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ABSTRACT

Creative symbiosis is embodied in the artistic relationship between composers and performers regardless of the degree of collaboration. Since obligate symbiosis may refer to the whole community of composers and performers contributing to the existence of a musical composition fulfilling its life-cycle from the conception through to the performance, facultative symbiosis may exemplify those artists who willingly choose to connect and engage in a collaborative process. This research unfolds an informative examination of such facultative relationships where collaboration has been used as a persuasive tool for creativity. To unveil and understand the experience of usually hidden artistic processes (both creative and re-creative), an intervention of conceptual and cognitive tools has been applied. Effectively, each collaboration concludes in producing a physical evidence of a score and a recording; however, these elements only derive the outcome and do not determine the processes. The elaboration in a form of exegesis (Volume 2) containing the author’s retrospective view, working schedules, communication extracts and subjective commentary assists in further understanding of such interactions. It has been shown that central elements for examination of symbiotic relationship such as work-in-progress, a composer’s intentions and a performer’s expectations can affect the process of crystallisation of scores and performances. Furthermore, the roles of composer and performer have been factored to identify the exclusive creative aspects which also highlighted the common features and the ability to transit both contexts by a single individual.

The methods employed in this research remain within those of qualitative inquiry including autoethnographical reflexive approach and action research. Those methods supported by partial analysis of scores and recordings, commentaries and interview transcripts assist in revealing of symbiotic circles, including the impact favourable environment and the importance of communication on multiple levels. A condensation of aspects, procedures and actions offers a systematic approach to self-observation which is transferable onto other collaborative cases.
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INTRODUCTION

This research came to realisation after years of professional engagement in artistic life as both performer-flautist and composer. I developed a significant attentiveness about my own awareness as composer and performer; however, I never attempted to scrutinise the symbiotic relationship within my collaborative actions. My intuition and knowledge based on historical evidence and own observations guided me through my practice but failed to deliver a fully understood definition of the relationship. Through the mapping of the creative symbiosis through selected projects I aimed to uncover its necessity and effectiveness. Figure 1 shows the activities that navigated symbiosis throughout this research: creative processes that encompassed technical characteristics of various working relationships (e.g. a performer did, did not or partially participate in a composer’s creative process) and influences that represented the impact of environmental, social and psychological aspects.

![Figure 1. Symbiotic connections in my practice as performer and composer.](image)

In relation to my own practice the chicken and egg question has emerged: Which one comes first: the composer or the performer?

In the world of ethology and interpersonal neurobiology Dissanayake (n.d.) refers to performers seeking attention from the audience (p. 149) being similar to the biological attraction among animals – crying for help to seek attention from the mother. Those noises can be enhanced by intensity, dynamics and exaggeration. Following this biological concept, I observe that the basis for each musicians’ development lies with the performance. Attempts of putting those noises together in a logical sequence might give a birth to the composition.

Similarly to a majority of composers I began my musical journey as performer and I continue dualistically with both a performing and composing career. Andrews (2004) points at the music education systems nurturing performative skills and reducing the focus on musical creativity due to limited understanding (p. 1). In my case the symbiosis between the compositional and performance aspects could be linked to the early stages of my musical educational development in Moniuszko Primary Music School in Katowice, Poland.
The environment structured by the school’s curriculum enabled me and the other students to exercise collective performance practices daily. Additionally, the emphasis was put on the students’ compositional skills by providing them with regular access to various instrumental and vocal ensembles. Composers were given the opportunity to participate as instrumentalists in performances of their own compositions. The early years of my musical education encouraged me to perceive a creative symbiotic element and fashioned my attitude towards the complexity of working relationships. My curiosity about a symbiosis between these two aspects of artistic minds has also spread to include the psychological issues of such relationships, for instance: types of personalities. Interestingly Kemp (1996) points out that the composer can be viewed as an *ubermusician* (p. 206) possibly due to the canonizing his/her persona since the 19th century. Through this research Kemp’s point has been investigated together with the problem of authority of composers. But what forms of creativity do performers contribute and at what point does the performer takes the responsibility for the shape of a musical work? The act of creation is also performed by interpreters by bringing compositions to a new life, the act of re-creation. Kemp (1996) claim, that creativity of composers stimulates the creativity of performers (p. 194). The issue of creativity of performers has been further discussed during collaborations and described in the chapters of this dissertation.

