

## Jessie's Well – Journal No. 6

Day 5 of scoring – April 9 <sup>th</sup> 2005	First entry – 6.17 pm	It's Saturday evening and I have just taken the kids to youth group
--	-----------------------	--

### Location and context:

I would have done some work on this today but this room has been very busy with home work and such and this morning was a workshop on how to be a good listener in counselling (I called it the "Sit down, Shut up and Listen" workshop) and this afternoon did have the pull of the Saturday paper.

My aim is to have this done for Monday and that means I might not get the whole score finished to a fine standard of proofing but it will be sufficient to give illustration to what I am discussing here.

That said, I will continue where I left off yesterday afternoon – scoring the section from 76. I have presented my thoughts on the orchestration of the changed tutti and also on the implications of counter melody and chromaticism and the thickening of the texture.

It would be informative to view the score pages 19 – 21 to see how that extension orchestration process proceeds and compare it with 60 and 68. the use of *col* is prolific again!

6.24

Day 5 of scoring – April 9 <sup>th</sup> 2005	2 <sup>nd</sup> entry – 6.30 pm	Just getting into this
--	---------------------------------	------------------------

So what has come up so quickly? The bass voice is quite changed from the first harmonisation and that has an impact on the voice leading especially for the lower woodwinds so I will manipulate some register crossing for them. I also had not finalised the counter melody as can be seen in the sketch at bar 81 (ex. ?)



I have since done so and the complete counter melody can be seen in the score. This could all be done more quickly if I could manipulate these computer programs more efficiently!

6.38

<b>Day 5 of scoring – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2005</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> entry – 6.42 pm</b>	<b>Writing</b>
---	---------------------------------------	----------------

If one takes a look at the sketch at 76, as above in (ex. ?) then one can see that the voice leading would be belted by examiners!!! So what is the 'logic' behind the false relations and the unresolved dissonance and unprepared dissonance etc?

It's really hard to explain what I have done here because I just know it works. I am aware that the sound of the F and E flat in alto and bass in 77 can sound awkward and unsettled and that is what I want. It's the breaking of rules to make a statement if one can say that. I know that the movement between the alto and the bass in that bar and into the next is a "big red cross" for me but such ambiguity build tension in a constructed and controlled manner and therefore when the release comes (as it does at 93 to an extent and then the end) then the meaning of the tension building is understood musicology sense and is satisfying for the listener and player. This section abounds with these devices.

I would have finished this score two days ago if all I had to do was write music!

6.52

<b>Day 5 of scoring – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2005</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> entry – 7.01 pm</b>	<b>Writing</b>
---	---------------------------------------	----------------

I have been working at page 21 of the score and I have adapted parts as I go to suit the ranges of the instruments. This may seem like a very simple matter to bring up but when registers are changed in an instrumental part then it should be done where there is a leap in the voice leading (like the bass here – baritone sax et al at bar 81) or it is a natural place to be able to leap (like in a dominant 7<sup>th</sup> type situation as in the oboe and 1<sup>st</sup> clarinet in bar 83). That is more like an examination rule BUT why it is important is because the dislocation that is happening here comes from the tonal ambiguity. To dislocate other things would be to make the sound more fraught than it needs be.

Also added a rallentando in bar 83

7.07

<b>Day 5 of scoring – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2005</b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup> entry – 7.12 pm</b>	<b>Thinking about percussion</b>
---	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

The mind moves around so much. I am leaping around the sketch watching where I am going following lines to points of repose and tension and beginning to think about percussion. At present there are no percussion parts but today in all the wondering about kids and youth group and chocolate cake with coffee my mind has been dwelling on the percussion issue!

I am sure there will be no snare drum but there will be a bass drum, a large gentle bass drum with depth and resonance. I am sure there will be no tinkling new age stuff but there may be the occasional triangle with small beater and maybe even a gentle cymbal roll or soft scraping of the ridges across the instrument. There will be something now and not a blank score for them. But it will be subdued and concise.

7.16

<b>Day 5 of scoring – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2005</b>	<b>6<sup>th</sup> entry – 7.18 pm</b>	<b>The leapig abut from above</b>
---	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

I have talked of the bass voices changing registers and that came because I moved the baritone sax to accommodate range problems for those who move with it. BUT I followed the bass line and I had already noted on the sketch when I should move and it was a bar before. The move here is different in that it is not a leap or a 7<sup>th</sup> type movement but an octave displacement and the rationale remains constant as for the other register leaps.

Interestingly, what I have done is not in the original sketch as can be seen above (and compared with the score parts for baritone sax et al) but is an addition that has been added as I have transited through numerous times considering the progress and process of the orchestration. I can't remember when but it is one of very few changes to notes.

It should be said I have added some dynamic variation since completing the sketch and some of that is not in the original sketch reproduced here but is evident in the score.

7.23

<b>Day 5 of scoring – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2005</b>	<b>7<sup>th</sup> entry – 7.25 pm</b>	<b>Percussion arrives!</b>
---	---------------------------------------	----------------------------

The first percussion note is placed as a bass drum at 84, l.v.

It is opportune to note here what is going to happen with the scoring, as the tonality becomes more multi tonal. The "rules" noted previously will not apply across the board because to extended the tonal centres that locate various parts of the orchestral timbre will adversely impact on the effect of largeness and depth.

Some examples being:

- Not having a melody 8vb ensure that the tonality is not compromise downwards. For example, at 87 – 90 there would be a great ambiguity between the bass and baritone voices (centred in G flat etc) if the melody (centred in F natural minor and related keys) crossed over those lines.
- Not taking the bass staff parts up an octave as noted in a normal situation will work in the revers of what has just been described. Here we will not have the tonality of the bass staff infecting the treble lines. A perusal of the sketch will illustrate matters here.
- It is reasonable to take the voice up as previously described at 84 and when the tonality broadens to make the three treble parts that become available at 88 the source of the fullness in the score.

7.33

<b>Day 5 of scoring – April 9<sup>th</sup> 2005</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> entry – 7.39 pm</b>	<b>That dissonance and orchestration concerns</b>
---	---------------------------------------	---

If I take the tenor up an octave I will cause some major tonal concerns that the octave distance mitigates to some extent. If it stays where it is it produces the beginnings of the ambiguity to come.

Is there narrative here? Yes, that which is discussed the other day.

Day 5 ends - time to go and get the kids!! 7.43