic motif itself almost immediately retreats into a subsidiary role, and both this
gently oscillating ostinato and the slowly moving bass seem to be exploring possibilities rather than, as in the Trio, presenting them fully formed. The intervallic construction of *Fantasy* – mirrored minor thirds in the third bar, and the tritone defined by the inward and upward (re)turn at the end of the phrase – all have parallels in the Trio. Where the emphasis in the Trio is on continuous melody, however, discontinuity (at least in the early stages of the movement) is, in *Fantasy*, the structural principle. One might even say that *Fantasy* alludes to melody and achieves continuity through repeated attempts to bring together those elements contained in the first few bars. Emphasising and countering this initial hesitance, the chord sequence at bar 7 – representing relative stability, perhaps\(^5\) – intervenes, and its variants continue to do so over the course of the movement. As the melodic line becomes more confident – indeed, passionate – these interventions become less frequent.

Exx 6 and 7 show the progress of the melodic writing in each work in simplified form, the accompanying annotations indicating the internal relationships.

---

5 This echoes one of the functions of the quotations from Debussy’s ‘…Feuilles mortes’ in *Mobile II*. 
Ex 6 Piano Trio, movement 1, bars 7 – 20, melodic line (predominantly the violin line)
Ex 7 *Fantasy*, movement 1, bars 8 – 11, 14 – 19, 22 – 25, 27 – 32, 33 – 41, melodic line

First version of melody
- Oscillating major 2nd (bars 1 - 2) from bar 3 opened out to a major 9th
- Decorated inversion of rising 2nd/9th from bars 4 - 5

Second version of melody
- Far more extravagantly wide-ranging than first version
- Falling major second, E flat - D flat
- Repetition of D flats from bar 15
- Elaboration of major 2nd
- Rising tone E - F sharp, echoing bar 18
- Rising semitone echoes the end of the expressive shapes in bar 17, repeated notes echo the high points of bars 15 and 17

Poco calando
- Variant of final gesture of bar 6, incorporating tritone B flat - E and major 9th D flat - E flat
Third version of melody

follows the contours of earlier shapes, but intervals are softened: tritones become perfect 5ths, and there is a stronger 'major' flavour

reminiscence of rising 2nd, followed by tritone E flat - A

Fourth version of melody

like the second version, this opens with four rising notes rather than three rising notes plus one falling; return of chromaticism

this tritone 'contradicts' the previous one figtree writing - the most ornamented so far - enclosing three tritones and ending with a reference back to the demisemiquavers at the end of bar 3

Poco piu mosso (\( \times \) c. 84)

a further reference to the original rising major 2nd

from here, the melody closely follows the shape and rhythm of bars 16 - 19.

the points of difference mostly simple rearrangements of the figuration (e.g. quintuplet, bar 30, compared to bar 17)

continuing insistence on the tritone

"poco a poco piu largamente"

mf cresc. "poco a poco"

tritones again, even more drawn out: D flat - G, then G - D flat

"poco rit"

from here, a transposition of bar 19
The two most noteworthy features of the melodic line in the Piano Trio are its ascent through almost three octaves – a link perhaps to the ascending lines we have already noted in other works, *Memoria*, *Stratos* and *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* for example. Here, the ascent is more gradual, but the trajectory is still the same, and, after a brief central interlude, continuous melody recommences at bar 53 in the upper register of the violin (see Ex 8b below). The variety of scales and modes used in the first eighteen bars of this movement
produces a breathing line, a line with points of tension and relaxation, a line countered later by that simple white note melody.

By contrast, the melodic writing in *Fantasy* uses wide leaps and more freely-ranging contours, sometimes rising and sometimes returning back to their starting point. Certain intervals are associated with certain pitches, most prominently, the rising tone D flat – E flat, and the tritone D flat – G that enfolds it; these shapes, and their variations, keep recurring and create a degree of internal cohesion within the apparently improvisatory texture, as they do in *Tableau*. Each version of the melody – ‘reinvention of the gesture’ might be a more apt description, since it conveys the movement’s sense of progress – has its own ‘flavour’, which might be predominantly tense or relaxed. A strong bass presence underlies each melodic presentation; in the Trio, the slower rate at which the melody unfolds renders a bass line superfluous, but it is necessary for greater harmonic clarity in *Fantasy*.

Connections with two other composers are worthy of exploration here.

### 7.4 James MacMillan and melodic decoration

At the time that Lewis’s Piano Trio and *Fantasy* were being written, James MacMillan was still a young and relatively unknown
composer; his Piano Sonata was written in 1985 but not performed until 1989; *After the Tryst* dates from 1988; *The Confession of Isobel Gowdie*, the work that sealed MacMillan’s reputation at home and abroad, was premiered at the 1990 Proms. The differences in intent and detail between Lewis’s work and that of MacMillan are many and great, but the highly ornamented melodic lines of the Piano Trio have parallels in certain slightly later scores of MacMillan’s, particularly pieces such as *Kiss on Wood* (1993) and *A Different World* (1995), both written originally for violin and piano.

The starting point for both these works is, as is so often the case with MacMillan, religious, and specifically Catholic; both pieces make use of plainchant; *A Different World* also quotes ‘a famous Passion chorale’. The flexibility of plainchant is, as we have seen, a feature of a great deal of Lewis’s melodic writing, and the contours of the Piano Trio are no exception to this influence. Perhaps more tenuously, the *objet trouvé* also occasionally finds its way into Lewis’s scores, often submerged and disguised, just as MacMillan distorts the Passion chorale in his.

The use of ornamentation in what are already highly decorative lines is, however, what makes comparison fascinating. For MacMillan, the decoration echoes the skirl of the pipes, the sound of Scots folk

---

music. The ornamentation in Lewis’s writing is most emphatically not folk-derived: I have already explored Lewis’s rejection of any notion of conscious ‘Welshness’ in his music in my chapter on *Memoria*. I drew some parallels there, however, between certain aspects of Lewis’s style and the supposedly ‘Celtic’ soundworld of contemporaries such as William Mathias. Just as Mathias himself encouraged his listeners to hear something of the Welsh national character in his language, MacMillan has emphasised the Scottish roots of his music. Lewis does not see the inflections of his melodic writing as an expression of national identity, still less as confirming any religious or political affiliations; there is a purer, more abstract intention behind Lewis’s notes. It is the music – and the effect of the music alone – that counts.

Nonetheless, it is worth comparing a few bars from the opening of MacMillan’s *A Different World*, Ex 8a, with the opening of the long violin melody from the latter part of the first movement of Lewis’s Piano Trio, Ex 8b. The white-note language is common to both, as is the style of decoration. The pacing of the MacMillan extract is closer to that of the opening of the Trio, quoted in Ex 4 above, but my interest here is in the similarity of treatment of a simple modal melody by two otherwise very different composers. The filigree piano writing later in MacMillan’s piece (Ex 8c) could also be compared to Lewis’s, although there are fewer notes in *A Different World*, and the difference in register between the high-lying violin line and piano
figuration means that there are no intricately entwined crystalline textures here as there are in the Piano Trio. A final point of difference is the presence of the pedal A flat throughout this section of the Trio: the subversive element maintains the musical tension in what might otherwise have seemed too easily achieved. MacMillan, at the end of *A Different World*, ‘veers into a brutal and obsessive coda’,⁷ Ex 8d, a rejection of the work’s earlier music – a return to the real world – in a deliberately crude form that would be anathema to Lewis. One needs only to hear the violence in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* – a work with similar extra-musical associations – to understand that for him brutality can be both shocking and musically refined.

⁷ Ibid.
Ex 8a MacMillan: *A Different World*, bars 4 – 12
Ex 8b Piano Trio, movement 1, bars 53 – 55
Ex 8c MacMillan: *A Different World*, bars 47 – 49
Ex 8d MacMillan: *A Different World*, bars 71 – 79
7.5 Oliver Knussen and melodic growth

Turning from James MacMillan to Oliver Knussen, and from Lewis’s Piano Trio to the Fantasy, one leaves speculation over interesting, but coincidental, stylistic relationships for the examination of a far deeper level of connection between two works.

Knussen’s short piano piece, Sonya’s Lullaby, dates from 1977 and after its premiere, it was revised the following year and published by Faber in 1979. Lewis recalls hearing an early broadcast of the piece and being interested in but dissatisfied by the work. The first movement of Fantasy undoubtedly takes Sonya’s Lullaby as its starting point – the many points of contact between the two pieces will be detailed below. Knussen’s brief programme note for Faber demonstrates other connections between the work and some more general aspects of Lewis’s language. Knussen writes:

The word Lullaby is used in the sense of an incantation to sleep; Sonya is my daughter, who was a four-month-old insomniac in October 1977 when the first sketch of this piece was written. Formally the music is, I hope, self-explanatory — but perhaps it is worth mentioning that an initial stimulus toward the piano writing was the harmonic exploitation of overtones produced from the lowest register of the instrument by composers as diverse as Brahms, Scriabin, Copland and Carter. Sonya’s Lullaby is the central panel of my chamber music Triptych (the other two being Autumnal for violin and piano and Cantata for oboe and string trio) and was written for the composer-pianist Michael Finnissy, who gave the

*Fantasy* is also the product of the early months of fatherhood. Lewis’s son Richard was born on 3 February 1984 and work on the piece commenced in October of that year.\footnote{The third movement of *Fantasy* is subtitled *for Richard (3.2.84).*} Lewis does not actually use the word ‘lullaby’ at any point in the score, but the atmosphere of an ‘incantation to sleep’ is certainly present in the first movement and, even more so, in the third.

Knussen’s reference to ‘the harmonic exploitation of overtones produced from the lowest register...’ reveals a concern, shared with Lewis, for piano writing that is sensitive to the character of this ubiquitous but problematic instrument. Lewis has often spoken of the care he takes in voicing chords; generally speaking he follows the principle that the lower the notes, the wider the intervals between them should be. Examples of this principle can be found in my chapter on *Tableau*, particularly with reference to the ‘stream of consciousness’ writing in the first and third sections and the opening of the fourth.\footnote{A quite different sonority is produced by Lewis’s equally frequent use of thirds in the bass. In later scores he often deliberately muddies the waters with major seconds sounding together, almost like tam-tams, in the lowest register of the piano.} There are many points in *Sonya’s Lullaby* where Knussen presents a bass-line that is well separated from the rest of the texture; so far separated, in fact, that it has to be played as a slow grace-note before the rest of the chord. This had already
been a feature of Lewis’s piano writing for several years – in the accompaniment to *Offeren y Llwyn* (1977), for example – but in the present form, as an expressive approach to a chord, it dates from *Fantasy*, and becomes a hallmark of Lewis’s style from this work on.\footnote{This texture could be seen with equal validity as a pianistic realisation of an organ texture, complete with pedal part.}

Ex 9 Knussen: *Sonya’s Lullaby*, bar 1

*Sonya’s Lullaby* opens with a sequence of three chords (Ex 9) which, in spacing, rhythm and sonority, bear a close family resemblance to those in Lewis’s *Fantasy*, bar 7 (see Ex 5 above). As in *Fantasy*, the chord sequence recurs at several points over the course of the piece – after bar 1 we hear it again six times, at bars 6, 12, lightly disguised at bar 21, as an echo at bar 25, quietly decorated at bar 42 and with a varied voicing at bar 52. Lewis also presents his chord sequence six times, but as a series of variants. Because it is first
presented at the very opening of the work, Knussen’s sequence has a sense of immovability emphasised by the (mostly) identical repetitions of the descending bass line and rising chords: they seem to frame his melodic line. The varied presentations of Lewis’s chord sequence are, by contrast, embedded within the longer melodic development (Ex 10); and although there is a sense of rhythmic and motivic stability here, there is also a mild ebb and flow of harmonic tension which parallels that of the melodic line itself. The insistence on a descending minor third in the bass (Knussen’s first interval is the relatively relaxed major third) unifies each recurrence and, incidentally, also creates an immediate aural link to Tableau and back beyond that to Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise.

Lewis’s melody at bars 8 – 9 (see Ex 7) opens with an almost identical gesture to Knussen’s (bars 2 – 5, Ex 11), the rhythm slightly varied, but the grace-note still present. In both cases, a melody that could be mostly written in stepwise movement is presented with the intervals opened out or inverted. Lewis picks out more (and different) notes from the same octatonic collection used – but differently spelt – by Knussen; the implied compound time signature, the dynamic and expressive markings are common to both; both phrases are circular in shape. Lewis has prepared the way for this melody in his opening bars, however; the initial compound interval has already been heard in its simple form at the start of the piece.
Ex 10 *Fantasy*, movement 1, showing six variants of the chord sequence

Bars 40 - 43

appassionato

*poco a poco piu largamente*

always more weight on the first accentuated chord

*ff con forza*
Between bars 7 and 11, Knussen repeats and extends his first melodic phrase; Lewis again takes some of Knussen’s new rhythmic shapes, contours and textures as the starting point for his own – note the acciaccatura, accented octave and staccato final semiquaver (bar 9 of both works) – and there are other parallels through to the end of the phrase (Ex 12a). Knussen’s Fantastico melody (bar 13, Ex 12b) is echoed by Lewis (although without the extravagant performance direction) in outline and rhythm at his bar 14; the quintuplets of Knussen’s bars 16, 18 and 19 (Ex 12c) form a rhythmic template for Lewis between his bars 15 and 18. Such
direct points of contact become less frequent as the two pieces progress and their structures diverge.

Ex 12a Knussen: *Sonya’s Lullaby*, bars 7 – 11

Ex 12b Knussen: *Sonya’s Lullaby*, bar 13 (right hand only)
There is an accompanying figure in Knussen’s piece that quietly develops during the course of the work. At first it is presented as a tritone (B – F) in the middle of the texture of the third chord in bar 1, the top note echoing and providing a slowly pulsing accompaniment to the melody in bars 2 – 5; in bar 7, it is rhythmically elaborated into a ‘gently rocking’ (Knussen’s direction) accompaniment that is echoed by Lewis from bar 2 of *Fantasy* (compare Ex 12a with Ex 5 above). Knussen gradually opens out this tritone (a perfect fifth at bar 16) until it gains a more freely moving identity of its own. From bar 26, it becomes much more wide-ranging in pitch and dynamic range, driving the music to the climax at bar 40.

In *Fantasy*, this inner strand of the texture takes a different path. It has already proved itself mobile and fluid, within a narrow pitch range, over the course of the first six bars. Lewis hardly takes it
outside that range, certainly not until the end of bar 19. At bar 21, the modality changes briefly, but from this point, Lewis abandons Knussen’s idea of a persistent rhythmic ostinato and it only occasionally comes into focus. Lewis’s climax, at bar 43, is also the penultimate variation of his opening chord sequence, and, rather than being driven on by the rocking rhythm, Lewis hammers and repeats his chords \textit{con forza}, the only subsequent similarity to Knussen being in the direction \textit{poco a poco più largamente}.

How best to summarise the relationship of \textit{Sonya’s Lullaby} to the first movement of \textit{Fantasy}? My speculative interpretation is that initially Lewis found something intriguing about Knussen’s piece, perhaps recognising a composer tackling similar compositional issues to those with which he had also recently been engaged, the musical ‘stream of consciousness’ in works such as \textit{Tableau}, for example. Observing and recognising another composer, as he considered, ‘missing the mark’ may have provided Lewis with a key to unlock new ideas in a way that a more successful model would not. To describe Knussen as a kindred spirit is perhaps to take things too far, but there is in Knussen’s refined and fastidious writing – both in the notes themselves and in their scoring – something that is shared by Lewis. In \textit{Fantasy}, Lewis turns \textit{Sonya’s Lullaby} inside out, reversing the relative weighting of chord sequence and developing melody, and creating a differently shaped movement (Knussen’s coda is not used as the basis for any material
in *Fantasy*). Interestingly, the similarities I have noted are visible rather than audible. Knussen’s use of triplets and quintuplets in his melodic line – particularly in the absence of any firm underlying pulse – creates a freedom that is almost improvisatory, allowing attention to be drawn to the expressive gesture of the melody itself; Lewis borrows Knussen’s improvisatory contours and rhythms in the earlier part of the movement but drapes them around melodies that have different harmonic implications and, as has already been intimated, a different long-term structural goal. It is perhaps most appropriate to see this relationship as an experiment in ‘twinning’ two works, and one that would be taken to an even greater extreme in the first and third movements of *Trilogy*. On that occasion, however, Lewis was ‘twinning’ two of his own compositions in their entirety, rather than borrowing ‘genetic material’ from a pre-existing work by another composer.

7.6 *Second movements*...

In both the Piano Trio and *Fantasy*, the central movements provide a sharp contrast in speed and mood to what has gone before. They have an element of *moto perpetuo* about them, particularly that of *Fantasy*, with its restless, almost unceasing semiquaver movement and finger-twisting passages of repeated notes. The varied palette of instrumental colours in the Trio adds to the kaleidoscopic effect in the extended rapid passage-work.
Unlike the latter stages of the Trio’s first movement, the variety of texture in the second is less the result of delicate filigree writing than of the use of one or two instruments to inflect, highlight or even contradict the main, swiftly flowing musical line. Turning back to the very opening of the first movement (Ex 4), we find the same thing happening, albeit at a much slower tempo and in a more lyrical context. The piano anticipates or echoes notes and shapes in the violin line, often with a sharp, percussive attack; the string timbre often emerges out of a cloud of piano resonance, the sustaining pedal held down through the long phrases; the cello can be heard in the third bar ‘blurring’ the primary violin line. These reverberant effects are not dissimilar to those produced by the electric guitar writing in *Stratos*; Lewis’s electronic treatment of the vocal writing in *Pro Pace* also makes use of pre- and post-echo.

Lewis’s use of the piano as an ‘echoing device’ does not only evoke associations of electronic manipulation of sound: in later scores (see, for example, the opening of *Cantus*, Ex 13a) the subtle combination of piano and clarinet timbres – the clarinet growing almost imperceptibly out of the deep but quiet bass resonance of the keyboard – suggests gongs and bells. Lewis’s scores abound with the instruction ‘bell-like’, and the slow, ritualistic conclusions of works such as *Tableau* often suggest the tolling of bells.
The characteristically Lewisian texture produced by highlighting certain notes of the melodic line is one that can be found in many subsequent scores. In *Silentia Noctis* and *Teneritas*, (Exx 13b and 13c) the effect produces an increase in rhythmic tension in an otherwise flexibly expressive melodic line; it keeps the line in check, perhaps, and (incidentally) guards against an over-romantic performance. *Sonante*, however, is much closer to the Trio’s second movement, the piano’s melodic line picked out from the clarinet’s faster one; in performance, the two lines seem almost to be independent of each other (Ex 13d).