According to the scientific biological sources symbiosis calls for an interaction between living organisms where the mutual benefits are exchanged. The Greek word “symbiosis” means “living together” which should not have a literal translation into my understanding of a symbiotic relationship. Nonetheless, a beneficial creative symbiosis can be observed in composer-performer relationships when the creator produces and the performer executes. Both are bonded to achieve a successful outcome. Apart from having a common goal in expressing ideas embraced within a musical score, they are also responsible for their own artistic image – maintaining their own identity. That very image depends on a mutual understanding of each other’s needs. The audience’s involvement may be described as parasitic from the creative point of view; however, it does bring a completion to an out-coming product of the composer-performer relationship. Generally, the audience would not actively participate in creative and executive artistic processes. Therefore, the audience’s participation as part of a creative journey has been excluded from this research.

The main research question: *How can self-initiated collaboration influence a symbiosis and its creative outcome?* will require assembling various collaborative relationships for the investigation. The sub-question: *How does hierarchy affect collaborations?* will assist in obtaining further observations on symbiotic elements within working relationships and expand the process of analysis. The aim of this research is to explore multiple symbiotic relationships

---

1 [https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/symbiosis.](https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/symbiosis.)
and pathways in achieving the mutual goal – the score and the performance. I will further investigate traditional hierarchy of composer-performer interactions and I will question their effectiveness. The outcome of this research will deliver a translation of symbiosis between all participating groups. The bias concealed inside my practice as composer, performer and research is evident; however, the research will certainly contribute to the field regarding collaboration and, through its practical component, it will broaden the repertoire.

The phenomenological subject of this research absorbs an overall symbiotic habitat of composers and performers. Since every collaboration included in this project displayed different artistic qualities the examination of available literature has targeted the research fields relating to the specific elements. The methodology was devised specifically to suit the nature of the naturalistic dialog of the topic of creative symbiosis. There has been no intention to examine a definition of collaboration per se and its social implications in a wider sense of collaborative enquiry. Therefore a number of essential body of research, including works of Lev Vygotsky (1980) or findings of Karen Littleton and Dorothy Miell (2004), has been absorbed but omitted from the direct discussion here. Herein, for the reader the “collaboration” may reflect on a variety of meanings and types of working relationships. The literature review has been divided into the following sections: historical overview, artistic collaboration (including psychological and environmental factors), extra-abilities (overcoming disability) in musical composition and performance and the mapping. The exploration of resources has been angled towards performers seeking a contribution into creative process and expansion of repertoire and the composers reaching out for external sources of inspiration. This research contextualises a subjective approach to the matter of symbiotic relationship through the variety of collaborative forms.

Historical overview

Composer – he who composes music, or forms the rules of composition. Under the word composition, may be seen the detail of knowledge, necessary for the art of composing. This is not yet sufficient without a genius to put it into execution.

Jean Jacques Rousseau, 1779.

The phenomenon of a creative symbiotic relationship has been implicitly and explicitly included by both instrumentalists and composers in their scholastic materials concerning collaboration and its artistic outcomes. The issues found in asserted working relationships have been confronted with the external researcher output and emphasised another main question of this research: How does a symbiotic relationship work? In a majority of works in the collaborative field conducted by instrumentalists one could observe an emphasis on producing a creative outcome, rather than describing the process itself. Apart from minor or major consequential research results such projects resulted in enriching the repertoire of modern instrumentalists.
An outcome (regardless of its success or failure) has certainly been achieved by the symbiosis of two representations: composers and performers. Halay (2016) argues that “performance is a medium through which music is formed. It is a significant part of a work’s compositional process and, as such, forms a symbiotic relationship with the act of composing” (p. 1). To the contrary, Budai (2014) claims that throughout the centuries a partnership of equally important composers and performers transformed into “a submissive association that favours the composer” (p. 37). Such statements emerging from the highly intimate relationship have zoomed in collaborative projects of this research and enabled me to contextualise a discussion on their opposing cognancy. Despite the justified equality of composers and performers in a final stage of the extensive symbiotic mutualism: presentation (performers) of intentions (composers) to the listener (the audience) such equality during the creative period remains in question. The issue of implied equality (unrestricted contribution of participants) and its realisation in practice (collaboration) with assistance of available resources (further analysis) will be vital in the examination of symbiotic relationship in this research.

