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Introduction

Alfia Nakipbekova

Iannis Xenakis (1922-2001) is universally recognised as one of the most significant and influential musicians of the twentieth century. His artistic output and its enormous impact on musical philosophy, compositional methods, sound and instrumental techniques has drawn considerable attention from numerous researchers and an array of committed performers, whose work interweaves and cross-pollinates within the multiple spectra of the richly patterned fabric of Xenakis’s universe.

Xenakian studies have been developing since the mid-1960s consisting of multi-faceted contributions and approaches expounded in monographs, journal articles and PhD dissertations; this field is continuing to expand with new theoretical insights and practical experiences from a diverse community of international musicologists, mathematicians, philosophers and performers. Integral to this growth, the gatherings of dedicated researchers at conferences and symposia devoted to Xenakis’s legacy play an important role as the dynamic junctures within this momentum. Such opportunities to

---

1 As noted by the editor Makis Solomos in the Introduction to Présences de/Iannis Xenakis, 2001, 3. Paris: Centre de documentation de la musique contemporaine. For the complete annotated bibliographies compiled and commented by Makis Solomos, see the appendix of Présences de/Iannis Xenakis, and ‘The Friends of Iannis Xenakis Association’, online http://www.iannis-xenakis.org/xen/read/biblio.html

discuss and evaluate the latest findings and projects-in-progress render long-term ramifications.

One of the most significant publications reflecting this important part in Xenakian studies is the book *Présences de/Presences of Iannis Xenakis* (2001) comprised of the proceedings of the first ever symposium devoted solely to Xenakis, ‘Presences of Iannis Xenakis’. The research papers from the two consequential events that followed – ‘Symposium Iannis Xenakis’, Athens, May 2005 and ‘Xenakis International Symposium’, London, April, 2011 – are also available. The range of the topics and approaches in these publications is astonishingly broad and vibrant: from theoretical analyses to increasingly diverging philosophical, aesthetical and interdisciplinary paths towards the heart of Xenakis’s creative source. Makis Solomos’ words, written almost two decades ago, are still relevant today:

“The time has come to rectify (while not necessarily erasing) the image that continues to dominate: the image of a composer-“mathematician”. Xenakis has defined himself only as a “user of mathematics” [...] His music itself is far from generalizing any formalization.” (*Présences de/Presences of Iannis Xenakis*, 2001, 4)

Continuing the tradition of sharing manifold theoretical and practical perspectives and paths in Xenakian studies, this book consists of selected papers presented at the Symposium ‘Exploring Xenakis: Performance, Practice, Philosophy’ (Leeds, 2017). The one-day Symposium brought together scholars from the UK, France, Japan, Australia, Belgium, Portugal, the Netherlands and Brazil. Compared to the Symposium proceedings mentioned above, the scope of this book is circumscribed by the scale of the event; the resulting articles, however, reflect a variety of research questions encompassing Xenakis’s compositional methods, reflections on performance, and the composer’s ideological position with regard to the avant-garde. The

---

3 The Symposium took place on 29-30 January 1998 at the Centre de Documentation de la Musique Contemporaine (CDMC) and Radio France, Paris.
5 The Symposium took place on 12 September 2017 at the School of Music, University of Leeds, supported by the RAM (the Royal Musical Association). The keynote lectures were given by Dr. Makis Solomos and Dr. Benoît Gibson.

In Part I, Xenakis’s relationship with the avant-garde is explored – Alannah Marie Halay and Michael D. Atkinson investigate the significance of Xenakis’s creative force in the rumbustious atmosphere of Paris in May 1968, elucidating ‘how Xenakis and those like him became central to the revolutionary consciousness of the day, and what it is about Xenakis’s practice that paradoxically disavows such possibilities.’ (See chapter one, p. 3).

In Atkinson’s words, ‘Xenakis’s work is placed in the context of its reception and ‘canonicity’ today, and questions whether such instantiation and acceptance manages to undermine that which was once so ‘active.’’