Ex 13a *Cantus*, movement I, bars 1 – 7
Ex 13b *Silentia Noctis*, bars 15 – 18

Laid on my bed in silence of the night,

I scarce had given weary eyes to sleep.

Ex 13c *Teneritas*, bars 14 – 21

Sempre espressivo e molto intenso

365
Perhaps the closest points of contact I have found for this colouristic technique in the work of other composers are a couple of brief moments of highlighting in the central section of Luigi Dallapiccola’s *Rencesvals* (1946), a setting of part of the anonymous Medieval text, the *Chanson de Roland* (Ex 14). This work is, however, unfamiliar to Lewis, although he discussed Dallapiccola’s *Quaderno Musicale di Annalibera* with his students in Bangor on several occasions. One could also look to the opening section of André Boucourechliev’s *Nocturnes* for clarinet and piano (1984) for a parallel to the opening textures of *Cantus*: there, the two instruments are described as
‘being seen as a single instrument’, a perfect description of Lewis’s work too (Ex 15).\textsuperscript{12}

Such colouristic writing also permeates a more well-known work, and one that certainly was very familiar to Lewis,\textsuperscript{13} Berio’s \textit{O King} (1967, revised and incorporated into his \textit{Sinfonia} in 1968). Berio’s instruments shadow and elaborate upon the vocal line, whilst both the percussive attack and intervallic construction of its opening bars are clearly echoed by Lewis at the start of the first movement of his Piano Trio (Ex 16, and Ex 4 above).


\textsuperscript{13} See Chapter 2.3
Ex 14 Dallapiccola: *Rencesvals*, bars 46 – 54
Ex 15 Boucourechliev: Nocturnes, I, bars 21 – 28
Ex 16 Berio: *O King*, bars 1 – 8
Before discussing the structural differences between the two movements in detail, it will be useful to set out a simple tabular analysis (Tables 2 and 3) showing their shape and some important landmarks. In both tables, the descriptions and alphabetical labels given to the various sections – Introduction, Quasi Trio, etc – are my own.

Table 2: Piano Trio, movement II, tabular analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 – 7</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 – 23</td>
<td>A – continuous quaver movement (violin) with notes picked out by the piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 29</td>
<td>B – paired semiquavers (strings), interrupted by sudden silences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 64</td>
<td>C – continuous quiet semiquaver movement (strings), interrupted by accented tremolando interjections and notes picked out by the piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 95</td>
<td>Quasi Trio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can be further broken down:
65 – 71 refers to Introduction and (briefly) A
72 – 76 new material
77 – 78 refers to 65 – 71
79 – 92 extension of new material
93 – 95 refers to 65 – 71 and leads back to...

| 96 – 115 | ...C |
| 116 – 117 | Refers to Introduction |
| 118 – 137 | A – continuous quaver movement now in piano |
| 138 – 141 | B |
| 142 – 160 | C |

Table 3: *Fantasy*, movement II, tabular analysis

| 1 – 43 | *Volatile, sempre ben in tempo e ritmico* |
| 44 – 45 | introduction of new texture (from movement I:41 – 43) |
| 46 – 58 | *Volatile* texture resumed |
| 59 – 81 | *meno mosso, sempre ben in tempo e ritmico* [Quasi Trio] |
| 82 – 94 | *Tempo I* |
| 95 | return of new texture (from movement I) |
| 96 – 137 | *Volatile* texture resumed |
It will be immediately apparent that the second movement of *Fantasy* has a much simpler structure than that of the Trio, although common to both is a modified ternary form, with a rearrangement of the material second time around. The continuity of the *Fantasy* movement contrasts sharply with the stop-start character of that of the Trio; the nature of the musical material itself reflects that difference. One can also point to the use of a far wider range of material in the Trio (even though for the most part it has a common harmonic source) than in the much more concise *Fantasy* (which, paradoxically, exploits harmonic ambiguity far more thoroughly).

The short-long rhythm that opens the Piano Trio’s second movement (Ex 17a) – the long note prolonged, indeed arrested – seems to symbolise the lurching progress of the movement as a whole until the long passage of semiquaver sextuplets starts at bar 30. Each of the opening pairs of chords seems to freeze on the second note,\(^{14}\) and whilst these dramatic gestures describe a similar ascending line to that which was heard in the opening paragraph of the first movement – both end on the same high A – here there is nothing of the lyricism of the earlier phrases. Rhythm, dynamics and percussive articulation play an important part in creating this

\[^{14}\text{Lewis has pointed out, however, that the crescendi on the held chords should give the music a sense of being ‘pushed forward’}.\text{Conversation with the author, April 2009.}\]
drama, but the softer-edged white-note or pentatonic modalism from earlier is replaced by more consistently tense octatonic writing.

Ex 17a Piano Trio, movement II, bars 1 – 7 (Lewis’s bar numbering)

The rhythm is tightened still further in the central section of the movement (bars 66 and 68, Ex 17b, and later at bars 93 and 94,) and is used again at the climax point (bars 116 – 7, Ex 17c). Here, and in the opening bars, the string writing anticipates a much
longer passage in *Scena*, where violin and piano fight for rhythmic supremacy (the conclusion of that passage is shown in Ex 17d). The up-bow crescendi contribute to the sense of tension in both works.

Ex 17b Piano Trio, movement II, bars 65 – 69

Ex 17c Piano Trio, movement II, bars 116 – 117
Lewis uses a similar rhythm at the climax point of the first movement of *Fantasy* (bars 41 – 43, see Ex 10 above), and compresses it still further when it recurs as the ‘new texture’ at bars 44 – 45 (Ex 18a) and 95 in the second movement; these moments of wild release from the incessant semiquaver triplets also have a parallel in the second movement of the Piano Trio (bars 52 – 53, Ex 18b).

At this point in the Trio, violin and cello describe a rapid ascent (a distillation of all earlier ascents) combining the two predominant
harmonic ideas of the movement against quiet oscillations in the piano. The notes are piled one on top of the other, dissonant and contradictory both within each individual string line and between them (Ex 18c). Lewis has mainly used octatonic collections here – usually D flat – E flat – E – F sharp – G – whose unresolved tritones create a sense of being harmonically frozen as strong as that produced rhythmically by the short-long gestures. Omitting the E and F sharp, however, completely changes the character of the harmony. It is a simple matter to move from extreme tension (all five octatonic notes encompassed by the tritone; the tritone itself; or a bisected tritone, that is to say, a diminished chord) to, if not exactly a release of tension, then a degree of relaxation in the form of this ‘quasi-seventh’ chord. Louis Andriessen, in *De Staat*, for example, relies heavily on a juxtaposition of these chords, usually associated with a melodic shape incorporating a ‘tonic’; in Ex 19, this shape ascends and descends, D – E – G sharp – A – G sharp – E – D, producing a motif as characteristic of minimalism in the 1970s as G – A – C – B was for Mozart and his contemporaries in the 1780s.
Ex 18a *Fantasy*, movement II, bars 44 – 45

Ex 18b Piano Trio, movement II, bars 52 – 53
Ex 18c Piano Trio, movement II, harmonic skeleton of bars 52 – 53

Ex 19 Louis Andriessen: *De Staat*, bars 106 – 9
Lewis piles note upon note in the central section of *Fantasy* too; here, the irregular rhythmic patterns of the chords (often $1 + 2 + 3 + 5$ semiquavers) produce a convulsive effect, and the composer enhances this still further by adding notes both above and far below the ‘home territory’ of the middle register (Ex 20a). This ‘rhythmically-convulsive’ style becomes still more frequent in Lewis’s works from the 1990s onwards: *Bellissima*, *Risoluto* and the central section of *Trilogy* all make use of it, and it is generally inseparable from a texture such as this in which chords are being built up.\(^{15}\)

In *De Staat*, Andriessen massively and obsessively erects similarly imposing chordal barricades, although the rhythm here is absolutely regular, after the initial transition into the new pulse (Ex 20b).

Lewis’s addition of notes and chords above and below the main area of activity during the passage in *Fantasy* serves as a good example of his use of colouristic effects in the movement as a whole. Even without recourse to the variety of scoring allowed by a piano trio, Lewis, in *Fantasy*, constantly surprises the listener by his very full and unpredictable use of all registers of the keyboard. The repeated semiquaver triplets (normal semiquavers in the central section) provide an aural anchor, being generally in the octave above middle C; the *meno mosso* takes us to the octave above that, most of the

\(^{15}\) Lewis has noted that this texture and its attendant rhythms had already occurred in his organ works *Esultante* (1977) and *Momentum* (1978).
chord-building being in the middle register. Around these repeated notes, which may either remain static or describe a melodic motif, there are repeated chords, upward flourishes, the colouristic single notes and chords already referred to, and a bass line that provides a link to the first movement, describing as it does the same minor thirds and tritones as the bass of the chord sequences in Ex 10 (see Ex 21).

Ex 20a *Fantasy*, movement II, bars 59 – 64
There is an unstoppable momentum about this movement that makes a perfect foil to the slow blossoming of the first movement. Parts of the equivalent movement of the Piano Trio – notably the semiquaver septuplets of bars 30 – 64, 96 – 115 and 142 –160 – have a similarly irresistible drive, but the ambitious alternation of \textit{moto perpetuo} figuration with the dramatic material first presented in the ferocious opening bars (Ex 13a) results in a more fragmented structure, emphasised by the start-stop rhythms, and reinforced at
bars 24 – 29 by the sudden long silences that interrupt the progress of the paired string semiquavers. Between these strong gestures
comes an extended passage of paired quavers for the violin with rhythmically irregular punctuation from the piano. Despite the rhythmic counterpoint and the great contrast in dynamic and articulation between the two instruments (the violin always smooth and quiet, the piano sharply accented), some of the tension of the opening bars dissolves as the violin line moves from melodically significant shapes within a narrow range to scale patterns over several octaves. Coming so early on in the movement, this puts the momentum of the music at risk. Harmonically, the music is still edgily poised around freely ‘modulating’ octatonic sets, but the almost unvarying texture – a single line in equal note values with a static bass in the piano – threatens to take us back to the mood of the first movement.

The passage recurs in the piano alone (bars 118 – 137), immediately after the climactic chords shown in Ex 17c; here, its length and textural uniformity seem more justifiable as a deliberate shift in perspective, from intense dramatic engagement in close-up to a long shot giving the climax a context.

In works from Night Fantasy onwards, Lewis explores the possibilities of creating continuity out of contrast in mosaic-like structures: ideas are set in motion and flow continuously, although
not always audibly,\textsuperscript{16} taking turns to come to surface and appear as foreground material. In the second movement of the Piano Trio, the juxtaposition of ideas and textures is simpler. In many later scores, Lewis will internalise the process and produce more satisfying shapes, not least in the third movement of \textit{Fantasy}.

\textbf{7.7 \ldots Third movements}

The function of the central movement of \textit{Fantasy} only becomes completely clear with the opening chords of the final movement. These echo – and, in the upper register of the piano, mirror – the final moments of the first movement. These notes seem to say that the central movement, for all its rhythmic excitement, volatility of mood and virtuoso execution, is less important than the calm to which we return here.

The relationship between the first and third movements of \textit{Fantasy} is clearly audible as the final movement starts. This is not the case with the Piano Trio; here, it is the \textit{end} of the third movement that echoes the end of the first, as if we have returned home by another route. The third movement of \textit{Fantasy} takes us on a new journey, even though its final resting place has recognisable links with its opening. Despite differences in their emotional courses (the final

\textsuperscript{16} A stream that occasionally disappears underground might be an appropriate analogy for the progress of the music in such works.
movement of the Piano Trio still has tensions from the second movement to resolve) both movements have a deeply satisfying shape, and, as noted at the start of this chapter, both achieve a final state of reflective, if not completely untroubled, tranquillity. As with so many of Lewis’s works, the silence which follows the double bar has already entered the spirit of the music long before the final notes, and is inevitably coloured by the varied moods and emotions of what has been heard before it.

When discussing the relationship between the first movement of *Fantasy* and *Sonya’s Lullaby*, I referred to the dedication of the third part of Lewis’s work to his recently born son, Richard. A similar dedication to Lewis’s daughter, Sarah, heads *Sonante*, and although that composition is a *scena* of considerable dramatic range, there are still some points of similarity between the quieter melodic material there and some of the ideas found in *Fantasy*’s final pages. These motifs – the briefest wisps of melody – have a wistful and almost folk-like feel to them, as if they are a distant memory, something half-remembered across the mists of time. There is a resemblance here to the similarly pensive melodies of Debussy’s ‘The Little Shepherd’, from his piano suite *Children’s Corner*. Lewis did not set out to quote from Debussy’s piece (as he does with ‘...Feuilles mortes’ in *Mobile II* and *Dead Leaves*) but it is easy to see how subconscious memories of a work strongly associated with childhood could infiltrate the creative processes. Similar melodic
motifs can also be found in Lewis’s *Dreams, Dances and Lullabies*, and fragments of ‘folk material’ also turn up in *Scena* and *Threnody* (the latter an elegy for a dead child).

In the final movement of *Fantasy*, Lewis creates a suspended, almost pulse-less world on which to float his threads of melody. The harmonic backdrop is that of the first movement, but the all-pervading, gently rocking rhythmic accompaniment is now no more than suggested. For the first couple of pages, Lewis alternates this other-worldly material with more explicit references back to the first movement; the music seems to move from one dream state to another. The references are in yet another transposition (the final page of the first movement repeated the opening material a semitone lower; here the transposition is a tone higher than first heard). The first sixteen bars of the movement may be tabulated as follows:

Table 4: *Fantasy*, movement III, tabular analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Calmo e tenero; senza misura, liberamente.</em> Material characterised by a gently repeating low pedal note and, in the highest register of the piano, fragments of simply decorated folk-like melody, floated ‘out of tempo’. The predominant interval is the tritone, although the bar ends with a rising tone, E flat – F, dovetailing neatly into the ensuing references to I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3</td>
<td><em>Molto flessibile (tempo rubato).</em> Refers back to I, bars 8 – 9 and 45 – 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Calmo e tenero.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9</td>
<td><em>Molto flessibile.</em> Refers back to I bars 44 – 48 (and in part to bars 8 – 11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brief reference at the end of the bar to the folk-like melody.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bars 10 – 15  | *Molto flessibile.* Refers back to I bars 14 – 19 and 49 – 54. (Briefest of references to the folk-like material in III bar 12.)

| Bar 16     | *Calmo e tenero* |

The rest of the movement, from the bottom system of page 13 to the end of page 18, is notated without barlines, and from here almost to the end of the movement, a quaver line in the middle register – *pp sempre, non cresc., dolce e sempre sotto voce* at a regular crotchet = 63 – is set up, around which other ideas, chordal or melodic, are projected. These ideas are again often fragmentary, although more extended melodic phrases also appear. This passage reappears as the final section of the Piano Concerto, illuminated beautifully by the orchestra, although the notation there is no longer unbarred.

The opening phrase of the movement can be broken down into seven fragments of two to four notes. These wisps of melody are decorative in themselves, and the phrase as a whole is poised between two tritones, B – F and E flat – A. It is easy to see the similarity between some of these fragments and the concluding notes of the opening phrase of Debussy’s ‘The Little Shepherd’ (Exx 22a and 22b).
Ex 22a *Fantasy*, movement III, bar 1 (top stave only)

Calmo e tenero  
\( \frac{3}{4} = \text{c. 60} \)  
\textit{senza misura, liberamente}  

\[ \text{fragment A} \quad \text{B} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{E} \quad \text{F} \quad \text{G} \]

pp lontano ma chiaro  
poco \( p \)  
\( \text{pp} \)

Ex 22b Debussy: ‘The Little Shepherd’, bars 3 – 4

Très modéré

\( p \)  
\( \text{mf} \)  
\( p \)

Bar 4 is an almost literal repetition of the melodic phrase in bar 1; fragments B and C are heard in bar 9, fragment B alone in bar 12. Bar 16 presents fragment C, a rhythmic variation of A, and two new fragments which are, however, clearly related to what we have already heard (Ex 22c). The very end of the movement returns to a compressed and varied form of its opening (Ex 22d). The final gesture – a rising whole-tone – takes us back even further, to the first bar of the first movement, although its transposition is that of one of the earliest decorative embellishments of the continuous quavers that start at the bottom of page 13.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{17}\) See the three-note figure at the start of page 14, top system, top stave.
Another clear connection with ‘The Little Shepherd’ can be found with the tiny three-note figure on the top system of page 15, transposed and expanded on the next line. The tail of that second idea is then combined with the first figure on the bottom system of the page. The rhythm of these figures is similar to (but not identical with) that of Debussy’s second phrase (bar 5); Lewis, like Debussy, alternates improvisatory freedom with more markedly rhythmic ideas, but, unlike Debussy, Lewis’s figures are embedded within a
larger idea (the continuous quaver movement). This allows his melodic ideas to melt unobtrusively into the purely decorative (Exx 23a and 23b).

Ex 23a Fantasy, movement III, right hand phrases from page 15

Ex 23b Debussy: ‘The Little Shepherd’, bars 5 – 6

Comparison with Sonante reveals ideas identical to those found in Fantasy (Ex 23c), and the addition of one note (in bar 7) brings Lewis even closer to Debussy’s original. By a process of allusion rather than direct quotation, Lewis is able to suggest a kinship with
‘The Little Shepherd’ that, despite a much closer paper relationship, is not aurally apparent between *Fantasy’s* first movement and *Sonya’s Lullaby*. Debussy’s piano piece will be, for many listeners, a deeply embedded part of their musical consciousness, and a fragment or even a misquotation may trigger an association. There is, too, strength in Debussy’s simplicity, whereas Knussen’s greater surface complexity precludes easy melodic memorability.

Ex 23c *Sonante*, clarinet phrases from bars 5, 7 and 14

Extracts from two later works, *Dreams, Dances and Lullabies*, and *Threnody*, illustrate not only Lewis’s continuing use of this type of melodic or motivic writing into the early 1990s, but also the association of the ideas with certain pitches (Exx 23d and 23e).\(^\text{18}\)

\[^{18}\text{In the case of Threnody, the reason for the alternation of the notes B – A is that they are derived from the musical letters of the name Thomas (h = B). See the Catalogue for further explanation.}\]
As *Fantasy* draws to a close, Lewis introduces a gentle upward scale (page 17, line 3) and an acerbic variant (page 18, line 1); he ‘corrects’ himself on line 2 and the piece then draws to its conclusion (Ex 24a). The triplets of these scales again suggest Debussy, and if one turns to bar 19 of ‘The Little Shepherd’, one finds a similar mode in use (Ex 24b). The comparison is instructive: Debussy, over the course of his miniature, uses similar gestures in a variety of modes (whole-tone, pentatonic and octatonic), just as Lewis takes
Debussy’s second (dotted) phrase and presents it in an almost whole-tone variation both in *Fantasy* and *Sonante*.