The history of music would not exist without establishing and nurturing symbiotic relationships between composers and performers. Those relationships, varying in nature, shapes and forms, have produced masterpieces that very often pushed boundaries of music and performance techniques. The examples could be found in a friendship between Claude Debussy and Arthur Hartmann or the unfulfilled love between Maurice Ravel and Hélène Jourdan-Morhange that resulted in violin sonatas (Chicheportiche, 2011, p.1). Similar examples have multiplied in the overview of centuries of music development. The most obvious reason for emphasising a symbiotic relationship may have been a collaborative work of performers who commissioned works from composers. Depending on the composer’s level of familiarity with a specific instrument the performer might have contributed into a creative process occasionally providing his/her box of tools. Examples of such contributions might appear in working relationships described in this research.

The creative symbiosis and its multipurpose could be found as early as in the Pre-Renaissance era that dissolved the authorship of composers leaving them in the shadow of anonymity, often due to the religious regulations but also their own preference. Due to concealment of the authorship (either full or partial) the evidence of early symbiotic relationship has challenged its clear identification. Rizzi and Griffith (2016) notice a collaborative movement in the Renaissance era which illuminated through works of composers writing musical treatises in collaboration with poets to supply introductory essays (p. 205). According to the authors such contributions and authorship, however, remains unknown. The Post-Renaissance musical style highlighted an important role of improvisation and synthetic nature of composers being performers of their own works. The development of notation and open-scoring left the gap in collaborative movement but kept the symbiosis since the contributing performers were partially
responsible for a final shape of musical works. According to Schulenberg (1984) only the realisation of the composers’ contrapuntal style had to be strictly respected (p. 139).

The Baroque era favoured the equality of performers and composers where most musicians were expected to act as both (de Haan, 1998, p. 6). Particularly the church organists were required to employ improvisational and compositional skills (Schulenberg, 1984, p. 132). A problem of such characteristic has also subjected the context of this research where a discussion about the role of symbiosis in my double role as composer-performer was presented. Such dual attitude might allow to dexterously transition from an original (written in the score) compositional thought (for example: a passage) into a brand new one created ad hoc during the performance.

Further explorations of music between the post-Baroque and the recent times reveal that the role of performers remain understood predominantly as executors and interpreters. Since the Classical era and beyond, the musical score has become an artefact and a representation of the composer’s intentions and instructions. The Romantic performer, due to increased virtuosity, detached further from the composer and therefore the symbiotic relationship underwent transformations (Feinberg, 2015). Paradoxically, the same factor (virtuosity) responsible for disconnection of both professions could also reconnect composers and performers in creative collaborations. Such symbiosis exploited the new virtuosity through new compositions and as suggested by Hunter (2005), reinforced the concept of self-transformation in the Romantic performance practice seen as a complete identification with the composer’s soul (p.370).

Even though still accommodating past habits of performance practice, current times have offered a vast array of collaborative possibilities and courses of action. The symbiotic element has been revived and enabled the formation of “joint enterprise in new music” (Foss 1963, p. 46). Roche (2011) points out that collaboration as creative action is currently in fashion and newly formed ensembles strive to work closely with composers and market not only themselves but also the composers (p. 22). Such a statement may certainly be the case in this research where working with established composers and performers may lead to increased exposure and even popularity of each other’s creative practice. The data, however, regarding the issue of marketing will not be subjected as a part of examination of the creative symbiosis in this research. Regardless of possible elevation of each other’s careers today collaborations become an attractive alternative to highly individualised world of the arts (Lind, 2009, p.53). One of the intentions of this research is to promote the attitude of collaborative spirit by offering a personal monologue through insights into my symbiotic process.
Rationale