In Part II, various aspects of Xenakis’s compositional style and technique are discussed – some of the mathematical procedures employed in his works and the resulting sonorities and textures, as well as the processes involved in the composer’s search for authentic expression. Part II opens with the chapter that focuses on Xenakis’s middle-period style (1961-1973) from the perspective of Xenakis’s compositional development. Dimitris Exarchos examines sketches and hand-written calculations made in the early 1960s in Berlin, when the composer was searching and refining his philosophical concepts and compositional techniques; this significant juncture is denoted by the composer’s discovery of the outside-time structures that enabled him to develop a generalised metatheory of composition. The focus of this chapter is the genesis of these ideas on the mathematical level and their musical applications in the following decades (although the author also re-interprets Xenakis’s earlier work accordingly). Taking as the case study the only work composed by Xenakis for organ, *Gmeeoorh* (1974), Marina Sudo scrutinises the factors that determine the degree and quality of densities and complexities of sound masses created by using ‘a variety of timbres in combination with textural writing based on linear arborescences’. (See chapter three, p. 39). As defined by Sudo, the paper ‘aims to describe the structure of the different levels of sound mass, focusing on the following questions: which factors determine the quality of each sonic event, how do they interact, and how are the different types of cluster stratified? In addition to the analysis of the published score, an aural analysis of recordings of *Gmeeoorh*, informed by the spectromorphological approach originally derived from Schaeffer’s concept of ‘l’écoute réduite [reductive listening]”, is presented.’ In chapter four ‘On *Herma*’, Benoît Gibson offers new insights into the structure and sound of this early work for piano and relationship between *Herma* and one of the earlier pieces *Achorripsis* (1957). A wide range of
questions is examined – from compositional concerns, such as classes of pitches, structure, graphic representation and stochastic distribution, to the problematic of editions and recording. Gibson includes a detailed overview of the commercially issued recordings of *Herma*, comparing and discussing the issues of the interpretative approaches in some of the recordings. The notion of *precision* in realisation of *Herma* is relevant to other instrumentalists, as each interpreter must confront the task of achieving a distinctive balance of the elements (pitches, densities, dynamics, etc.) within the complexity of a particular Xenakis’s composition.

The subject of performing Xenakis’s music is richly illuminated in *Performing Xenakis* (2010), an important publication that draws together the experiences and reflections on interpretation and techniques directly from distinguished performers. In Part III of this book, the authors approach the performatve aspect in Xenakis’s music from three singular perspectives: as a ‘secret’ element in some of Xenakis’s electroacoustic compositions; the interdisciplinary exploration of the sonority, structure and cinematic allusions (with reference to the Russian cinematographer Andrei Tarkovsky’s film *Stalker*, 1979) evoked through the process of internalising *Nomos alpha*; and the exploration of the possible interpretative and technical solutions involved in performing and recording of the piece – one of the most complex and rewarding compositions for solo cello – demonstrated through analysing and comparing the selected recordings. In chapter five, Reinhold Friedl examines the rarely mentioned hidden performatve aspects of Xenakis’s electroacoustic music: not the performance of his electroacoustic music but the performances for his electroacoustic music. His detailed exposition of the recorded material and its background re-emphasises the uniqueness of Xenakian textures. By examining the recordings of *La Légende d’Eer* (1978) and *Bohor* (1962), Friedl argues the possibility of the unnamed performers being involved in creating the body of intermeshed electronic and live sound. *Nomos alpha* is the focus of the following two chapters. Chapter six conveys cellist Alfia Nakipbekova’s personal experience of mastering *Nomos alpha*. (To listen to the recording of *Nomos alpha* by Alfia Nakipbekova see link https://soundcloud.com/alfianakipbekova/iannis-xenakis-nomos-alpha). Although the work has been thoroughly analysed in terms of Xenakis’s use of mathematical procedures in organising the compositional material, a close exploration of the work’s interdisciplinary and philosophical aspects from the performer’s subjective viewpoint (termed as the Associative Method), has not been previously undertaken. As outlined in the
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chapter, the arduous process of striving to unravel the essence of Xenakian expression while engaging with the challenges of the new physicality, engenders the moments of insights, a recurring state of clarity in which the composition is perceived as a ‘window’, the opening toward the expanses of the totality of Xenakian musical megacosm. At these moments, Nomos alpha is transformed from the singularity of a ‘difficult’ piece for cello into a catalyst for reaching new knowledge in the realm of expression and philosophy of performance. In chapter seven, Makis Solomos considers the subject of performance in recorded versions of Nomos alpha ‘which has still been little investigated’, (See chapter seven, p. 110) tracing the development of the work’s performance tradition over three generations of cellists: from Siegfried Palm (who premiered the piece), Pierre Penassou and Rohan de Saram, to the ‘second generation’ – Pierre Strauch, Christophe Roy and Arne Deforce; among the ‘third generation’ of Nomos alpha cellists he includes Martina Schucan, Moritz Müllenbach and Alfia Nakipbekova. Solomos’ close perusal of the recordings of Nomos alpha by Roy and Deforce reveals the potentialities in developing the interpretative space through comparing the two versions from ‘specifically Xenakian aspects’, such as ‘sound, energy, gestuality’, identifying these two approaches to interpretation as chthonic and cosmic. The chapter includes excerpts from Solomos’ interviews with the two musicians – these lively discussions generate as many questions as they offer personal insights and practical experiences by the performers.

This chapter, dedicated to the evaluation of conceptual and expressive depths confronting the interpreters of Xenakis’s music, concludes the book as an invitation to further research in the developing performance practice area within the fertile terrain of Xenakis’s music – the source of bountiful vitality and potential for limitless proliferation across disciplines, cultures and paths to knowledge.
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