Ex 24a *Fantasy*, movement III, right hand phrases from pages 17 and 18

Ex 24b Debussy: ‘The Little Shepherd’, bars 19 – 20

Other features of the latter part of this movement may be quickly summarised. Lewis also embeds four of the Knussen-derived melodic phrases from the first movement, simultaneously creating relationships between the improvisatory and Debussian music in the upper register.\(^\text{19}\) The bass line of the movement as a whole is much more static than that of either of the preceding movements; there is an emphasis on a low B as an almost immoveable pedal, often coloured by the D either a third or a tenth above. The most significant departure from this harmonic foundation accompanies

\(^{19}\) Page 14, top system, corresponds to movement III bar 13/ movement I bar 17; page 15, middle system, corresponds to III bars 13 – 14/ I bars 17 – 18; page 16, top system, corresponds to III bars 11 – 12/ I bars 15 – 16; page 16, middle system, corresponds to III bar 10/ I bar 14.
an extraordinary evocation of bells (page 17, system 3, to the top system of page 18), a passage enclosed by the two ascending triplet scales referred to above. Lewis asks for a rhythmic and dynamic independence from the continuous quavers but the effect in the context of so much freely embedded material is strangely disciplined, reminiscent of the ascending vibraphone shapes in the early part of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*.

The quavers themselves almost entirely circle around the notes E flat – F – F sharp – A, with a brief excursion (page 16, bottom system) into a transposition of the pattern and, to accompany the bell-like passage, an extension downwards to include C and D. The unpredictability of the patterning goes some way to countering the harmonic stasis, and provides another example of Lewis’s technique of ‘harmonic activation’ albeit in a slower context than in other works. The variety of melodic and motivic material above the quaver line means that the hypnotic repetition never becomes monotonous, and the occasional changes in pedal note show the quavers in a new harmonic light. It is interesting to compare the irregular patterning here (Ex 25) with the clarinet’s semiquaver movement shown in the extract from *Sonante* at Ex 13d above; there is a slightly wider reservoir of pitches being drawn upon in the later work, but the unpredictability of the circling is the same. The effect there – nervous, unexpected – could not be a greater contrast with the patient unwinding of the line here, demonstrating again that it is the
context rather than the notes by themselves that defines a mood or atmosphere.

Ex 25 *Fantasy*, movement III, page 14, start of unbarred section

Finally, Lewis drops in occasional middle register chords, sometimes singly, sometimes in pairs, the latter echoing the rhythms of the end of the first movement that will conclude the whole work. These may either be whole-tone or octatonic chords: like the shifting bass line, they provide yet another source of colour to illuminate the quaver movement.
It is the interplay of all these elements, simple in themselves but in combination a rich tapestry of finely balanced tensions, that is most impressive about the concluding pages of *Fantasy*. Indeed, the way the work as a whole ‘breathes’ – the alternation of chords with an ever more intricately woven melodic line in the first movement, a genuinely (that is to say, harmonically) fast-moving second movement, and, in the last, a transformation of the mood of the opening, through allusions and a dream-like aura, to a point of resolution – testifies to Lewis’s skill and imagination.

The journey taken in the last movement of the Piano Trio is more turbulent than that in *Fantasy*. The opening gesture strikes an immediately defensive attitude, supporting a reading of a work which, despite pages of lyricism, is fuelled in all movements by unexpectedly violent impulses. Compare the piano’s sforzando out of which the string melody emerges in the first movement of the Trio with the patient, pianissimo start to *Fantasy*: each sets the tone for the work as a whole. That sforzando re-echoes in the first bar of the Trio’s last movement. However, instead of a long string melody, we hear glassy harmonics. The notes are the same as in the first movement, but the emphasis is now on harmony rather than melody.

Another echo – that of the fourth section of *Tableau* – follows, as a spaced-out (in both the literal and colloquial uses of that expression)
presentation by the piano of the twelve notes of the chromatic scale is heard, distributed over five octaves. Affinities with other scores abound – the low pedal notes sound the same minor third (here B – D) noted in *Fantasy*. Gradually, the strings transform these notes from ‘suspension’ into melody; the lines take on the contours, ornamentation and rhythmic flexibility of the opening paragraph of the whole work. All pitches are fully used but, as in the first movement, a few notes of the larger melodic shapes tend to be grouped into simple tonal or modal cells, freely wheeling themselves up into the next register via tritone pivots, and creating a shifting harmonic effect.

The first wave takes us to bar 14; the piano then starts the process again, with greater purpose now, since there is no longer a dialogue with the strings, but a continuous, accelerating line. A first peak is reached on a repeated B (bar 20 and again at bar 22). The strings present their lines with textures from the second movement – tremolandos, semiquaver triplets – but they support the piano’s climactic B each time with held notes of their own. The culmination (bar 24) triggers a sequence of slow piano chords, the first three fortissimo, the last a pianissimo whisper. This signals the beginning of the end of the movement.

The briefest of recapitulations follows – a mere three bars – a structural echo of the interlude between the two longer melodic
sections of the first movement. I mentioned allusion in connection with the relationship between Debussy and the last movement of *Fantasy*; here again, using the simplest means, Lewis condenses the essence of the work into a few brush strokes, underpinned by the pedal B which persists until the double bar (Ex 26).

The whispered piano chord of bar 27 is mirrored in bar 31 and decorated by the strings before the final section begins at bar 33. Here, as in the second half of *Tableau* section IV, a sense of solemn ritual is evoked by the piano’s tolling chords; the means here are simpler: Lewis simply alternates two chords, whose origins can be found in the melodic shapes of the first movement. The end result is also more expressive than that of *Tableau*; the chords are a backdrop to further string allusions. Most significantly, fragments of the second string melody of movement I are set amongst the slowly rocking chords – movement III bar 40 quotes from movement I bars 53 – 54; III bar 42 from I bars 54 – 55; III bar 44 is equivalent to I bar 64. The parallels between these reminiscences and those of the latter stages of *Fantasy* are clear.
As in the piano work, the language of the embedded material informs that of its otherwise more neutral surroundings; the simple string notes heard at bar 35 are, by bar 39, being decorated simply, in the spirit of the first movement; by bar 49 this decoration has
taken on recognisable melodic significance, now clearly a quotation from the same expressive melody we have just heard.

The conclusions of both Tableau and the Piano Trio have counterparts in works from the 1990s. Night Fantasy echoes Tableau in that its repertoire of chords is wider (Ex 27a). However, this work is, like Musica Aeterna, almost entirely constructed from chords, with virtually no melodic writing. The music progresses by building up longer chord sequences from small building blocks; the final twelve-chord sequence (repeated once) is first hinted at with a three-chord block near the start of the piece, and it is only when other ideas have been systematically worked through that the three-chord block takes its rightful place as the conclusion of the work.

The closing bars of the second, final, movement of Cantus are closer in spirit to those of the Trio. Two chords alternate over a pedal F, and although here this passage lasts a mere eight bars, the memory of a much longer similar passage in the work’s first movement renders anything longer unnecessary. The closing section of this work is again a shortened reprise of the conclusion of the first movement, where the slow, repetitive chordal writing creates a disturbing effect, a sort of hallucinatory Gymnopédie (Ex 27b).
Ex 27a *Night Fantasy*, bars 292 – 303
The surprise provided by the final bars of the Trio is the return to the piano’s suspended quavers. The strings have found peace, it seems – Lewis’s favourite rising major second in the violin is mirrored by a falling one in the cello, and the pair of instruments ends a pure fifth apart\(^{20}\) – but the piano joins them only reluctantly, and the resonance of half a dozen other pitches, some at odds with the strings’ E flat – B flat, continues to ring. These gentle

\[^{20}\text{The purity of the perfect fifth has some significance for Lewis in his string writing – he emphasised it in his own programme note for Scena, stressing not just the importance of the interval in writing the piece, but also its particular acoustic qualities.}\]
bars create a rather Ravelian impression, the bittersweet conclusion of 'Les entretiens de la belle et de la bête' in *Ma mère l'Oye* perhaps being the meeting-point between the two composers.

The fact that the two main works under consideration in this chapter have both, in their closing pages, evoked others connected with childhood by two of the most significant French composers of the early twentieth century testifies to a certain understatement in some of Lewis’s music at this time; the process of simplification, noted when comparing *Time-Passage* and *Memoria*, is taken still further here. Lewis at times uses remarkably few notes, but he does so with precision; he means what he says and says what he means.

### 7.8 Some conclusions and reflections

Lewis does not write symphonically. His music does not develop by engaging in harmonic argument. He contrasts and juxtaposes, but does not develop. And yet, in both these works, Lewis has demonstrated an ease in creating dynamic structures that echo more traditional concepts of development. Furthermore, both works contain elements of ‘returning’, of making connections between beginnings and endings which, whilst not to be understood as ‘recapitulations’ in the conventional sense, nonetheless create a familiar and satisfying sense of homecoming.
Lewis uses a wide range of memorable melodic gestures in both works. They are never in a fixed form, however; a process of continuous variation goes on, imparting unusual pliancy to the music. Lewis’s concept of music’s being like a river that is always the same and yet always different also explains the interconnections between so many of his pieces: the true artist, according to this view, writes but one work, each individual composition drawing on the manifold riches of that work.

Lewis also allows his listeners time: time to hear the notes he has written, time to consider their import, time to savour their allusions and associations, time to hear the resonance and silence in and around the notes. In his programme note to Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, Lewis wrote of ‘a call across time and space’, a phrase that seems to encapsulate all that is most significant about both these works, the Piano Trio and Fantasy. The half-remembered modal melodies and the allusions to Knussen and Debussy have all been transformed at these works’ conclusions into older, deeper memories, memories that enrich and intensify our experience of time itself.

---

21 See also Chapter 2.3.
22 An echo of Dutilleux’s view, quoted in Caroline Potter, Henri Dutilleux: his life and works, Aldershot, 1997, 59 – ‘An artist has a very small number of things to say which are ever emphasised and ever identical’.
8. EPILOGUE

8.1 Jeffrey Lewis – recognised

The preceding pages have, I hope, provided ample evidence that Lewis’s music is both worthy of and repays study, that he is without doubt a genuinely creative artist rather than a mere craftsman, and that his output as a whole holds a fascination, both emotional and intellectual, that makes its present neglect baffling. That I find Lewis’s music deserving of wider recognition goes without saying; that I am not alone in that view will have become clear from the reviews and opinions I have quoted. However, fame and success – as measured by performances, broadcasts, recordings and publications – have so far eluded Lewis, and he is in danger of falling between the cracks of the story of music in Britain in the last third of the twentieth century. So, what is it that has prevented the wider appreciation that one might expect of a composer who for twenty years received regular commissions from the BBC, from important festivals and from well-known artists?

There are, I believe, three factors behind Lewis’s present invisibility: the retiring personality of the composer himself and his distaste for self-promotion; the setbacks – exemplified by the unfortunate
cancellation of the Virgin orchestral recording in the early 1990s\(^1\) – that have dogged his recent career, and a corresponding lack of good fortune of the order that can bring a composer’s name, even briefly, to the fore; and the complex perceptions of what a general music-loving public might be thought to enjoy and what a more specialist, ‘contemporary music’ audience may wish to hear. One can readily point to a large number of living British composers whose music is – despite recordings and the easy availability of performing materials – rarely heard because it is perceived to lie between these two extremes; how much more difficult it is, therefore, to programme music that is, like Lewis’s, unpublished and virtually unknown. An ever-increasing failure of nerve on the part of promoters, publishers, broadcasters and even performers to take risks with unfamiliar names (unless, one might add cynically, they are young and marketable) exacerbates the situation.

There are no easy solutions to any of these problems. It is worth noting, however, that difficulties in securing funding for commissions and a sharp drop in the number of performances and broadcasts of Lewis’s music coincided with the period immediately following his retirement from the University of Wales – an indication, perhaps, of the importance of such a teaching post in keeping a composer (or indeed an academic), if not in the public eye, then at

\(^1\) See Chapter 2.5.
least in the eye of the musical establishment. Whether the situation for Lewis would be any different today had he sought a publisher early on in his career is, of course, impossible to say, but I suspect that the quality of his music would be much more widely acknowledged if that were the case. Lewis has succeeded in maintaining control over every aspect of his compositions, but the cost has been high; it is well-nigh impossible for a composer working in the early twenty-first century to promote his work with neither a publisher nor an agent – especially a composer who, like Lewis, has resisted any engagement with twenty-first century technology.

8.2 Jeffrey Lewis – placed

Over the course of the preceding analyses I have referred to many of Lewis’s own musical interests and preferences and indicated where these might have influenced certain aspects of his style and language. I have also made reference to a number of Lewis’s contemporaries, occasionally drawing attention to similarities between their work and his, but more often pointing out that these passing resemblances have only limited relevance in the broader context of ‘placing’ Lewis in the late twentieth-century Western art-music tradition. From one point of view, Lewis may be perceived as an eclectic composer, absorbing elements from a wide range of sources from plainchant to Messiaen. There is, however, a danger that an identification of these elements may simply result in a
catalogue of superficial likenesses, whether melodic, harmonic or
textural. This may in turn neglect a far more interesting
investigation of the deeply embedded cultural alignments that are
intricately, indeed inextricably, bound up with the psychology,
background, education and experience – both of music and of life –
of any composer. Even when discussion is limited solely to the
music, it can often be more fruitful and revealing to explore how a
work behaves, and why, than how it sounds – the many connections
between *Time-Passage* and *Memoria*, for example, are more apparent
from the page than in performance.²

Any summary of the composers and styles that inform Lewis’s music
must start with plainchant, both specifically as a sound-world
echoed in many of the choral works, and more generally in the
contours and rhythmic flexibility of so much of his music, whether
vocal or instrumental. Lewis is attracted to melodic shapes that
move vocally, that is, by small steps over a relatively narrow range
and often with simple, regular rhythms. The building bricks of many
of the works I have discussed have been the tiny fragments or
melodic motifs (rising seconds, falling thirds) common also to
plainchant melody.³ Rhythms may be instructed to be interpreted

---

² See Chapter 3.1.
³ In Lewis’s work, the harmonic context is often modal too, which creates another layer of
associations between his world and that of the church music of the Middle Ages. Needless to
say, this association is one based on occasional surface similarities rather than deep organising
principles, since Lewis’s harmonic use of modes hardly corresponds with that of the Medieval
period. Lewis often juxtaposes simple (Aeolian, Dorian) modes, or portions of them, with more
‘with the flexibility of plainchant’, although more precise rhythmic articulation may also be required at times (the use of the Scotch snap, for example). Lewis avoids the trap of writing pastiche plainchant – even in the Sacred Chants – in much the same way that Stravinsky avoids writing pastiche folksong in the ‘Russian’ works from Le sacre du printemps to Symphonies of Wind Instruments. The folk element in Stravinsky’s scores is highly stylised and it is used in a context that in itself echoes a sense of stylisation: the folk rituals of Le sacre or Les noces are idealised rather than authentic. In Lewis’s case, the Medieval texts, and indeed the choral medium, of Recordatio and Carmen Paschale provide a context in which the suggestion of plainchant appears completely natural; his individuality emerges from the play of tension between objectivity (references to an ancient musical language creating a sense of emotional distance) and intense expressivity (his ‘reinvention’ of that ancient language), echoing the conflicts and ambiguities at the core of many of his works.

A significant part of Lewis’s musical education came from his experience of church and chamber choirs, and it is hardly surprising that his musical thinking is, at least in part, influenced by certain aspects of some of the unaccompanied church music he was complex, chromatically inflected ones. The latter type is often retrospectively identified by the composer from the chord sequences which may in turn have been generated from quite different principles (eg symmetrically constructed chords). These more complex ‘modes’, therefore, might be better understood as transposable pitch-sets, although Lewis never uses them in a conventionally serial manner.
exposed to as a singer both whilst at university and earlier. For example, the texture of a work such as *Sacred Chant VII (Aeterna Christi Munera)* echoes the seamless quality of much Renaissance polyphony, and if one goes back thirty-five years to *Mobiles I and II*, one finds a similar quality in the uninterrupted linear writing, each part inching along independently and creating a dense musical fabric whose lines have been patiently drawn out. Those earlier pieces were written under the immediate influence of Ligeti rather than that of the sixteenth century, but the effect produced by the slow unfolding of the music is comparable. Similarly, the absence of structural signposts and points of articulation that informs the shapes of some of Lewis’s larger ensemble and orchestral works might be regarded as a fusion between elements of the longer paragraphs of Tudor and Italian church music, the formal innovations of works such as *Lontano* or *Atmosphères* and the non-Western musical traditions that have been mentioned in the chapter on *Memoria*.

Years spent singing in choirs have also instilled discipline into another important aspect of Lewis’s writing: whatever harmonic vocabulary he is using, whether simple modes and scales or more complex chromaticism, he is conscientious about moving, either between transpositions of pitch sets or from one type of harmonic

---

4 See Chapter 2.3.
material to another, by means of pivot notes. This habit of mind is unobtrusive but it imparts a sense of underlying order and inevitability to the music.\(^5\)

Certain unexpected works and composers from the church and choral repertoire are admired by Lewis: Edgar Bainton’s *And I Saw a New Heaven* and, especially, Balfour Gardiner’s *Evening Hymn* are favourite pieces, and Herbert Howells’ work is particularly respected for its harmonic richness.\(^6\) Vaughan Williams’ choral writing is of less interest to Lewis, and Elgar’s music – seen as coming out of the Germanic, symphonic tradition – is actively disliked.