This research stems from my curiosity to understand more deeply the bond between composing and performing music. My knowledge of this topic has been developed mostly through the practical experience and theoretical application. These two approaches combined did not result in definite and objective answers about how the relationship between the composer and the performer work. My desire was to investigate the symbiotic relations and their complexities through communication within my own practice. This project delivers a detailed life cycle of a symbiotic relationship based on collaboration. The nature of this research called for autoethnographical translations and involved collaborative parties.

The traditional understanding of the relationship between composers and performers follows logical steps from the composer writing a work and the performer interpreting the new work from the composer’s score. However, the role of the composer could be removed whenever an improvisatory performance element was introduced, thereby derailing the expected step-wise process. In my practice, I have tended to follow my intuition and knowledge (habits) while facing challenges presented by the arts of interpretation and composition. By placing my research in a practical context, I adopted a model of rationality proposed by Schön (1986) where the reflection-in-action enabled me to interactively frame problematic situations by approaching new works in new ways. The application of this model as well as an obvious subjectivity of this research’s nature may cause implications of bias and particularly Fischhoff’s (1975) a “hindsight bias” or “creeping determinism”. Based on a summary of my past collaborative experiences a possibility of predicting the outcome and navigating the environment may present the issue since it has already been implied in retrospective research methods (Fischhoff, 1975, p. 288). To prevent such biases I challenge to abandon any hypothetical approach and assumptions and allow the indeterminacy, occasional surprise and failure to steer the research process.

Nine case studies illustrate the symbiotic relationships involved: five composers, three performing groups and myself as composer and performer. The choice of participants was both planned (my pre-existing aspiration to work with a chosen artist) and spontaneous (decision made upon an influential impact that occurred in an artistically favourable environment). Planned collaborations required the establishment of a new suitable environment whereas spontaneous collaborations emerged from such favourable habitat. Three composers: Larry Sitsky, Aleksander Gabrys and Gary Schocker were selected from a range of possible participants during the preplanning stage of this project. The choice was based on various conditions such as: established career, compositional style, country of origin. Two remaining composers, Odeya Nini and Katherine Saxon were invited to participate after a successful artistic encounter during an Artist Residency in Banff, Canada. Only one performer, Dominik Polonski was chosen to participate during the research planning stage. Two other groups, David
Montgomery and Emma Sullivan and, Ysolt Clark, Alex Raineri and Graeme Jennings emerged during the work on this research at Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. More biographical information about participating artists can be found in Appendix C.

The remaining element of my investigation concerned my practice as composer performing my own composition. This common dual praxis, however, has never previously included a third-party involvement: the researcher. I expected such scrutiny to objectively expose a working relationship between two minds enclosed in one body and deliver outcomes for comparison with other symbiotic combinations.

The proposed layout of each of the nine sections incorporated a chronological design beginning with origins through collaborative flow and ending with conclusions about each collaboration. Such logical presentation enabled me to visualise the evolution of each symbiotic relationship including the communication patterns and overall length of individual working relationships. The order of sections (Figure 2) followed the reasoning emerged from the diagram (Figure 1) and allocated collaborations in the following manner:

1. Me as performer collaborating with participating composers;
2. Me as composer and performer;
3. Me as composer collaborating with participating performers.

![Figure 2. The order of collaborations in this research.](image)

Aside from the investigatory nature of symbiotic relationships between composers and performers, the findings of this study presented physical evidence of such relationships and broadened the repertoire as new compositions and recorded performances have resulted of my examination. By contextualising those findings I would provide further assistance in understanding of explicit mechanisms of symbiotic working relationships. The composers and performers have come to experience each other’s methods through the process of artistic creation and recreation. That knowledge was then based on implicit understanding of each other’s needs so that further analysis was not required.
Implicit in the research was a degree of unpredictability in the dynamics of each working relationship. Each creative symbiosis had its own environmental requirements or was dependent on already established creative habitats. Those habitats exposed different dynamics of the working relationship where a variety of attitudes towards collaboration was illuminating. As well, a map detailing the life cycle of a music composition from its conception to delivery based on working relationships was revealed.

Collaboration

An idiom of symbiotic relationship between artists has been represented through collaboration. It was important for this research to associate with the available literature and extract fundamentals for comparison of differences and similarities. Through obtainable materials it was evident that the word collaboration signified a variety of meanings and it grouped and generalised all kinds of working relationships. Taylor (2016) comments, that the term collaboration is often abused and does not always allow to competently comprehend the complexity of such interactions between composers and performers (p. 564). Arguably, he further draws a demarcation line separating an active participation in a process where both parties are equally responsible for the creation from any other forms including a self-collaboration and mutual influences (p. 565). Taylor’s precise definition of collaboration has had a significant effect on this research; however, herein the term “collaboration” has oscillated unrestrictedly and embraced a variety of its types. A definition of collaboration as “activity charged with interactions and relationships” has further assimilated with this research (Taylor & Littleton, 2016, p. 11). The model of collaboration presented by Hayden and Windsor (2007) became a focal point and it was considered during the development of working relationships included in this research. Both authors characterise working relationships between: directive (traditional hierarchy: composer writes and performer interprets), interactive (the composer’s authorship is unquestionable but working relationship allows for negotiations and exchange of ideas) and collaborative (a group achievement and a collective decision making) (Hayden and Windsor, 2007, p. 33). They also point out collaborations involving a technical input only without having to incorporate any aesthetic ideas (p. 34). Similarly to this research, Hooper (2012) conceptualises collaboration by reassembling the process of working relationship between the performer Christopher Redgate and the composers Dorothy Ker and Fabrice Fitch. Hooper also asks the question which borders with this research’s framework: Does collaboration matter?

Does it really matter? Merrick (2004) delivers substantial data that collaboration may be beneficial to composers and performers in their overall symbiotic relationship and may deliver positive outcomes (p. 18). It was expected that the collaboration, regardless of its definition and
the actual applicability would result in supporting the examination of the symbiotic relationship and offer variants to answer the above question.

Social and Environmental Influences

I find it really important and somehow crucial to the compositional process to know for whom I am writing, on both a musical and a personal level (Nigel Westlakes in Graham, 2000, p. 54).

The available literature, both analytical and biographical, enables one to compare templates of behaviours or simply the outcomes only without thorough description of symbiotic relationships. Most biographers offer a comprehensive study of past collaborative working relationships where elements of technical compositional development and basic interchange of ideas have been examined. Since such commentaries are based on artists’ notes, letters and anecdotal stories they may lack a detailed flow of a full symbiotic creative process. What might have not been fully exposed as well, was a failed or unsuccessful working relationship. Nowadays, there has been a significant deliverance of research where aspects beyond the initial idea and the outcome is being offered. Such studies, mostly structured on practice-based research may contain (apart from those two main elements mentioned above) an insight into psychological aspects of creative relationship and its environment. As seen in nature a successful symbiosis would not enable a coexistence without mutually fitted organisms with a favourable environment enhancing their productivity.

The study of examples of other artists’ symbiotic relationships draws the observation that each symbiotic relationship needs to be divided into: solitude (working alone) and collaboration (connecting with outer influences). This is certainly a case in this research where dominancy of a collaborative process is exposed but periods of self-occupation have also been highlighted. Cain (2013) provides examples supporting the claim that working alone is central to productivity and introvert personalities (often the composers) can propel creatively. Storr (2005) argues that nearly all creative individuals in their adult life turn into the solitude (p. 146). He also explains that the creative work done in isolation, however, should not exclude the communication and either implicitly or explicitly needs to aim at somebody (Storr, 1961, p. 27).