It will be clear from earlier chapters that Lewis has little sympathy with the Austro-German tradition: that line from Haydn and Mozart, through Beethoven, Schubert and Brahms, to Mahler and Bruckner. Symphonic thinking plays no part in Lewis’s music; soliloquy rather than colloquy is his driver, and argument in the sense of musical development is irrelevant to his compositional aims. Many of his structures have more in common with older forms such as the passacaglia or chaconne, in which the composer elaborates or provides a musical commentary or discourse upon an original idea. His very personal reinvention of this form provides a good example

\(^5\) See Chapter 5.2 for a more detailed discussion of this.
\(^6\) Certain pages from Howells’ a cappella *Requiem*, particularly the setting of the words ‘Et lux perpetua luceat eis’ in the first *Requiem Aeternam*, whose music is also found in *Hymnus Paradisi*, have been cited by Lewis as good examples of harmony and texture being inseparable and – in the context of a relatively conservative English choral tradition – innovative.
of how one might identify the fundamental workings of a piece by its behaviour rather than by its sound: it would be inappropriate to look for any other connection between Lewis’s music and that of the Baroque period, despite his early obsession with J. S. Bach.

Lewis engages enthusiastically with few nineteenth-century works. Liszt’s *Via Crucis* is a rare exception, and it is a work which incorporates many of the tensions and conflicts discussed above; its outwardly ascetic aura achieves a restrained Romanticism only in its final pages. Lewis has also expressed an interest in the music of Robert Schumann, a composer whose structures likewise often contradict the expectations set up by his language. The short movements of Schumann’s composite piano works are sometimes left open-ended (*Kinderszenen*, ‘Bittendes Kind’), enter a nightmarish, potentially never-ending cycle (*Kinderszenen*, ‘Fürchtenmachen’), or, in the larger works, take a fantastic journey through a stream of consciousness (*Phantasie*, Op. 17, first movement) rather than engaging in more traditional tonal argument. A further point of connection between the two composers (also providing a link with Alban Berg) is a common interest in cryptograms, an interest that suggests mutual sensitivity to the quasi-mystical qualities possible when meaning is invested in notes
through their extra-musical associations. This might almost be viewed as a form of musical transubstantiation.\textsuperscript{7}

Lewis is, unexpectedly, an admirer of Wagner, although this admiration is necessarily qualified since he has a horror of the operatically trained female voice. Indeed, I am sure that his interest in Wagner has emerged from his far more complete enthusiasm for Messiaen. The references to \textit{Tristan und Isolde} in the \textit{Sacred Chants} echo similar references in Messiaen’s Tristan trilogy and the climax of Lewis’s \textit{Chant VI} for organ alone quotes those of both Isolde’s \textit{Liebestod} and its transformation in the \textit{Turangalîla-Symphonie}.

This brings us to the composer for whom Lewis has the greatest admiration of all – Olivier Messiaen. The massive and often discontinuous structures erected by the Frenchman might appear to have little in common with Lewis’s work, and overt Catholic symbolism is incompatible with the gentler, more fastidious spirituality of a work such as \textit{Recordatio}. There is, of course, a shared preference for a predominantly modal language, but the uses to which this modality is put are quite different. I suspect that Lewis’s respect for Messiaen’s music is that of a composer safe in the knowledge that his own music sounds (mostly) quite dissimilar and therefore appears to be free from any direct influence. Where

\textsuperscript{7} See Chapter 4.3.
individual pieces have a stronger Messiaenic flavour – one thinks particularly of the organ works (most notably *Esultante*), a piano score such as *Musica Aeterna*, isolated passages in the Wind Quintet, or even individual phrases in *Sonante* or *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise* – the associations often have more to do with the medium or instrumentation than with the musical language *per se*. I have already noted the connection between the sound of the long-held clarinet notes in *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, *Sonante* and *Cantus* with equivalent moments in Messiaen’s *Quatuor pour le fin du temps*, and the sound-world of the three sections of *Esultante* is superficially similar to movements of *L’Ascension*, *La nativité du Seigneur* and *Les corps glorieux*. But these are the exceptions rather than the rule, and Lewis himself reveals a strong enough musical personality in all these scores to make the listener hear the connections as nothing more than a passing homage to a major figure. One might remark with equal justification upon the similarity between the opening movement of *L’Ascension* and some of César Franck’s organ works, or indeed compare the alternating chorale and filigree piano writing of Chopin’s Scherzo in C sharp minor, Op. 39, with Messiaen’s superimposition of birdsong onto more harmonically stable material in the piano works.

Turning to an earlier generation of French musicians, Debussy has always been held in extremely high regard: some of Lewis’s most stimulating and thought-provoking lectures involved discussion of
Roy Howat’s book *Debussy in Proportion* (Cambridge, 1983). The hypotheses put forward in this volume regarding Debussy’s structural planning informed the composition of passages in several works in the 1980s and ’90s, although use of Fibonacci or other number series, Golden Section proportions or symmetry does not, as far as I can tell, underlie the structure of any work in its entirety. I have already commented upon the large- and small-scale correspondences between *Carmen Paschale* and Debussy’s *La mer*, and the use of the ‘...Feuilles mortes’ chords in several works. A Ravelian sensibilité – precision, colour and imagination all controlled by the hand of an invisible but ever-present puppet-master – is an equally relevant point of comparison. Lewis’s orchestral palette often sounds strikingly like Ravel’s, even when the latter’s *jeu de timbres* and xylophone are replaced by vibraphone and marimba. I have noted that the Lewis fingerprint *par excellence*, the rising whole-tone, particularly as used in *Memoria*, echoes Ravel’s use of the same interval in *Shéhérazade*, and is often presented in Ravel’s rhythm, although hearing Debussy’s ‘Sirènes’ (the third of his orchestral *Nocturnes*) and his *Prélude* ‘...des pas sur le neige’, not to mention the opening bars of *La mer*, makes one realise just how dangerous it is to attribute the origins of any particular musical gesture to a single source.

It is surprising that the music of Henri Dutilleux holds little appeal for Lewis, since there are a number of correspondences between the
works of the two composers. In particular, the melodic writing in some phrases of *Sonante* recalls that of certain pages of *Ainsi la nuit*, and that quartet’s opening chords are suggested in the (also Bergian) quartet writing of *Chaconne*. The long-held clarinet notes mentioned above in connection with Messiaen could equally be heard as echoes of the gathering points at the ends of each section of *Timbres, espace, mouvement*, although clearly the association here has less to do with specific instrumental timbres than the structural sense of a culminating focus upon a single pitch.

Reference to these composers – Messiaen, Debussy, Ravel and Dutilleux – strongly indicates that Lewis’s output has a far greater affinity to French music than to any other. When one compares his work with that of contemporary British composers – Nicholas Maw or the Matthews brothers, for example – the difference in aesthetic is clear. Where they make statements, Lewis alludes; their brushes are often loaded with post-Mahlerian oils whilst Lewis’s finer lines are etched in pen and ink. This is not to imply the superiority of one approach over another; rather, these dissimilarities are functions of a fundamental interest in different musical processes. Interestingly, Oliver Knussen’s music, which often places a strong emphasis on instrumental colour, was the unexpected catalyst for a major piano work.\(^8\) Although Lewis has no great affection for Knussen’s scores, it

---

\(^8\) See Chapter 7.5.
is significant that of that generation of British composers\textsuperscript{9} it is only he who has provided Lewis with a stimulus of this nature.

Jonathan Harvey is another composer for whom one might expect Lewis to have greater enthusiasm, since they are both fascinated by the subject of musical time versus clock or linear time, and both have used symmetry in the formation of chords and chord sequences. The relatively accessible choral music that Harvey has produced in the last couple of decades has a counterpart in Lewis’s output. Harvey’s use of electronics, however, takes him in a very different direction from that of Lewis. His exploration of the temporal issues referred to above is often expressed through the spectral analysis of sound. Perhaps the chord activations of works like \textit{Carmen Paschale} – the intense contemplation of moments in time, apparently frozen at a distance, but teeming with life when viewed at close hand – might be considered analogous to Harvey’s similarly concentrated meditations on intervals and chords. However, Lewis himself would undoubtedly view his primary antecedent at such moments as being Ligeti, especially in works such as \textit{Atmosphères}, \textit{Lontano}, \textit{Lux Aeterna} and the \textit{Requiem}, whose textures are predominantly micropolyphonic. \textit{Lontano} was, as has been noted, first performed soon after Lewis had studied with Ligeti,\textsuperscript{10} and

\textsuperscript{9} Loosely speaking – Maw was born in 1935, David Matthews in 1943, Colin Matthews in 1946 and Knussen in 1952.

\textsuperscript{10} See Chapter 2.3.
something of that work’s sound-world imbues many of Lewis’s own contemporaneous scores.

Lewis’s interest in the other musical giants of the twentieth century will have probably been inferred from the preceding chapters, but may be briefly summarised thus. He prefers Berg to Schoenberg or Webern, which is not unusual today, and one can see similarities in the methods both Berg and Lewis employ to generate some of their material: the use of pitch-sets (Epitaph) rather than note-rows is the most obvious manifestation of this. Schoenberg’s orchestral writing (with the exception of ‘Farben’, from the Fünf Orchesterstücke, Op. 16) leaves Lewis cold, and only certain works of Webern still impress (the first movement of the Symphony, Op. 21, is singled out). Generally, Stravinsky is preferred to Bartók; the obsessive cleanliness of Stravinsky’s manuscripts finds correspondence in Lewis’s own beautiful scores, and, whilst he has little interest in the so-called Neo-Classical works, Lewis mentions Le sacre du printemps, the Symphony of Psalms and Requiem Canticles as pieces he particularly admires. There are, perhaps, echoes of the vocal writing in the final section of Requiem Canticles in the voicing of passages in Recordatio. He admires most of Varèse, and certain scores of Berio and Xenakis, but is less enamoured of Lutosławski. For me, there are points of contact between Lewis and both Takemitsu and George Crumb, primarily, once again, in the area of
instrumental colour, although Lewis himself is ambivalent about their work.

Reference must also be made to the music of John Tavener and Arvo Pärt, with whom Lewis shared the Festival platform in the Vale of Glamorgan in 1992. As I have noted in the Biographical Sketch, comparisons in the press with those celebrated figures were by no means disadvantageous to Lewis, but to align Lewis’s music with theirs is to underestimate and misrepresent the range of his achievements: the harmonic language of Memoria, for example, may be accessible, but it is used to create a work whose workings continue to fascinate long after many other modally inflected works fade into anonymity, partly because of the tension between the familiar and unfamiliar (language and structure), and partly because it engages fully with both the listener’s head and heart.

So, finally, how to ‘place’ Lewis in this tangled context? His output strongly resists generalisations and categorisations. Although the works studied in the present thesis clearly have a consistency of language they also reveal a correspondingly varied manner of expression, a soundscape that is specific to each piece. This language continues to reverberate in later scores, whilst the composer also explores new structural and textural ideas, and introduces new harmonic and melodic turns of phrase. What was a recognisably ‘Lewisian’ style in the 1980s changes imperceptibly into
an equally characteristic language for the 1990s and over the turn of the millennium, one phase merging with the next, as happens with many other more celebrated names.

Lewis resists identification with any ‘school’ and would at first sight appear to have left no musical descendents. It is therefore intriguing to find echoes of Lewis’s organ writing in a recent piece for trumpet and organ, *Orion* (2004), by a former student, John Pickard. Pickard’s biography does not now acknowledge Lewis as one of his teachers, but the close working relationship between the two in the early- to mid-1980s is reflected in Pickard’s musical hand-writing (both metaphorically and literally – he acted as amanuensis for Lewis on several pieces, and sometimes it is difficult to distinguish visually between their scores) if not in his very different structural concerns. Even more fascinating is the presence of Lewisian fingerprints in parts of the *Oboe Concerto* by Guto Puw (2007). Puw had not heard Lewis’s music (apart from an isolated performance of the, in many ways, uncharacteristic *Bellissima*) before he directed a performance of *Gweledigaeth* for Lewis’s sixty-fifth birthday concert in Bangor in November 2007. Puw was briefly, however, a student of John Pickard’s in the early 1990s, and one wonders whether these points of similarity come via Pickard from Puw’s musical ‘grandfather’, whether they still hang, unexorcised, in the air of the Bangor University Music Department, or whether they are the
musical characteristics of the Welsh, embraced by Puw but
wholeheartedly rejected by Lewis himself.

Nicholas Maw offered some thoughts on the difficulties and,
perhaps, the ultimate futility of attempting to align one composer
with any other or, in a few short words, summarise their style:

I never think of my work in terms like romantic or
post-romantic. I do not categorize like that. I was just
recently talking to some of my students and telling
them that I really don’t like the word “style.” I think
that word has been overused and used dangerously
in the 20th century. It’s only in the 20th century
where this huge amount of commentary has gone on
that the concept of “style” has, in my view, become
destructive.

I like to think in terms of vocabulary. My own
vocabulary is one that contains characteristics
related to many previous elements in music that are
meaningful to me.\footnote{<http://www.fabermusic.com/serverside/composers/Details.asp?ID=Maw,%20Nicholas&View=biog&Section=composers> (Accessed 30 June 2009).}

I would draw particular attention to the second paragraph. Lewis,
like Maw, uses a vocabulary consisting of ‘many previous
meaningful elements’. He too creates a language in which these
elements are forged into something personal, using a range of
techniques that may or may not have their origins in the work of
other composers, and which are, in his best pieces, held in place by
an unobtrusively original manner of musical expression that also
informs the structure of those works. Lewis’s concept of his art – a
non-developmental music that avoids the conventional tropes of
minimalism, despite its modality; a music that shuns any note of faux-exoticism despite the structural influence of Asian music; a music that aims for continuity in which articulation points (structural signposts, aural breathing spaces) are for the most part removed – hardly draws attention to itself. Maw goes on to say ‘I see my own music as having plenty of advanced elements, many of which nobody has yet commented on!’;\textsuperscript{12} it might almost be Lewis speaking those words, and with equal justification.

In the \textit{Biographical Sketch}, I made a connection between Lewis’s music and that of Charles Koechlin, making the point that both men ploughed their own furrows, quite independent of contemporary musical pressures. Their music is beholden to no-one else and sounds like no-one else. Two other names come to mind, also from earlier in the twentieth century, whose music reflects something of that same sense of a composer quietly following his instincts rather than actively seeking fame and self-glorification through their work: Erik Satie and Gustav Holst.

Holst’s reputation has mostly lived in the shadow of Vaughan Williams, despite the enormous success enjoyed by \textit{The Planets}. And yet, time after time, one is astonished by the sheer originality of so many of his other works, even tiny gems such as his setting of

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
Tennyson’s *The Splendour Falls*, in which his choir is divided on- and off-stage to magical effect. His misfortune was not to write the cycle of symphonies that would have sealed his reputation; the life-affirming qualities of the *Hymn of Jesus* and the extraordinarily taut structure of *Egdon Heath* have taken many decades, despite ardent champions (Sir Adrian Boult and André Previn, for example), to be recognised. There was something of the quiet radical about Holst, a description that might also be applied to the subject of the present thesis.

Lewis has frequently expressed an interest in Satie’s music, from an unexpected affection for the *café-concert* songs and a delight in the quirky and surreal (*avant la lettre*) humour of some of the later piano music, to a high regard for the simple but profoundly influential *Sarabandes* and *Gymnopédies*, and a genuine interest in the mentality that could produce such a work as *Vexations*, of which, as I have mentioned, Lewis organised two performances in the 1970s. There are certain similarities too in the outlook of the two men. This has little to do with the sound of the music, although occasionally something of the ambiguous, chaste-erotic world of the composer of the *Trois Gymnopédies* can be detected in Lewis’s piano works. Robert Orledge13 makes the following observations, which, with the substitution of Lewis’s name for that of Satie, and the word

---

‘completed’ for ‘published’, applies perfectly to the subject of the present thesis:

... to a large extent, composition must also have provided a means of escape for Satie; from everyday philistinism... ...his exquisite calligraphy... ...and devising of compositional systems, must have arisen as much from a need to fill lonely hours as from a desire to create beauty amidst ugliness and squalor... ...the quantity of sketches he made far outweighs his published works. He found completing pieces far harder than starting them...\(^{14}\)

Orledge goes on to quote the composer Jean Wiéner on Satie’s obsessive care over calligraphic detail:

...it took him a good twenty minutes to write a six-line postcard... It happened that Satie, being at my house, wanted to write something after dinner... ...Over half an hour afterwards he had only started to write the address, and more often than not, it was only a question of a few lines to cancel a dinner engagement.\(^{15}\)

Lewis is a slow and careful musical calligrapher, but this paragraph also recalls Lewis’s obsessive care to avoid being misunderstood even when engaged in everyday activities: a simple text message might be sketched and revised several times before being sent.

Orledge comments that ‘It must also be said that Satie’s letters and scores, however obsessional in their neatness, still contain both corrected and unspotted errors.’ That too is true of Lewis; earlier in the thesis I pointed out an error in the score of *Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise*, and I remember the composer’s dismayed response

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 10  
\(^{15}\) Ibid.
when I indicated an incorrect time signature in *Trilogy*: the immaculate hand-writing, one feels, should act as an amulet against any mistakes, and that it should have failed created twice the distress.

**8.3 In conclusion**

Satie was a musician whose aesthetic at certain points in his career tended towards the Medieval, whose scores were works of art in themselves, and, most significantly, one whose modesty militated against the wider dissemination of his music. Much of his output would have been lost to us were it not for the intervention of a few friends and colleagues who recognised the value of his scores and rescued them from oblivion. He was for many years viewed primarily a miniaturist, albeit one of some genius, whose large-scale structures – the stage works and *Socrate* in particular – were consistently misunderstood because his listeners were unable to reconcile traditional notions of how music should unfold with his aesthetic. Jeffrey Lewis is a composer with a strong sense of musical scale and timing, a wide range and a distinctive, recognisable voice, whose music communicates strongly and directly with its audience and with those performers who have had the experience of close acquaintance with it. The true individuality of his work lies in the way he has forged a beguiling personal musical language and sound-world, hypnotizing the sympathetic listener into a willingness
to forego traditional Western ideas (and ideals) of climax and closure in favour of structures which simply ‘exist’ in time.

He achieves this without any compromise of musical integrity: he avoids any overtly self-conscious experimental idiom whilst maintaining a strong element of the unexpected in his work. He has never abandoned a personal aesthetic that marries rigorous musical self-discipline with deeply expressive writing, and he combines the pursuit of technical perfection with an awareness that the asymmetrical and uneven is often more perfect than a smooth, unruffled surface. The feature of Lewis’s music I would single out to the first-time listener as a point of entry to his world is the quality of distilled emotion, which occurs again and again, like a benediction, in the closing pages of so many of his scores. It is only one facet of this shamefully overlooked composer’s work, but it provides a key which can then unlock the secrets of other, different, scores. Works such as Memoria, Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise, Tableau, Carmen Paschale, the Piano Trio and Fantasy – and many others besides – possess a radiance and serenity that offer the listener a sense of timeless peace all too rarely allied in the work of other composers with intelligent and thought-provoking musical creativity.

Yet again one is reminded of Lewis’s words from his address to The Friends of Cathedral Music in 1993: ‘music, of all the arts, is capable of conveying [the] timeless mystical dimension’. That Jeffrey
Lewis achieves this is beyond doubt: his music allows us a momentary revelation of the transcendent; a glimpse of infinity.\textsuperscript{16}

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{16} The final paragraphs are adapted from my article ‘A glimpse of infinity: time and stillness in the music of Jeffrey Lewis’, \textit{The Musical Times}, cxlv (2004), 65 – 74.
APPENDIX 1

JEFFREY LEWIS – A CATALOGUE OF WORKS

METHODOLOGY

The ordering of this catalogue is, as far as can be reasonably ascertained, chronological, and each work, or version of each work, has been given a catalogue number (J 1, etc). The title (where there is one) and forces, including details of orchestration, follow, as do the sources of any texts used. Where a completion date is given in the score, this is used to place the work in chronological order. These dates, when present, are quoted exactly as they appear in the score and are prefaced by the words ‘score dated’. Other dates in the Catalogue that appear without a question mark have been supplied by the composer; those prefaced with a question mark have been posited according to manuscript and other evidence, and the recollections of the composer. Dedications are quoted exactly as they appear in the score.

Details of the first performance (FP) follow, giving the venue, date and performers. If the first performance took place in the context of a Festival or other special event, that is noted. Dates of subsequent performances by the same artists are noted next; details of other performances, broadcasts and commercial recordings – including those with limited pressings – follow.
Most of Jeffrey Lewis’s scores have been self-published. By and large, they appear in two formats – copies prepared from transparencies, and photocopies of the manuscripts. Almost all scores are in the composer’s own distinctive hand. The exceptions to the general rule of self-publication are those few pieces which exist as manuscript copies only and the five works which have been published commercially. Descriptions are given of the original manuscripts of early (student) works, where they have been viewed; commercial publications have been detailed.

Copies of almost all of Lewis’s scores are held by the composer, although in at least one case (*Praeludium*, J 49) he now only possesses the transparencies from which a score might be prepared; the performing materials for *Visual Music* (J 42) have been lost. I possess copies or photocopies of four-fifths of Lewis’s scores.\(^1\) Items held in the Welsh Music Information Centre at the Wales Millennium Centre in Cardiff, amounting to just under a quarter of Lewis’s output, are noted in the Catalogue, together with the smaller number of scores and off-air recordings which are kept in the British Music Information Centre; shelf-marks and catalogue numbers are given for these. Those scores still held by the BBC Music Library in Cardiff are also noted.

---

\(^1\) See Catalogue, footnote 1.
Any further commentary concerning the works, or details relevant to the circumstances of either the première or of other important performances, is given under a final heading, Notes.
APPENDIX 2
JEFFREY LEWIS – A CATALOGUE OF WORKS

J 1 **Untitled (a)**, piano
Date: before 1961, probably before 1958, possibly as early as 1951
Dedication: none
FP: not known, probably unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: I have a photocopy of the original manuscript in my possession. This sixty-four bar composition, on the two sides of a single sheet of twelve-stave manuscript paper, is written in a juvenile hand, suggesting an early date. I have not been able to compare this manuscript with any dated example of Lewis’s pre-University handwriting, however, so it is difficult to state with any certainty exactly when the piece was composed. J 2, the only other extant work from the composer’s schooldays, is written in a much more mature hand, and uses a considerably more sophisticated musical language. J 1 includes no performance directions (apart from a few slurs), or even any indication of the piece’s instrumentation, although the composer has always referred to it as his ‘early piano piece’.

J 2 **Improvisation on the Compline Antiphon – Salve Regina**, organ
Date: before 1961, possibly 1958 – 9
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Format: ms
Notes: again, I possess a photocopy of the original score. This work is forty-seven bars long and covers four sides of twelve-stave manuscript paper. The title page is signed, and the piece is prefaced by the plainchant melody itself over the text *Salve regina mater misericordiae*. There are indications of tempo, dynamics and registration. The composer cannot recall any performance of this piece, but can date it to before his application for University entry (possibly as early as his O level year, 1958 – 9), since he remembers playing it on the piano at his interview in Hull, with John Joubert playing the pedal part.

J 3 **Sonatina**, bassoon and piano
   i Allegro molto ritmico
   ii Adagio e molto espressivo

---

1 The author has in his possession copies of all scores except: J 8, J 9, J 10, J 15, J 16, J 18, J 19, J 22, J 25, J 26, J 27, J 28, J 30, J 31, J 34, J 36, J 41, J 42, J 49, J 50, J 53, J 62 and J 68.
iii Andante con espressione – Allegro furioso ma ritmico
Date: [?] 1962 – 3
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Format: ms
22 stave, 35.5 x 26.2 cm, A.L. No.16/Printed in England (with ship motif)
4 double sheets
p 1 title page (signature in top rh corner thickly deleted and rewritten under the title; address in bottom rh corner: University Hall,/ Birchwood Rd.,/ Penylan,/ Cardiff.)
p 2 blank
pp 3 – 10 music
pp 14 – 16 blank
written in black ink (now slightly browning)
Notes: The composer does not recall any performance of this work, but, according to David Evans (conversation with the author, 6 January 2009), if it did receive a performance it would have been in a University College, Cardiff, Music Society concert and it would have been given by Robert Codd with the composer at the piano.

J 4 Duo, trumpet and piano
Date: [?] 1963
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Format: ms
18 stave, 35.8 x 26.3 cm
2 double sheets
pp 1 – 6 title and music
pp 7 – 8 blank
written in blue ink
Notes: again, according to David Evans (see Notes to J 3), any performance of this work would have taken place at University College, Cardiff, during a Music Society concert. There were several trumpeters in Cardiff at that time who might have played the work – Evans mentioned John Jenkins and Tony Small as possible performers. Lewis does not recall any performance, however.

J 5 Four Pieces, piano
i Dance I
ii Dance II
iii Interlude
iv Finale
Date: [?] 1963
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Broadcast: see notes
Format: ms
22 stave, 35.8 x 26.3 cm
3 double sheets
p 1 title
pp 2 – 10 music
pp 11 – 12 blank
written in black ink
Notes: the composer does not recall any performance of these pieces, but does remember playing a piece which may possibly have been one of these on an HTV (Harlech Television) broadcast. A concert programme of the University College, Cardiff, Music Society dated 23 October 1963 includes as the final item Jeffrey Lewis’s Two Pieces for Piano played by the composer. Given the date, these could conceivably have been a pair from the set of four. In the same programme Lewis accompanied tenor Clive Jones in songs and arias by Mozart, Purcell, J Morgan Nicholas and Bach. David Evans has a copy of the programme in his possession.

J 6 Sing We Merrily, SATB choir
Text: Psalm 81: 1 – 4
Date: score dated 1963
Dedication: none
FP: [?] St David’s Cathedral, Pembrokeshire, St David’s Summer Festival. Date unknown, probably 1963 or 1964.
Palestrina Choir of University College, Cardiff, directed by Peter James.
Format: ms
24 stave, 35.8 x 26.1 cm
1 outer double sheet enclosing two (torn) single sheets
pp 1 – 6 music
written in blue ink; date added (top right of p 1) in pencil; piano reduction sketched bars 1 – 10 (pp 1 – 2) in pencil; text in blue ink p 1, pencil pp 2 – 6; other amendments, additions and marginalia in pencil, red ink and black ink
Notes: David Evans has a copy in his possession.

J 7 Care-Charmer Sleep, SATB choir
Text: Samuel Daniel
Date: score dated Jan 1964
Dedication: none
FP: [?] University College of North Wales, Bangor. [?] 1981.
University College Singers (UCNW, Bangor) directed by Bruce Wood.
Format: photocopy of ms copy (by Dalwyn Henshall – date unknown)
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: the composer cannot recall any earlier performance than this one, for which the performing score was produced.
J 8 *String Quartet*
Date: [?] 1964
Dedication: not known
FP: not known, possibly unperformed
Format: ms

J 9 *Two Dance Sketches*, mixed ensemble – flute, oboe, clarinet, bassoon, horn, trumpet, trombone, percussion (cymbals, side drum) and piano
Date: [?] 1964
Dedication: not known
FP: not known, possibly unperformed
Format: ms

J 10 *Theme and Variations for Orchestra*
Orchestration: 2222/4331/xylophone/celesta/pf/hp/str
Date: [?] 1964
Dedication: not known
FP: not known, probably unperformed
Format: not known

J 11 *Diptych*, organ
   i  Andante sostenuto
   ii  Allegro vigoroso e ritmico
Date: 1964 (see notes – the score has no date)
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Other performances: see notes
Format: ms
27 stave, bottom of paper cut off, 38 x 30 cm
2 double sheets
p 1 title page
pp 2 – 7 music
p 8 blank
written in black ink; some fingerings, pedallings and registration brackets added in pencil.
A copy of the score is held in the BBC Music Library, Cardiff.
Notes: a performance of an organ piece by Lewis, dated 1964, was given by the composer under the title *Verset – Via Crucis* in a concert given by the Palestrina Choir at St Mary’s Church, Swansea, on 13 April 1965 (programme in the possession of David Evans). In an email from the Palestrina Choir’s conductor, Peter James, to the author (7 January 2009) he wrote: ‘*Via Crucis* does not exist as a free-standing piece! We needed an organ piece for a concert c. 1966 and, in good old student fashion, simply renamed *Diptych* for the occasion. I’m sure no-one else noticed!!’ It is possible that only one movement of *Diptych* was performed on that occasion.
J 12 **Two Medieval Sketches**, harp
   i  (based on plainsong)
   ii (based on a Dufay chanson)
Date: [?] 1965, possibly earlier
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Format: ms
20 stave, 35.8 x 26.3cm
2 double sheets
pp 1 – 2, 7 music – Sketch I
pp 3 – 6 music – Sketch II
p 8 blank
written in blue ink; pedal changes circled in red pencil; some
dynamics and a dotted barline added in pencil
Notes: according to the composer, it is possible that a performance
of the Two Medieval Sketches was given by Margaret Rees, a
student in Cardiff at the time, although he has no other details.

J 13 **Improvisations**, flute and piano
   i  Adagio espressivo
   ii Allegro aggressivo e ritmico
Date: [?] 1965
Dedication: none
FP: see notes
Format: ms
25 stave, bottom of paper cut off, 35.8 x 30.2 cm
3 double sheets
p 1 title page
pp 2 – 7 music
pp 8 – 12 blank
written in black ink; some dynamics added in black ink, fine nib
Notes: according to the composer, it is possible that he performed
the Improvisations with flautist Paul Broom, another student at
Cardiff at the time, although Lewis has no further details.

J 14 **Portraits**, flute, clarinet and harp
   i  Allegro vigoroso e ben articolato, flute and harp
   ii Molto adagio, clarinet and harp
   iii Allegro e molto ritmico, flute and clarinet
   iv Largamente, quasi fanfara e violento, flute, clarinet and
       harp
Date: score dated Sept 1965
Dedication: none
FP: University College, Cardiff, Music Society Concert. Date
unknown.
Paul Broom, flute. William Roger Jones, clarinet. Margaret Rees,
harp.
Format: photocopy
J 15 **Symphony for Large Orchestra**
Orchestration: picc, 3 – 3rd doubling alto fl, 22, b cl, 2, c bsn/4331/timp/ perc (6 players) – 2 side drums, bass drum, tam-tam, cymbals, suspended cymbals (large), tambourine, wood block, 3 Chinese tom-toms, triangle, vibraphone, glockenspiel, xylophone/celesta/harpsichord/pf/hp/str

- i Moderato e misterioso – Allegro vigoroso e ritmico
- ii Adagio sostenuto ed espressivo
- iii Allegro scorrevole
- iv Theme, Chorale and Variations: Largamente – Allegro spiritoso – Allegro molto

Date: 1965
Dedication: none (according to the composer)
FP: unperformed
Format: ms, bound for submission as Lewis’s BMus exercise

J 16 **Fanfares with Variations**, orchestra
Orchestration: 2 – 2nd doubling picc, 2 – 2nd doubling cor a, 21/1111/timp/ perc – suspended cymbal (large), side drum, xylophone/harpsichord/pf/hp/str

Date: score dated April 1965, revised in 1970 (see notes)
Dedication: none (according to the composer)

Other performances:
Leeds Town Hall. 19 February 1972 (first public performance). Leeds College of Music Symphony Orchestra conducted by the composer.

Broadcast: BBC Radio, date unknown.
A recording of the FP.

Format: transparency copy (according to the composer)
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff and a further score is catalogued under Variations for Orchestra in the BBC Music Library, Cardiff.
Notes: the revision consists of removing the harpsichord from the orchestra and redistributing the part between piano and harp.

J 17 **Two Cadenzas**, piano

- i Molto lento, quasi recitativo
- ii Allegro vivo

Date: score dated 23:12:1965
Dedication: none

Subsequently performed by the same artist:
University of Wales, Swansea. 1967.
Other performances:
Town Hall, Cheltenham, Cheltenham Festival. 13 July 1967.
Bronislawa Kawalla, piano.

Ann Airton, piano.

Gregynog Hall, Newtown, University of Wales. 16 June 1973.
Geoffrey Buckley, piano.

Martin Jones, piano.

Format: ms; transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 18 **Trio**, flute, oboe and piano
   i  Sonata
   ii  Elegy
   iii  Cadenzas
Date: score dated Feb. 1966
Dedication: none
Mabillon Trio – William Bennett, flute, Philip Jones, oboe, Susan Bradshaw, piano.
Format: ms
Notes: the third movement, *Cadenzas*, is based in part on material from the second of the *Two Cadenzas*, J 17.

J 19 **Chamber Concerto**, orchestra
Orchestration: 2 doubling picc, 121/1111/timp/perc – xylophone, 3 suspended cymbals (small, medium, large), side drum, bass drum, 3 tom-toms, 2 bongos, 1 wood block, maracas, claves/electric guitar/pf/hp/str
Date: score dated February 1967
Dedication: none (according to the composer)
FP: Concert Hall, BBC Broadcasting House, Cardiff. Date unknown.
BBC Welsh Orchestra conducted by John Carewe. (See notes)
Broadcast: BBC Radio, date unknown.
A recording of the FP. (See notes)
Format: not known
Notes: A review by David Evans in *The Musical Times* Vol 108 No 1491 (May 1967), pp 443 – 4, refers to a workshop performance by the ‘rehearsal orchestra’ conducted by John Carewe during the first Festival of Twentieth Century Music in Cardiff between 16 and 20 March 1967. It is possible that this is the only airing that the piece has received and that Lewis is conflating memories of the
BBC performance of *Fanfares with Variations* and this performance under the same conductor, in which case there would also have been no broadcast of the work.

**J 20** *Epitaphium – Children of the Sun*, Chamber Cantata for narrator, flute, clarinet, piano, percussion (3 players) – timpani, 3 suspended cymbals, 3 tom-toms, 2 bongos, wood block, claves, maracas, side drum, xylophone, vibraphone – and small (4 voices per part) SATB choir
Texts: Encyclopaedia Brittanica, Hara Tamiki, Kazuo M, Dick Wilcocks, Okamoto Jun
Date: score dated April 1967
Dedication: none
Broadcast: BBC Radio, date unknown.
A recording of the FP.
Notes: the programme booklet for the Festival indicates a slightly different list of performers to those noted above. Peter James has commented (email, 7 January 2009): ‘I seem to recall that the Cardiff Polyphonic people found it tricky so we drafted in a few extras.’

**J 21** *Stanzas*, mixed ensemble – flute doubling piccolo, oboe, clarinet, bassoon, horn, violin, viola, cello and piano
Date: score dated June ’67, rev Oct – Nov
Dedication: none
Notes: the work was rehearsed at an SPNM Composers’ workshop weekend at Shornells, Abbey Wood, London (16 – 18 June 1967), referred to in Don Banks’ article in *The Musical Times*, cviii (1967), 831. Stanley Sadie’s review of the 1968 performance (*The Musical Times*, cix (1968), 252, describes *Stanzas* and companion pieces by Howard Rees and Paul Broom as being ‘more like studies in style for a mixed ensemble than fully fledged creative efforts; useful for the composers, but not particularly interesting to listen to.’ At the rehearsal weekend, the Ensemble was directed by Howard Rees; it is not stated whether he also directed the Wigmore Hall performance.

**J 22** *Spatialis*, flute, oboe and clarinet
Date: score dated Sept 1967
Dedication: not known
FP: unperformed
Format: ms

J 23 **Mosaic**, string quartet
  i  
  ii  Molto adagio
  iii  (♩ = 60)
Date: score dated Dec 25th, 1967
Dedication: none
FP: Concert Hall, BBC Broadcasting House, Cardiff, St David’s
Music Festival. 29 February 1968.
Principals of the BBC Welsh Orchestra.
Broadcast: BBC Radio, date unknown.
A recording of the FP.
Format: transparency copy
A copy is held in the BBC Music Library, Cardiff.

J 24 **Gweledigaeth**, SATB choir and soprano melodica
Text: Revelation 4: 1 – 3 (in Welsh)
Date: score dated Jan. 28th ’68
Dedication: for David Evans and the Palestrina Choir
FP: Llandaff Cathedral. Date unknown.
Palestrina Choir of University College, Cardiff, directed by David
Evans (see notes).

Subsequently performed by the same artists:
Venues and dates unknown.

Other performances:
University of Wales, Bangor, Jeffrey Lewis 65th Birthday Concert. 3
November 2007.
University Singers (University of Wales, Bangor) directed by Guto
Puw. Graeme Cotterill, chamber organ.

Broadcast: BBC Radio, date unknown.
BBC Television, date unknown.
Palestrina Choir of University College, Cardiff, directed by David
Evans.

Format: photocopy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre,
Cardiff.

Notes: the composer does not recall being present at any of the
early performances of **Gweledigaeth**, although David Evans
remembers Lewis playing the soprano melodica part on those
occasions; in an email dated 4 January 2009 he writes: ‘I well
remember the performances and publicity relating to
**Gweledigaeth**. It had a performance in Llandaff Cathedral, and
there was also a BBC recording, with either Arnold Lewis or Alun
John in charge of the session at the studios in Llandaff. There was
a spin-off Welsh language TV arts programme which featured the
work and I took part (Jeff was I think in Poland) along with the
	tenor Kenneth Bowen. Jeff’s music was used as the closing
	sequence of the programme... Jeff was the melodica player for all
	the performances although he claims he was not there!’
	(Correspondence with the author, 19 January 2009.) The recording
	of the piece used in the television programme was accompanied by
‘weird graphics’ (David Evans, 6 January 2009). In addition to the
	score held by the WMIC noted above, David Evans has a few copies
	in his possession and a set is held in the Music Department,
	University of Wales, Bangor.