Since collaborations encompass such highly complex dynamic relations between composers and performers, it was crucial in this research to develop grounds for understanding of social and environmental influences. A typical model of composer as an independent artist working alone remains strongly present in the musical culture (Taylor, 2016, p. 563). Through the scope of this research, however; I challenge this attitude and aim to avoid or even reject a “directive” form of working process. Therefore, the focus shifts into the development of social and environmental factors that would enable both, an “interactive” and “collaborative” working relationships. In
support of this changing hierarchy Livingstone and Archer (2010) refer to a modern collaborative formation as rearrangements of a typical (historically observed) creative process where the attitude of a creator-individual is abandoned (p. 453). The observation of transforming hierarchy illuminates through the chapters of this research, however; not without obstacles. Sawyer (2003) claims that the social and interactional process drives the creativity of a working relationship (p. 19). It is a fair claim but only if both collaborators agree to participate on interactive and collaborative level. It has been noted in this research that same cases of involved composers and performers manifested a directive working relationship and the encouragement for any collective work resulted in conflict situations and misunderstanding. To avoid uncomfortable situations where involved artists could feel threatened it was important to develop an open dialog where reliable communicative language have been implemented. The initial dialog between the artists included the outcome expectations and time lines. The structure of each collaboration remained undisussed and left for development during the creative flow.

According to Laermans (2012), modern collaboration functions within a defined time frame and during that time artists channel their interest and communicate goals and capacities (p. 94). He further elaborates that collective hopes for successful outcome however cannot be guaranteed or predicted. A development of dialog within this research was therefore important to anticipate possible scenarios. Paradoxically, the successful creative outcomes did not always reflect a successful collaboration.

It is crucial to emphasise that foundation for all creative work is communication. Eisner (2002) argues that cultural development depends on communication patterns. By responding to such communication and through social contribution a creative symbiotic relationship can be formed. Such relationship may depend on complementing one another’s lives through a creative work (Eisner, 2002, p. 7). Since the phenomenon of communication “depends on not what is transmitted, but on what happens to the person who receives it”, a communicative action within a creative relationship can be ambiguous from the perspective of an observer and a researcher (Maturana & Varela, 1987, p.196). In some cases of this research a problem of techniques of communication and a content of transmitted information resulted in underdeveloped communication and appeared to be a major obstacle in a developmental stage of collaboration. The problem of working within highly individualised environment where all artists feel self-assured about their own practice caused the effect of the biblical Tower of Babel. The participating artists tend to use their own language which had to be universalised and translated to achieve an advantageous symbiosis.

The history of composer-performer relationships throughout the centuries has revealed collaborations where the successful outcome was achieved. Sporadically, some evidence of a deeper psychological insights has been offered through the biographers. Mawer (2017), for instance, investigates the personality of Maurice Ravel and his collaborative partnerships.
She claims that the variability of Ravel’s relationships did not rely solely on his personality but also on personal attributes of other collaborators and overall psychological chemistry (p. 251). Such phenomenon of personality clashes or finding a right chemistry (which in biological sciences also enables a successful symbiosis) radiates through each participating group of artists in this research and it has been examined in literary sources. Finding and maintaining the mutually reliable communication in collaboration will not however remove the unpredictability factor of the outcome from any artistic collective group. Laermans (2012) wrote:

The participants ‘join forces’ but cannot predict the eventual outcome on the one hand, and they are quite unsure about the evolving qualities of their mutual working relationships on the other (p. 94).

Laermans (2012) also makes note that truly collaborative artistic relationships in contemporary reality (present times) are always “collaborations yet to come” (p.94). The uncertainty mentioned in Laermans presents itself as an obvious and integral part of any symbiotic relationship worked through collaboration. It has been examined (in this research) that such obstacle may be manoeuvred to a certain degree however it would never be fully controlled. Exercising collaboration may also result in transgression and fragmentation of identities which leads into a double subjectivity that requires a delicacy of balance (Bigliazzi & Wood 2006, p. 5). Such implied deconstruction of identities may apply in the extreme collaborative projects of this research. An appropriate handling was therefore required including reassuring the trust and problem-solving communication.