J 25 Antiphony, four groups of instruments – Group 1: 2 horns,
	trumpet, 2 trombones, 2 double basses and percussion (timpani,
	large suspended cymbal, vibraphone, xylophone, 2 tom-toms, 2
	bongos, 2 temple blocks, side drum); Group 2: flute, oboe, 2 horns,
	trumpet, bass trombone and percussion (bass drum, large
	suspended cymbal, bells, keyed glockenspiel, 2 wood blocks, gong,
	wind chimes); Group 3: string quartet; Group 4: Philocorda, piano
	and electric guitar
	Date: score dated March 11th 1968
	Dedication: none
	FP: unperformed
	Format: transparency copy

J 26 Brass Piece, brass ensemble – 6 horns, 4 trumpets, 4
	trombones and 4 tubas
	Date: [?] 1968 (see notes)
	Dedication: none
	FP: unperformed
	Format: ms

Notes: the score is undated but it bears a subtitle, ‘Written in
Poland’, and its presence in a folder with other dated material
(June – August 1968) strongly indicates a similar date.

J 27 Collage for Solo Orchestra
	Orchestration: picc, 11, ob d’amore, cor a, cl in E flat, 1, b cl, sop
	.sax, alto sax, tenor sax, bass sax, 0/0111/perc – vibraphone,
	xylophone, marimba/
	celesta/harpsichord/pf/mandolin/guitar/hp/4 vlns, 2 vlas
	Date: [?] June 1968 – see notes
	Dedication: none
	FP: unperformed
	Format: ms

Notes: like the Brass Piece, J 26, the score is undated, but its
presence with other dated material written in Poland (June –
August 1968) strongly indicates the suggested date. The piece is in

two movements.
J 28 **Antiphony II** for chamber orchestra
Orchestration: 11, cor a, 1, b cl, 1/0111/vibraphone/celesta/pf/hp/str
Date: [?] June/July 1968 – see notes
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: another work (see J 26 and J 27) found with other material written in Poland. Lewis suggests the indicated date as the most likely one.

J 29 **Chamber Music**, solo violin, 3 flutes doubling piccolos and 6 violins
Date: score dated 26th July 1968
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: written in Poland. Teaching notes from Lewis’s studies with Boguslaw Schäffer accompany this score.

J 30 **Work for Large Orchestra**
Orchestration: 313 alto sax, tenor sax, 1, c bsn/1220/celesta/pf/hp/str – vlns div a 8, vlas div a 4, vc div a 4, cb div a 3
Date: unfinished, [?] July/August 1968
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: as with J 26, the words ‘Written in Poland’ appear on the four-page score (each consisting of two sheets of 24-stave manuscript paper) and indicate the suggested date.

J 31 **Four Studies**, two flutes
   i  
   ii 
   iii 
   iv $\frac{4}{4} = 120$
Date: [?] 1968
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: Lewis notes that although the score is undated, it was written in Poland and comes from the same period as J 26 – J 30.

J 32 **Mobile I**, SSTB choir (originally written for SSAA choir)
Text: none
Date: score dated 1968, revised 1971
Dedication: none
FP: not known
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: the revised score contains directions for two alternative versions:
Alternative Version (1) – with optional chime bars.
Alternative Version (2) – the original scoring, SSAA; the revised version may be transposed up a semitone for this combination.

J 33 Mobile II, two groups of instruments – Group 1: flute, 2 clarinets and 2 violins; Group 2: flute, clarinet, trumpet, trombone and vibraphone
Date: score dated 1968 – revised 1971
Dedication: none
Leeds College of Music Twentieth Century Music Ensemble directed by the composer.

Other performances:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 13 February 1986.
University Contemporary Music Ensemble (UCNW, Bangor) directed by John Pickard.

Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: based in part upon J 32.

J 34 Mutations, orchestra
Orchestration: 3 – 3rd doubling picc, 33 – 3rd doubling b cl, 3 – 3rd doubling cbn/4331/timps/perc (3 players) – 1: xylophone, side drum, gong, bass drum, suspended cymbal (large), 2 tom-toms; 2 – vibraphone, 2 tom-toms, 2 bongos, suspended cymbal (large); 3 – glockenspiel, 2 wood blocks, side drum, 2 bongos, suspended cymbal (large), bells/celesta/hp/str
Date: 1969
Dedication: none (according to the composer)
FP: Brangwyn Hall, Swansea, Swansea Festival. 8 October 1969.
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra conducted by Louis Frémaux.
Broadcast: BBC Radio, date unknown
A recording of the FP.
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 35 Untitled (b), organ
Date: 1970
Dedication: none
FP: Holy Trinity Church, Sheffield. 15 July 1970.
John Coates, organ.
Notes: this was written to be performed during the composer’s wedding to Ann Airton. It is a sixteen bar piece at \( \frac{1}{4} = \text{c. } 50 \), predominantly pianissimo, swelling to a brief forte climax at the start of bar 10. The influence of Messiaen is unusually clear. A title (on the front of the manuscript) has been thickly deleted. The absence of any dedicatee is, in this context, perhaps surprising.

J 36 **Sonanze**, clarinet, piano and percussion (2 players) – 1: vibraphone, 4 suspended cymbals (large – small), gong, 2 congas; 2: 2 bongos, 3 tom-toms, 3 suspended cymbals (small, medium, large), 2 bells (tuned to E flat and D), gong

Date: 1971

Dedication: none


David Austin, clarinet. Jeffrey Lewis, piano. Graham Hearn and John Marcangelo, percussion.

Format: ms

J 37 **Mobile III**, mezzo-soprano and mixed ensemble – clarinet, horn, trumpet, violin, cello and percussion (vibraphone, glockenspiel, set of tuned crotales, 3 triangles, 3 suspended cymbals, 3 cowbells, 2 bongos, 3 tom-toms, 2 congas, 3 wood blocks, glass chimes, tam-tam)

Text: none

Date: score dated June 1971

Dedication: none


Josephine Nendick, mezzo-soprano. Sonor Ensemble directed by the composer.

Format: transparency copy

A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 38 **Mutations II**, organ

Date: score dated 31:7:1971

Dedication: for the Schnitger organ – St. Michael’s church, Zwolle, Holland, and the “250 years Schnitger-Zwolle”

FP: St Michael’s Church, Zwolle, Holland. 7 April 1972.

Jeffrey Lewis, organ.

Other performances:

Greyfriars Kirk, Edinburgh, Edinburgh Festival. 4 September 1972.

Stuart Campbell, organ.

Great Hall, University of Leeds. 6 February 1973.

University College of North Wales, Bangor. 8 May 1975.

Gillian Weir, organ.
Broadcast: Dutch Radio, date unknown.
A recording of the FP.

BBC Radio 3, 16 October 1976.
Stuart Campbell, organ. Recorded in University Chapel, Glasgow.

Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

Notes: Mutations II won second prize in the 1972 International Organist-Composer Competition in Zwolle, Holland.

J 39 Duologue, violin and piano
Date: score dated 27:9:1971
Dedication: for Denes Zsigmondy and Anneliese Nissen
Denes Zsigmondy, violin. Anneliese Zsigmondy, piano.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:

Other performances:
Nona Liddell, violin. Daphne Ibbott, piano.

Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, date unknown.
A recording of the performance by Nona Liddell and Daphne Ibbott.

Recorded: Zheng Yu Wu, violin, David Jones, piano, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, 15 September 2007, and released on Metier msv 28514.

Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 40 Dream Sequence, countertenor (or mezzo-soprano), harpsichord and cello
Text: from The Upanishads: The Supreme Teaching – Dreams
Date: score dated February 10th, 1972
Dedication: none
FP: Leeds Institute Gallery. Date unknown.
Format: photocopy

J 41 Tritoma, violin, horn and piano
Date: 11:4:1972
Dedication: not known
FP: Subscription Rooms, Stroud, Stroud Festival. 11 October 1972.
Ifor James Horn Trio – Ifor James, horn, Nona Liddell, violin, Allan Schiller, piano.
Format: transparency copy
Notes: Tritoma won second prize in the Stroud International Composer’s Competition in 1972. It is a reworking of Duologue (J 39).

J 42 Visual Music
Date: [?] 1972
Dedication: not known
FP: not known
Format: not known
Notes: the only information I have about this work is that it was composed while Lewis was teaching at Leeds College of Music, and that it consists of the interpretation by the performers of various symbols taken from the Highway Code. The score and performance materials are lost.

J 43 Strata, wind, brass and percussion
Orchestration: 2 doubling picc, 12 – 2nd doubling b cl, 1/0330/perc – 3 tom-toms, 2 bongos, 2 congas, side drum, 3 suspended cymbals, vibraphone, glockenspiel
Date: score dated Dec 1972
Dedication: to the City of Leeds College of Music
Leeds College of Music Twentieth Century Music Ensemble directed by the composer.
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 44 Refrain, cello and piano
Date: [?] 1973
Dedication: none
FP: not known, probably unperformed
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: written for, but not included in, a volume of teaching pieces for cello (‘Cello Music for Young Players) published by the Guild for the Promotion of Welsh Music.

J 45 Music for ‘Cello and Piano
Date: score dated July, 1973
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
J 46 **Aurora**, orchestra
Orchestration: 2 doubling picc, 22 – 2nd doubling b cl, 2/4230/perc (2 players) – 1: vibraphone, glockenspiel, suspended cymbals (small, medium, large), tam-tam; 2: celesta, vibraphone, glockenspiel, xylophone, suspended cymbal (large), bells/hp/str
Date: score dated Sep. 1973
Dedication: none
FP: University of Wales, Aberystwyth. 7 February 1974.
BBC Welsh Orchestra conducted by Akeo Watanabe.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 9 February 1974.

Other performances:
Concert Hall, Broadcasting House, Cardiff. 10 August 1981.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Bryden Thomson.

Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, date unknown.
A recording of the FP.

BBC Radio 3, date unknown.
A recording of the performance by the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Bryden Thomson.

Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 47 **Realizations**, double bass and piano
Date: [?] 1973
Dedication: none
FP: Leeds University. 18 June 1974.
Paul Sanderson, double bass. Barbara Winrow, piano.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:

Format: photocopy
Notes: the instrumentation of the piece is described in the score as being ‘for double bass and piano (or versions for miscellaneous bass register instruments and piano, or version for keyboards).’
The freedom of scoring reflects the experimental nature of the work: there are two full pages of performance notes as well as a chord chart, a sequence of seven ascending figures, and instructions on ways to interpret and play the chords on the chart. The final ascending figure is taken from *Aurora*, J 46, and this should only be played once, at the end of the piece, whose duration is c. 10 – 15 minutes.

J 48 **Ritornel**, flute, viola and harp
Date: score dated May 1974
Dedication: none
FP: Glynn Vivian Art Gallery, Swansea, Swansea Festival. 15 October 1974 (see notes).
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: although advance publicity from the Guild for the Promotion of Welsh Music had advertised the concert date as 14 October, the brief review that appeared in Welsh Music, iv (1975), 91, gives the date of the FP as 15 October; this performance date has been confirmed by an entry in Lewis’s diary.

J 49 Praeludium, orchestra
Orchestration: 2 doubling picc, 222/4230/timps/perc (1 player) – vibraphone, glockenspiel, 3 suspended cymbals (small, medium, large), tam-tam, 2 bongos, 2 tom-toms, side drum/hp/str
Date: score dated April 1975
Dedication: none (according to the composer)
FP: Llandaff Cathedral, Llandaff Festival. 10 June 1975.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Uri Segal.

Other performances:
Neuadd Ysgol y Gader, Dolgellau. 16 October 1975.
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 17 October 1975.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Gaetano Delogu.

Concert Hall, Broadcasting House, Cardiff. 9 January 1980.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Owain Arwel Hughes.

Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, 10 June 1975.
A live broadcast of the FP.

A recording of the performance by the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Owain Arwel Hughes.

Format: transparency copy (according to the composer)

J 50 Scenario, orchestra
Orchestration: 2 doubling picc, 22 – 2nd doubling b cl, 2/4230/perc (1 player) – vibraphone, glockenspiel, 3 suspended cymbals (small, medium, large), tam-tam, 2 tom-toms (small, large)/str
Date: score dated June 1975
Dedication: none (according to the composer)
FP: Fishguard High School, Fishguard Festival. 1 August 1975.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Meredith Davies.
Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, date unknown.
A recording of the FP.
Format: transparency copy
Two copies of the score are held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 51a Offeren y Llwyn, (The Woodland Mass), male voice choir and piano
Text: Dafydd ap Gwilym
Date: score dated July 1976
Dedication: For Meirion Jones and the Brythoniaid Male Voice Choir – Côr y Flwyddyn
FP: see notes
Format: transparency copy
Notes: It is almost certain that Offeren y Llwyn has never received a performance in this version. The periodical Welsh Music reported (Vol V No 7, p 102) that, two years after its composition, and not alone in this regard, the work still awaited its premiere by the group it had been written for. There seem to have been exclusive first performance rights given to the choir, which may be what prompted the arrangement of the piece into what is listed below as J 51b. A performance scheduled for 16 March 1978 was cancelled.

J 51b Offeren y Llwyn, (The Woodland Mass), SATB choir and piano or harp
Text: Dafydd ap Gwilym
Date: 1977
Dedication: none
FP: University of Wales, Aberystwyth. 26 July 1980.
Aberystwyth Madrigal Singers directed by Royston Havard.
Unknown, piano/harp.

Other performances:
St Mary’s Church, Caernarfon. 20 February 1982.
University College Singers (UCNW, Bangor) directed by Bruce Wood. Elinor Bennett, harp.

National Eisteddfod, Rhyl. 5 August 1985.
National Youth Choir of Wales conducted by George Guest. Janice Ball, piano.

St Mary’s Church, Bowdon. 19 March 2005.
Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Clifford Lantaff, harp.

A recording of the performance given by the National Youth Choir of Wales.

Format: photocopy
Two copies of the score are held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: J 51b is an adaptation of the male voice choir setting of Offeren y Llwyn, J 51a, with the addition of a brief introduction for unaccompanied wordless voices.
J 52 **Time-Passage**, mixed ensemble – flute doubling piccolo, clarinet, bass clarinet, horn, trumpet, tenor trombone, percussion (2 players) – 1: vibraphone, xylophone, 2 bongos (1 pair), 2 tom-toms (small, medium), 3 suspended cymbals (small, medium, large), tam-tam (large), wood block; 2: glockenspiel, xylophone, tubular bells, 1 tom-tom (large), 2 congas, 1 suspended cymbal (large), side drum – piano, violin and cello
Date: score dated November 1976 – January 1977
Dedication: for Edwin Roxburgh and the 20th Century Ensemble of London
FP: Concert Hall, Broadcasting House, Cardiff, St David’s Music Week. 4 March 1977.
Twentieth Century Music Ensemble of London directed by Edwin Roxburgh.
A recording of the FP.
Format: transparency copy

J 53 **Spectra**, guitar
Date: 1977
Dedication: not known
Julian Byzantine, guitar.
Subsequently performed by the same artist:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 3 May 1979.
Other performances:
University of Wales, Bangor. 19 November 1992.
Craig Ogden, guitar.
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 54 **Esultante**, organ
   i Con brio
   ii Molto calmo
   iii Con bravura
Date: score dated April 1977
Dedication: for Gillian Weir
FP: St Asaph Cathedral, North Wales Music Festival. 27 September 1977.
Gillian Weir, organ.
Subsequently performed by the same artist:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 26 January 1978.
Great Hall, University of Leeds. Date unknown.
Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester. 17 February 1979.
Other performances:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 29 November 1984.
John Scott, organ.
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 16 February 1989.
Thomas Trotter, organ.
Huw Williams, organ.
Manchester Cathedral. 13 August 2002.
Bangor Cathedral. 15 February 2003.
Jonathan Scott, organ.
Recorded: Jonathan Scott, organ. A recording of the performance given on 15 February 2003, issued in a limited pressing on Credwn CR0100 (2 CD set).
Format: transparency copy

J 55 *Momentum*, organ
Date: score dated January – May, 1978
Dedication: for Gillian Weir
Gillian Weir, organ.
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: a subsequent performance, by Huw Lewis, was planned for 4 March 1980 at the Brangwyn Hall, Swansea, but it is not known whether this performance took place or not.

J 56 *Memoria*, orchestra
Orchestration: 2 – 2nd doubling picc, 22 – 2nd doubling b cl, 2/4231/perc – vibraphone, marimba, glockenspiel, bells/hp/str
Date: score dated July – September 1978
Dedication: In memory of my mother
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Boris Brott.
Other performances:
University of Wales, Aberystwyth. 1 May 1981.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Elgar Howarth.
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 30 November 1989.
University College Orchestra (UCNW, Bangor) conducted by John Pickard.
BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Grant Llewellyn.
A live broadcast of the FP.
A recording of the performance by the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Elgar Howarth.

A recording of the performance by the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Grant Llewellyn, and a subsequent studio recording by the same artists.
A copy of the recording from 30 April 1991 is held at the BMIC (catalogue number 1522).

Format: transparency copy
Copies of the score are held in the BBC Music Library, Cardiff and the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 57 **Stratos**, mixed ensemble – clarinet, violin, cello, vibraphone, glockenspiel, electric guitar and piano
Date: score dated May, 1979
Dedication: none
University Contemporary Music Ensemble (UCNW, Bangor) directed by the composer.
A recording of the FP.
Recorded: William Stafford, clarinet, Sophie Mather, violin, Hester Chapman, cello, Daniel Jones, vibraphone, Toby Kearney, glockenspiel, James Faulkner, electric guitar, Ian Tate, piano, directed by David Jones, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, 18 July 2007, and released on Metier msv 28514.
Format: photocopy
A copy of the score is held in the BBC Music Library, Cardiff.

J 58 **Epitaph for Abelard and Heloise**, mixed ensemble – flute doubling alto flute, clarinet, violin, cello, percussion (vibraphone, glockenspiel, medium and large suspended cymbals, tam-tam) and piano
Date: 1979
Dedication: none
FP: Chapter Arts Centre, Cardiff. 11 November 1979.
Principals of the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra directed by the composer.

Other performances:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 19 February 1981.
St Asaph Cathedral, North Wales Music Festival. 26 September 1984.
University Contemporary Music Ensemble (UCNW, Bangor) directed by the composer.
Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester. 5 April 2004.
Members of the Altèri New Music Ensemble – Fiona Slominska, flute, Sarah Ableman, clarinet, Gerald Gregory, violin, Douglas Badger, cello, Mark Concar, percussion, Ian Tate, piano – directed by David Jones.

University of Wales, Bangor, Jeffrey Lewis 65th Birthday Concert. 3 November 2007.

Members of Ensemble Cymru – Clare Graves, flute, Peryn Clement-Evans, clarinet, Edward Davies, violin, Heather Bills, cello, Dewi Ellis Jones, percussion, Harvey Davies, piano – directed by David Jones.

A recording of the FP.

A recording of the performance given by the University Contemporary Music Ensemble (UCNW, Bangor) directed by the composer on 19 February 1981.

Lontano directed by Odaline de la Martinez.
A copy of this recording is held at the BMIC (catalogue number 1874)

Recorded: Members of the Altèri New Music Ensemble directed by David Jones, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, on 8 April 2004, and released on Campion Cameo 2038.

Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held at the BMIC (shelf mark Ha O)

J 59 Tableau, piano

i \( \frac{\text{\ }}{\text{\ }} \) = 60

ii \( \frac{\text{\ }}{\text{\ }} \) = 72 – 76

iii \( \frac{\text{\ }}{\text{\ }} \) = 60

iv \( \frac{\text{\ }}{\text{\ }} \) = 40

Date: score dated January 1980
Dedication: For Jana Frenklova
Jana Frenklova, piano.

Subsequently performed by the same artist:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 14 February 1980.

Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, date unknown.
A recording of the second performance.

Format: transparency copy

J 60 Elegy, 2 oboes, organ and strings
Date: score dated 17th April 1980
Dedication: none
FP: St David’s Cathedral, Pembrokeshire, St David’s Cathedral Bach Festival. 28 May 1980.  
Sir Nicholas Jackson, organ. London Virtuosi conducted by the composer.

Other performances:  
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 1 December 1980.  
University Chamber Orchestra (UCNW, Bangor) conducted by Dalwyn Henshall.

Format: transparency copy

J 61 Carmen Paschale, SATB choir  
Text: Sedulius Scottus (included in Medieval Latin Lyrics, London, 1929)  
Date: score dated 14th February 1981  
Dedication: see notes  
FP: University College of North Wales, Bangor. 19 November 1981.  
University College Singers (UCNW, Bangor) directed by Bruce Wood.

Other performances:  
Dyfed Choir directed by Christopher Barton (see notes).

University of Manchester. 23 February 1996.  
BBC Singers directed by Stephen Cleobury.

St Olave’s Church, York, York Late Music Festival. 25 October 1997.  
Elysian Singers directed by Matthew Greenall.

St Mary’s Church, Lymm, Lymm Festival. 5 July 2002.  
St Ann’s Church, Manchester. 9 July 2002.  
Manchester Cathedral. 13 August 2002.  
Bangor Cathedral. 15 February 2003.  
Imperial War Museum North, Salford. 13 March 2005.  
St Mary’s Church, Bowdon. 19 March 2005.  
Altéri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones.

Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, date unknown (after 30 November 1982).  
BBC Singers directed by John Poole.

BBC Radio 3, 23 February 1996.  
A live broadcast of the performance given by the BBC Singers directed by Stephen Cleobury.

Recorded: Altéri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. A recording of the performance given on 15 February 2003, issued in a limited pressing on Credwn CR0100 (2 CD set).  
A recording of the performance by the BBC Singers directed by John Poole was used during an exhibition of work by Mick Brown at the Ucheldre Centre, Holyhead, Anglesey, which opened on 6 April 2001.
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

Notes: the performance by the Dyfed Choir listed above may not have taken place, since there is no concert date associated with the work, as there are with the performances of two other works by Lewis given during the 1995 Go West Festival. According to the composer’s programme note for the first performance, the work bears a dedication, ‘for Bruce Wood and the University College Singers, UCNW, Bangor’, although this does not appear on any copy of the score I have seen.

J 62 **Untitled (c)**, organ
Date: 1981
Dedication: not known
FP: Lichfield Cathedral. 23 May 1981.
Peter King, organ
Format: not known
Notes: this short piece, described by the composer as fanfare-like in character, was written to be performed during the confirmation service of Paul James, son of Peter and Heather James.

J 63 **Pro Pace**, four solo voices (soprano, mezzo-soprano, tenor, bass) with live electronics
Text: Dick Wilcocks, Albert Camus, Seichiro Tage, Heiwa-Ondo (the Peace Dance), Okamoto Jun, Requiem Mass
Date: score dated April – July 1981
Dedication: none
FP: St Donats Castle, Vale of Glamorgan Festival. 26 August 1981.
Format: transparency copy
Notes: according to Alan Hall’s review in *Welsh Music* Vol VI No 9 pp 75 – 76, ‘the players [sic] next day gave a workshop session to [sic] Jeffrey Lewis’s *Pro Pace...and her song reached out.*’

J 64 **Limina Lucis**, organ and orchestra
Orchestration: 3 doubling picc, 332, c bsn/4331/perc (2 players) – 1: suspended cymbals (medium, large), tam-tam (large), glockenspiel, crotales; 2: suspended cymbals (medium, large), gong, vibraphone, crotales/celesta/ organ/str
Date: 1982
Dedication: none
FP: Brangwyn Hall, Swansea, St David’s Music Week. 3 March 1982.
John Scott, organ. BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Moshe Atzmon.
A recording of the FP.
J 65 **Piano Trio**, violin, cello and piano  
i Sostenuto, sempre espressivo  
ii Con anima  
iii Lento possibile e sostenuto  

Date: score dated July – November 1983  
Dedication: none  
FP: University College of North Wales, Bangor. 23 February 1984.  
University College Trio (UCNW, Bangor) – Jana Frenklova, piano, Edward Davies, violin, Prudence Ashbee, cello.  

Subsequently performed by the same artists:  
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 31 January 1985.  
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 11 December 1986.  

Other performances:  
St Illtyd’s Church, Llantwit Major, Vale of Glamorgan Festival. 26 August 1992.  

Elizabeth Layton, violin. Lionel Handy, cello. Vanessa Latarche, piano.  

Broadcast: BBC Wales, 3 February 1985.  
A recording of the second performance.  

J 66 **Chaconne**, flute, clarinet, harp and string quartet  
Date: score dated July 1984  
Dedication: in homage to Sir Michael Tippett  
FP: unperformed  
Published: in Geraint Lewis (ed.): *Michael Tippett OM: A Celebration* (Tunbridge Wells, Kent: the Baton Press, 1985)  

J 67 **Fantasy**, piano  
i Flessibile e tranquillo, sempre espressivo  
ii Volatile, sempre ben in tempo e ritmico  
iii Calmo e tenero  

Date: score dated October 1984 – January 1985  
Dedication: iii: for Richard (3.2.84)  
FP: University College of North Wales, Bangor. 25 April 1985.  
Jana Frenklova, piano.  
Format: transparency copy  

J 68 **Fanfare**, three trumpets  
Date: 1985  
Dedication: not known
FP: Bangor Cathedral, Centenary Service of the University College of North Wales, Bangor. 3 May 1985.
Gwyn L Williams, Brian Jones, Julia Hall, trumpets.
Format: not known

J 69 *Hymnus Ante Somnum*, SATB choir and organ
Text: Prudentius (included in *Medieval Latin Lyrics*, London, 1929)
Date: 1985
Dedication: for Royston Havard and the Cardiff Motet Singers
The Choir of St John’s College, Cambridge, directed by George Guest. Unknown, organ.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:
St John’s College, Cambridge. 5 June 1987.

Other performances:
Chelmsford Cathedral. 3 July 1987.
Chelmsford Cathedral. 16 March 1988.
Choir of Chelmsford Cathedral directed by Graham Elliott.
Unknown, organ.

Metropolitan Cathedral of Christ the King, Liverpool. 15 September 1991.
Choir of the Metropolitan Cathedral of Christ the King, Liverpool directed by Philip Duffy. Terence Duffy, organ.

Bangor Cathedral. 30 October 1997.
University College Singers (Bangor) directed by Bryan White.
William Reynolds, organ.

St John’s Church, Chester. 1 July 2000.
Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Peter Kwater, organ.

St James’ Church, Gatley. 12 December 2000.
Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Peter Gunstone, organ.

Manchester Cathedral. 13 August 2002.
Bangor Cathedral. 15 February 2003.
Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Jonathan Scott, organ.

University of Wales, Bangor. 21 November 2002.
Monteverdi Singers directed by John Huw Davies. Martin Brown, organ.

A live broadcast of the second performance given by the Choir of St John’s College, Cambridge directed by George Guest.

A live broadcast of the second performance given by the Choir of Chelmsford Cathedral directed by Graham Elliott.


Published: Novello (© 1988)
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 70 *Quintet*, flute doubling piccolo, oboe, clarinet, bassoon and horn
Date: score dated July – October 1985
Dedication: none
FP: University of Wales, Aberystwyth. 9 March 1987.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:
University College of North Wales, Bangor, 22 October 1987.

A recording of the FP.
A copy of this recording is held at the BMIC (catalogue number 803)

Format: transparency copy
Notes: the première had been scheduled for performance by the Athena Ensemble on 20 February 1986 at University College of North Wales, Bangor, but this concert was cancelled.

J 71 *Sonante*, clarinet and piano
Date: score dated March – April 1986
Dedication: for Sarah (b. 28/11/85)
FP: St Michael and All Angels’ Church, Lower Machen, Lower Machen Festival. 17 July 1986.
Thea King, clarinet. Clifford Benson, piano.

Other performances: Library Theatre, Bradford. 21 September 1989.
Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester. 26 September 1989.
John Mellor, clarinet. David Jones, piano.

University College of North Wales, Bangor. 6 December 1990.
Dov Goldberg, clarinet. Harvey Davies, piano.

Liverpool Central Library. 5 October 1994.
Emmanuel Church, Didsbury. 8 October 1994.
Chester Town Hall. 11 October 1994.
Renold Lecture Theatre, UMIST. 19 October 1995.
Washington DC, USA. 4 April 1995.
Peryn Clement-Evans, clarinet. Harvey Davies, piano.
Thea King, clarinet. Clifford Benson, piano.
A copy of this recording is held at the BMIC (catalogue number 946)
Recorded: Karen Turner, clarinet, David Jones, piano, at ASC Studios, Macclesfield, on 13 July 2000, and released on ASC CS CD 43.
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 72 **Sequentia de Sancto Michaele**, SATB choir and organ
Text: Alcuin (included in *Medieval Latin Lyrics*, London, 1929)
Date: 1987
Dedication: for Royston Havard and the Cardiff Motet Singers
FP: St James’ Church, Gatley. 12 December 2000.
Altéri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Peter Gunstone, organ.
Published: Novello (© 1991)
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.
Notes: the work was performed twice during the concert.

J 73 **Scena**, violin and piano
Date: score dated January – March 1988
Dedication: none
FP: St Michael and All Angels’ Church, Lower Machen, Lower Machen Festival. 30 June 1988.

Other performances:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 27 April 1989.
British Music Information Centre. 18 September 1990.
Edward Davies, violin. Helen Davies, piano.

Recorded: Zheng Yu Wu, violin, David Jones, piano, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, 15 September 2007, and released on Metier msv 28514.
Format: transparency copy
A copy of the score is held at the BMIC (shelf mark J)
J 74 **Concerto**, piano and orchestra  
Orchestration: 2 – 2nd doubling picc, 22 – 2nd doubling b cl, 2 – 2nd doubling c bsn/2200/perc – vibraphone, glockenspiel, suspended cymbal (large), tam-tam/hp/str  
Date: score dated July 1988 – March ’89  
Dedication: none  
Jana Frenklova, piano. Opera 80 Orchestra conducted by Stephen Barlow.  
Martin Jones, piano. BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Nicholas Cleobury.  
A copy of this recording is held at the BMIC (catalogue number 1160)  
Format: transparency copy  
Notes: a BBC recording by Jana Frenklova, piano, with the BBC Welsh Symphony Orchestra conducted by Nicholas Cleobury, was left incomplete and therefore never broadcast.

J 75 **Silentia Noctis**, high voice and piano  
Text: Petronius, translated by Helen Waddell (Medieval Latin Lyrics, London, 1929)  
Date: score dated 6 September 1989  
Dedication: For Jane Webster  
FP: University College of North Wales, Bangor. 2 December 1989.  
Jane Webster, soprano. Nicholas Bosworth, piano.  
Subsequently performed by the same artists:  
Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester. 15 June 1990.  
St James’, Piccadilly. 3 August 1990.  
Other performances:  
University of Wales, Bangor. 3 May 1991.  
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 10 June 1992.  
Sharon Vaughan Williams, soprano. Annette Bryn Parri, piano.  
Merlin Theatre, Haverfordwest, Go West Festival. 27 September 1995.  
Carol Smith, soprano. Andrew Ball, piano.  
Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester. 26 May 2005.  
Caroline MacPhie, soprano. Angela Brzezinka, piano.  
A recording of the performance given by Carol Smith and Andrew Ball.  
Recorded: Caroline MacPhie, soprano, David Jones, piano, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, 15 July 2007, and released on Metier msv 28514.
J 76 Dreams, Dances and Lullabies, harp
Date: 1989
Dedication: the preface to the published score notes that ‘it is dedicated to Elinor Bennett’
Elinor Bennett, harp.

Subsequently performed by the same artist:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 3 November 1990.
Merlin Theatre, Haverfordwest, Go West Festival. 28 September 1995.

Recorded: Elinor Bennett, harp, at St Silas Church, London, and released in 1994 on Lorelt LNT 105.
A copy of this recording is held at the BMIC (catalogue number 493) and at the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

Published: Curiad – Telyn Fyw 2/Living Harp 2: Seven new compositions for harp by living composers ed. Elinor Bennett (© 1998)
Notes: the original title for this work was Lullabies, Dances and Dreams. It was reordered, not by the composer, but by John Metcalf, when he was preparing the text for the Lorelt CD release listed above. This form of the title was carried over into the Curiad publication of the work, but it has not been approved by the composer. The work’s completion date is, according to the CD notes, December 1989.

J 77 Threnody, piano
Date: score dated January/August 1990
Dedication: for Jana and Bruce, in memory of Thomas (see notes)
FP: St John’s, Smith Square, London. 24 September 1990.
Jana Frenklova, piano.

Subsequently performed by the same artist:
University College of North Wales, Bangor. 1 December 1990.

Other performances:
Chetham’s School of Music, Manchester, BBC/Manchester Composers Platform. 7 October 1995.
Peter Lawson, piano.

South Molton, Devon, Barkham Series of Concerts. 1 March 1996.
Merlin Theatre, Frome, Somerset. 12 April 1996.
University of Wales, Bangor. 4 April 2001.
Harvey Davies, piano.

Daiwa Foundation Japan House, London. 4 March 1996.
Juliana Hodkinson, piano.

Renold Lecture Theatre, UMIST. 15 March 1996.
Woodhouse Copse, Holmbury St Mary. 11 September 1999.  
David Jones, piano.

Broadcast: BBC Radio 3, 8 March 1996.  
An excerpt was broadcast on *Hear and Now*, probably from the  
performance given by Peter Lawson.

Recorded: Harvey Davies, piano, at the University of Wales,  
Bangor, on 29 September 1997, for use in the exhibition ‘Bedlam:  
Custody, Care and Cure, 1247 – 1997’, Museum of London, 7  

David Jones, piano, at ASC Studios, Macclesfield, on 13 July 2000,  
and released on ASC CS CD 43.

Format: transparency copy  
Notes: the dedication is in memory of the two-year-old son of Jana  
Frenklova and Bruce Wood. Given the very personal nature of this  
dedication, it is omitted from some copies of the score.

J 78 **Westminster Mass**, SATB choir  
Text: Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus and Benedictus, Agnus Dei (Mass)  
Date: score dated September 1990  
Dedication: This work was commissioned by the Dean and Chapter  
of Westminster Abbey at the instigation of Martin Neary, Organist  
and Master of the Choristers  
FP: Westminster Abbey. 2 December 1990.  
The Choir of Westminster Abbey directed by Martin Neary.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:  

Published: Roberton (© 1996)  
Copies of the score are held at the BMIC (shelf mark Nb) and in the  
Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 79 **O Mare**, orchestra  
Orchestration (details taken from final copy): 3 – 2\textsuperscript{nd} doubling picc,  
3\textsuperscript{rd} doubling alto fl, 333/4331/perc (2 players) – vibraphone,  
marimba, glockenspiel, crotales, tam-tam/hp/str  
Date: first draft of the score dated 15/11/91  
Dedication: none  
FP: unperformed  
Format: ms (see notes)  
Notes: the composition and most of the orchestration of this work  
was completed, but Lewis has to date only prepared part (bars 1 –  
113 of a 328 bar piece) of a final copy which incorporates revisions  
both of the notes and some orchestral details. Lewis noted in the  
draft score that a celesta would be used and that one clarinet  
would double bass clarinet. Further percussion instruments – and
possibly players – would be required, including 3 suspended
cymbals and tubular bells. However, these instruments have not
yet appeared in the final, but incomplete, copy.

J 80  **Lux Perpetua**, four solo voices (ATTB)
Text: Introit, Offertory, Agnus Dei, Communion, Responsory
(Requiem Mass)
Date: score dated March 1992
Dedication: for the Hilliard Ensemble
Hilliard Ensemble – David James, countertenor, Rogers Covey-
Crump, tenor, John Potter, tenor, Gordon Jones, bass.
Subsequently performed by the same artists:
Christ Church, Spitalfields, Spitalfields Festival. 16 June 1994.
Format: transparency copy

J 81  **Trilogy**, piano
   i  Lentissimo, intenso e molto espressivo (poco flessibile)
   ii  Vivo, animato, molto ritmico
   iii  Lentissimo, intenso e molto espressivo (poco flessibile)
Date: score dated 18th September – 27th November 1992
Dedication: none
FP: i only: Washington DC, USA. 16 April 1995.
Harvey Davies, piano.
Richard MacMahon, piano.
Recorded: David Jones, piano, at ASC Studios, Macclesfield, 12
July 2000, and released on ASC CS CD 43.
Format: transparency copy

J 82  **Litania**, mixed ensemble – 2 piccolos, percussion
(vibraphone, glockenspiel, tam-tam), harp and celesta
Date: score dated 5th January 1993
Dedication: none
FP: Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester. 5 April 2004.
Members of the Altèri New Music Ensemble – Fiona Slominska,
Benjamin Griffiths, piccolos, Mark Concar, percussion, Amy
Liptrott, harp, Ian Tate, celesta – directed by David Jones.
Recorded: Members of the Altèri New Music Ensemble directed by
David Jones, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester,
8 April 2004, and released on Campion Cameo 2038.
Format: photocopy

J 83a  **Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis**, SATB choir and organ
Date: score dated 9th January 1993
Dedication: none
FP: Bangor Cathedral. 16 May 1993.
Choir of Bangor Cathedral directed by Andrew Goodwin. Martin Brown, organ.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:

Other performances:
Bangor Cathedral. 29 March 2008.
St Mary’s Church Choir, Swansea, directed by William Reynolds. Huw Tregelles-Williams, organ.

Format: transparency copy
Notes: The first performance took place during the 1993 spring Regional Gathering of The Friends of Cathedral Music held in Bangor. For more information about this event, see the Introduction to the present thesis.

J 83b Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis, boys’ voices and organ
Date: score dated 14th January 1993
Dedication: For Andrew Goodwin and the choristers of Bangor Cathedral
FP: unperformed
Format: transparency copy
Notes: J 83b is an adaptation of the SATB choir and organ Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis, J 83a. Apart from the redistribution of the voice parts, there are two small changes in the Magnificat where overlapping vocal lines (bars 37 – 8 and 107 – 8) are separated out, resulting in the addition of two bars. Similarly, there is one additional bar in the Nunc Dimittis, as bars 58 – 59 of J 83a open out at bars 58 – 60 of J 83b.

J 84 Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis, SATB choir and organ
Date: score dated 23rd January 1993
Dedication: For Jonathan Rees-Williams and the Choir of St George’s Chapel, Windsor
FP: not known, possibly unperformed
Format: transparency copy

J 85 Antiphon, trumpet and organ, with boys’ voices, solo treble or solo tenor ad libitum
Text: Jubilemus Salvatori
Date: score dated 19th May 1994
Dedication: for Graham Sanders and Martin Brown
Graham Sanders, trumpet. Martin Brown, organ. The senior choristers of Bangor Cathedral directed by the composer.
Format: photocopy
Notes: *Antiphon*, like *Litania* (J 82), is based on the twelfth century plainchant melody of Adam de St. Victor, *Jubilemus Salvatori*. In the absence of vocal intonations, the organ should provide them, although there is no direction in the score to that effect.

J 86 **Cantus**, clarinet and piano
   i  Intenso ed espressivo
   ii  Intenso – a tempo meno mosso
Date: score dated 3rd December 1995
Dedication: For Peryn and Harvey
FP: The Bulkeley Arms Hotel, Beaumaris, Anglesey, Beaumaris Festival. 19 May 1996.
Peryn Clement-Evans, clarinet. Harvey Davies, piano.

Other performances:
Chester Town Hall. 31 October 2001.

Recorded: Karen Turner, clarinet, David Jones, piano, at ASC Studios, Macclesfield, 12 July 2000, and released on ASC CS CD43.

Format: photocopy
A copy of the score is held in the Welsh Music Information Centre, Cardiff.

J 87 **Night Fantasy**, piano, four hands
Date: score dated 12th March 1996
Dedication: for Helen and Harvey
FP: Y Tabernacl, Machynllech, Machynllech Festival. 20 August 1996.
The Davies Duo – Helen and Harvey Davies, piano, four hands.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:
University of Wales, Bangor. 26 September 1996.
St Albans Arts Centre. 16 May 1998.
Good Shepherd Chapel, Waterford Institute of Technology, Waterford New Music Week. 1 February 2001.
Sligo Festival. 28 March 2004.
University of Wales, Bangor, Jeffrey Lewis 65th Birthday Concert. 3 November 2007.

Broadcast: RTE Radio, date unknown.
A recording of the performance given on 1 February 2001.

Excerpt recorded by The Davies Duo, Barcud, Caernarfon, 3 February 1998, for inclusion in *Y Cyfansoddwyr*, an S4C television documentary, broadcast April – May 1998.

Recorded: The Davies Duo at Ty Cerdd, Millennium Centre, Cardiff, 17 and 18 September 2007, and released on Campion Cameo 2073.
J 88 Calmo, piano
Date: score dated 16/8/96
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: withdrawn by the composer.

J 89a Musica Aeterna, piano
Date: score dated 7/1/97
Dedication: none
FP: Manchester Cathedral. 18 February 2006.
David Jones, piano.
Recorded: David Jones, piano, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, 9 April 2004, and released on Campion Cameo 2038.
David Jones, piano. A recording of the FP, due to be issued in a limited pressing on Credwn (2 CD set).
Format: ms

J 89b Molto Tranquillo, piano
Date: score dated 7/1/97
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: Molto Tranquillo is a shortened version of Musica Aeterna (J 89a), omitting bars 108 – 178 of the original 183 bar composition.

J 90 Piano Duet (No 2), piano, four hands
Date: score dated 14/5/97
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: provisional title.

J 91 Teneritas, flute and piano
Date: score dated 10th August 1997
Dedication: For Jonathan Rimmer and Harvey Davies
FP: University of Wales, Bangor. 26 February 1998.
Jonathan Rimmer, flute. Harvey Davies, piano.
Subsequently performed by the same artists:
Dates and venues unknown.
Other performances:
Crush Room of the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden. 31 March 2003.
Timothy Kipling, flute. Mark Packwood, piano.
Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester. 31 July 2005.
Jonathan Booty, flute. Ian Tate, piano.

Recorded: Aoife ni Raghaill, flute, David Jones, piano, at ASC Studios, Macclesfield, 18 July 2000, and released on ASC CS CD 43.

Format: photocopy

**J 92 Recordatio**, SATB choir

Texts: from *Medieval Latin Lyrics* (London, 1929)²

Date: 1999

Dedication: For Matthew Greenall and the Elysian Singers, and the 1999 York Late Music Festival

FP: York Minster, York Late Music Festival. 23 October 1999.

Elysian Singers directed by Matthew Greenall.

Other performances:
 Manchester Cathedral. 13 August 2002.
 St Asaph Cathedral. 10 November 2002.
 Bangor Cathedral. 15 February 2003.
 Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones.

Recorded: Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. A recording of the performance given on 15 February 2003, issued in a limited pressing on Credwn CR0100 (2 CD set).

Format: photocopy

---

² The preface to the score contains the text and translations together with the following words of introduction: ‘The Latin text comprises fragments taken from Helen Waddell’s “Medieval Latin Lyrics”, and the collection of single words, phrases and verses is structured to form an integrated text on the subject of remembrance.’ This preface is perhaps a little misleading, since not all the text can be found in Waddell’s volume: even the word *recordatio* itself is conspicuous by its absence. The Latin text follows with a list of its sources in *Medieval Latin Lyrics* (page numbers refer to the Penguin edition, 1952):

* Aeterna – p 44, Paulinus of Nola: *Ad Ausonium*; p 126, Walafrid Strabo: *Commendatio Opusculi de Cultura Hortorum*

* In aeternum – p 106, Fredugis: *Cella Alcuini*; p 212, Ms. Of Benedictbeuern

* Tempora lapsa volant, fugitivis fallimur horis…sic quoque dissimiles ad finem tendimus omnes./nemo pedem retrahit quo sibi limes erit… – p 76, Venantius Fortunatus: *Ad Iovinum inlustrem ac patricium et rectorem provinciae.*

* Vere mundus celebrat diem sui natalis – p 230, Ms. Of Benedictbeuern.

* Memoria – p 114, Angilbert: *Versus de Bella quae fuit acta Fontaneto*

* Perenne vivax et memor – p 46, Paulinus of Nola: *Ad Ausonium*

* Beatae memoriae; In pace – p 104, Alcuin: *Epitaphium*

* In memoria aeterna erit justus; ab auditione mala non timebit. This line does not appear in *Medieval Latin Lyrics*, but is taken from the Gradual of the Requiem Mass, preceded by the words *Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine*. The same text (uniquely, uncredited) is used at the opening of *Pro Pace*. The following words and phrases are also not to be found in *Medieval Latin Lyrics*: *In perpetuum; Aeternitas; Quietus; Tranquillitas*. Comparison between Lewis’s method of assembling a text here and in *Sacred Chant X* (J 97b) reveals similar structural principles at work, particularly in the mantra-like repetitions of the final pages of each work.
J 93 *Bellissima*, flute, oboe, clarinet and piano  
Date: score dated 9th March 2000  
Dedication: For Gwyl Gerdd Newydd Bangor, Ensemble Cymru, and Richard and Sarah  
FP: University of Wales, Bangor, Bangor New Music Festival. 14 April 2000.  
Members of Ensemble Cymru – Jonathan Rimmer, flute, Huw Clement-Evans, oboe, Peryn Clement-Evans, clarinet, Harvey Davies, piano.  
Subsequently performed by the same artists:  
Cilcain Chapel, Cilcain. 14 October 2000  
Other venues and dates unknown.  
Other performances:  
Birmingham Conservatoire. 4 May 2006.  
Format: photocopy  
Notes: *Bellissima* is based on the dance anthem of the same name, first released by DJ Quicksilver (the pseudonym of Orhan Terzi and Tommaso de Donatis) in November 1996. Although no such instruction appears in the score, a short excerpt from this recording should be played immediately before a performance of *Bellissima*, which should then follow without a break.

J 94 *Scarborough Fair*, electric guitar and piano  
Date: 2000  
Dedication: For Richard  
FP: see notes  
Format: photocopy  
Notes: this arrangement of the folk song was, together with *Fantasy* (J 95), written for the GCSE Music practical examination of Lewis’s son, Richard, taken on 7 March 2000 at Friar's School, Bangor; Lewis accompanied his son’s performance.

J 95 *Fantasy*, electric guitar  
Date: 2000  
Dedication: For Richard  
FP: see notes for J 94.  
Format: photocopy

J 96 *Dead Leaves*, treble recorder and piano  
Date: score dated June 2000  
Dedication: For John Turner and Keith Swallow, and to the memory of Debussy’s daughter, Chouchou  
FP: Y Tabernacl, Machynllech, Machynllech Festival. 26 August 2000.  
Other performances:
West Road Concert Hall, University of Cambridge. 10 June 2003.
Tristan Rhys Williams, treble recorder. Unknown, piano.

Format: photocopy

J 97a Four Sacred Chants, SAT choir and organ
  Chant I:  In Aeternum, SA choir and organ
  Chant II: Lux Perpetua, SA choir and organ
  Chant III: Lucis Aeternae, SAT choir
  Chant IV: Requiescant in Pace, Sopranos and organ
Texts: Chant I: Communion (Requiem Mass)
  Chant II: Introit and Agnus Dei (Requiem Mass)
  Chant III: Tract (Requiem Mass)
  Chant IV: Catholic Prayer
Date: score dated January 2003
Dedication: To David Jones and the Alteri Chamber Choir (see notes)
FP: Bangor Cathedral. 15 February 2003.
Members of the Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones.
Jonathan Scott, organ.
Recorded: Members of the Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Jonathan Scott, organ. A recording of the FP, issued in a limited pressing on Credwn CR0100 (2 CD set).
Format: photocopy
Notes: the concert in which the Four Sacred Chants were first performed was entirely devoted to Lewis’s music, and entitled Of Time and Stillness. The same programme, minus the Chants and on that occasion entitled Sometime Voices, had been given by the same performers in Manchester Cathedral on 13 August 2002, in conjunction with an exhibition by Anglesey-based artists Mick Brown and Jeni Farrell-Booth. Each Chant was written to precede the performance of one of the works already heard the previous August: Chant I preceded Hymnus Ante Somnum (J 69), Chant II, Carmen Paschale (J 61), Chant III, Esultante (J 54) and Chant IV, Recordatio (J 92). The concert concluded with second performances of Chant I and Hymnus Ante Somnum, the interval coming after the performance of Esultante. The texts of Hymnus Ante Somnum, Carmen Paschale and Recordatio were read, in Latin and English, by Meera Bell-Thomson before the respective performances of each work. The dedication was amended for the concert programme to read “To David Jones and the Alteri Chamber Choir, with gratitude”.

J 97b Sacred Chants, SATB choir and organ
  Chant I:  In Aeternum, SA choir and organ
  Chant II: Lux Perpetua, SA choir and organ
  Chant III: Lucis Aeternae, SA choir
  Chant IV: Requiescant in Pace, Sopranos and organ
  Chant V: Aeternitatis, SA choir and organ
Chant VI: *Laudate*, organ
Chant VII: *Aeterna Christi Munera*, SATB choir
Chant VIII: *Passacaglia in Memoriam Luciano Berio*, SAT choir and organ
Chant IX: *Ave Maria*, AT choir
Chant X: *Requiem Sempiternam*, SATB choir and organ
Chant XI: *Sabbato ad Vesperas*, SATB choir and organ

Texts:
Chant I: Communion (Requiem Mass)
Chant II: Introit and Agnus Dei (Requiem Mass)
Chant III: Tract (Requiem Mass)
Chant IV: Catholic Prayer
Chant V: a setting of the words ‘In perpetuum, in aeternum, aeternitatis, perpetua, aeternitas, aeterna’
Chant VII: St Ambrose
Chant VIII: vowel sounds of the name ‘Luciano Berio’
Chant IX: Catholic Prayer
Chant X: a setting of the words ‘Requiem sempiternam, requiem semper, requiescat, pace, requiescant in pace, requietis, quietus, requies, da pacem domine, tranquillitatis, cum bona pace, tranquillus, quietum’
Chant XI: Peter Abelard (included in *Medieval Latin Lyrics*, London, 1929)

Date: 2003 – 5
Chants I, II and IV: see J 97a above
Chant III: score dated January 2005 (see notes)
Chant V: 2003, revised 2005
Chant VI: score dated 18/5/03
Chant VII: 2003
Chant VIII: score dated June 2003
Chant IX: 2003
Chant X: score dated September 2005
Chant XI: score dated 30/10/05

Dedication: Chants I, II and IV: see J 97a above
Chant III: For Gwennant Pyrs and Côr Seiriol
Chants V – XI: none

FP: Chants I, II and IV: see J 97a above.
Chant III: Liverpool Anglican Cathedral, service to celebrate the centenary of Rotary International. 27 February 2005.
Côr Seiriol directed by Gwennant Pyrs Roberts.

Subsequently performed by the same artists:

Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones.
First performance of the complete sequence of eleven Chants: Manchester Cathedral. 18 February 2006. Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Jeffrey Makinson, organ.

Other performances:
Chant III: Imperial War Museum North, Salford. 29 January 2006. Members of the Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones.

Chants III, VII and IX: St Margaret’s Church, Dunham Massey. 16 September 2006. St James’ Church, Gatley. 11 December 2006. Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones.

Broadcast: excerpt from Chant III recorded by Côr Seiriol directed by Gwennant Pyrs Roberts at Bodelwyddan Castle, 16 April 2005, for inclusion in Dechrau Canu Dechrau Canmol, S4C, 30 October 2005.

Recorded: Altèri Chamber Choir directed by David Jones. Jeffrey Makinson, organ. A recording of the FP of the complete sequence, due to be issued in a limited pressing on Credwn (2 CD set).

Format: photocopy
Notes: Chants I, II and IV are identical to those included in J 97a; Chant III is a revised and extended – to almost three times its original length – version of the setting of the same text found in J 97a, prepared for the female voice choir, Côr Seiriol. Between February and July 2003, Lewis continued to add to the original series of Four Sacred Chants, composing six more. At this point, the manuscripts, sketches and numerous notes about the texts were put away in a folder until, about eighteen months later, the possibility of performing the entire sequence was explored. The process of preparing the manuscripts for the first performance ranged from, at its simplest, checking and tidying the scores (Chants VI, VIII and IX), via a more comprehensive revision (Chants V and VII – the latter was musically almost complete, but textless) to the rejection of an existing Chant and the composition of two more in its place (Chants X and XI). The rejected Chant was a setting for SATB choir and organ entitled Ascendit (see J 97c) and was originally placed after the present Chant VIII. It is possible to perform any of the Chants singly or in any combination; Chant VI is preceded by an alto intonation which may be omitted; the organ intonation before Chant IX may also be omitted if an organ is not available.

J 97c Sacred Chant: Ascendit, SATB choir and organ
Text: no text is included in the ms
Date: score dated 25th July 2003
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: withdrawn by the composer (see J 97b).

J 98 Risoluto, treble recorder, oboe, bassoon and piano
Date: score dated 2/3/04
Dedication: For John Turner, Richard Simpson, Graham Salvage and Janet Simpson
FP: unperformed
Recorded: John Turner, treble recorder, Richard Simpson, oboe, Graham Salvage, bassoon, Janet Simpson, piano, at Chetham’s School of Music, Manchester, 12 April 2004, and released on Campion Cameo 2038.
Format: photocopy

J 99 Sereno, piano
Date: score dated 17th May 2004
Dedication: For David Jones with gratitude
FP: University of Wales, Bangor, Jeffrey Lewis 65th Birthday Concert. 3 November 2007.
David Jones, piano.
Recorded: David Jones, piano, at the Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, 15 July 2007, and released on Metier msv 28514.
Format: photocopy

J 100 Beyond the Heavens, soprano, viola and piano
Text: from The Upanishads
Date: score dated September 2007
Dedication: For David Jones
FP: University of Wales, Bangor, Jeffrey Lewis 65th Birthday Concert. 3 November 2007.
Format: photocopy

J 101 Untitled (d), piano
Date: score dated 25/11/08
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: provisional title.

J 102 Untitled (e), piano
Date: unfinished (started 14/3/09)
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: to date, this consists of 389 bars on twenty-one sides of manuscript. The title is provisional.
J 103 *Pulsing*, piano
Date: unfinished (started 20/3/10)
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: to date, this consists of 67 bars on three sides of manuscript.

J 104 *Memoria Echoes*, piano
Date: score dated 5\textsuperscript{th} June 2010
Dedication: none
FP: Emmanuel Church, Didsbury. 20 November 2010.
David Jones, piano.
Format: ms

J 105 *Fons Amoris*, SATB choir
Text: *Stabat mater speciosa*
Date: unfinished (started 27/4/10)
Dedication: none
FP: unperformed
Format: ms
Notes: to date, this consists of 36 bars amongst sketches on four sides of manuscript.
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