The impact of the favourable environment made at least half of this research possible to complete; those environments being the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University in Australia and the Banff Centre for Creativity in Canada which enabled me to integrate socially with other like-minded artists. Amabile (1983) points out the importance of social and environmental factors that has been a prominent feature in the field of research regarding the creativity. She also argues that ordinary and trivial events or features may trigger creative processes (p. 357). It has been hoped that this research will expand the knowledge on the impact of social and environmental factors in creation of musical works.

Kanga (2015) discusses the seniority as a social aspect often present in creation of symbiotic formation. Based on his experience he argues that an age-disparity does not dominate the creative relationship. A resemblance of such remarks can be observed in this research in chapters describing collaborations with Larry Sitsky and Gary Schocker. Kanga (2015, para. 17) continues with another social issue of performers’ dilemma:

Deliberate omission of details in a score - what I call "low-resolution notation" - was a useful way of transferring control over the final performance to the performer while still allowing the composer to stay in control of certain key aspects.
Such issues relate to performers working with living composers but also with no-longer-available composers, where ideas are encoded into an artefact of a notated score. The problem of scoring and capturing only unquestionable directions was already mentioned in the historical overview. The issue of notation as a medium for communication of the composer’s intention appears as a separate challenge. In Krausz (1993), the problem of interpretation was broadly investigated among authors including the realisation of the abstract form of the musical work, musical notation and extra-musical descriptions as well as freedom of interpretation (pp. 125-169).

In my experience the disparity of interpretation often becomes a be-or-not-to-be of a symbiotic relationship between composers and performers mainly due to its origin – the score. Cole (1958), claims that liberty should be natural for every performer as a notated score does not represent the key to all of the composer’s intentions which means there is no single true interpretation of a work. (p.368) The interpretative factor was exercised during each collaboration of this research however the issue was minimised due to the lack of comparison to any previous performances. This topic has been further discussed in The Mapping section of this dissertation.

Disability

An issue of disability in performance and composition has firmly established itself in this research. It is important to emphasise that there is no intention to examine disabilities (both mental and physical) from a scientific, physiological or psychological perspective. Contextualising disability as an extra-ability is identified in this research only as stimulus for the creative work. An interest in disability was propelled by the collaboration with Dominik Polonski where two-focal issue presented itself, firstly, overcoming physical limitations by creating a super-performer, and secondly, relate to a mental state caused by such limitations. Most of references containing this topic was found in the collection of works by Joseph N. Straus who claims that disability has always been permanently attached to the nature of human beings and its meaning has now shifted into cultural studies (2006, pp. 113-117).

In his introduction to Extraordinary Measures: Disability in Music, Straus (2011) lists mental conditions such as hysteria, neurasthenia, fugue and nostalgia that are no longer considered legitimate. Those former mental illnesses became a prime idea for compositional structures in this research. It was desired that all compositions included in the project would have to have some connection to above diagnosis, either through depicting a mental state or formalising the structure. Straus (2011) compares deformation of a musical form to physical disabilities of a human body (p. 108) and this point of departure was taken to build around the major component of this research. Since disability in music has been present throughout the centuries in bodies and minds of artists (e.g. Beethoven’s deafness) it was also incorporated in their creative
activities in a narrative form (Lerner & Strauss, 2006, p. 1). The translation into musical narration could be exercised by adding a special meaning to notes, repetitions, dissonant harmonies or like in this research embrace a formal structure. As mentioned above the practical part of this research followed the procedure to perceive the disability as extra-ability which was presumed as an impact on the traditional language of writing and performing music by searching for unconventional solutions. A physical abnormality seen as a challenging difficulty in composition practice has also added an extraordinary element during the performance of works which could be enhanced by its dramatic narratives (Lerner & Strauss, 2006, p. 7).

The challenge of exposure of a mental illness through composition and performance was a complex task for this research and particularly for collaboration with those participants who expressed their interest to incorporate such phenomenon. Selecting three defuncted mental illnesses (fugue, hysteria and nostalgia) as themes for each composition was a starting point but did not guarantee the transparency during the performance unless physically demonstrated. A significant direction of thought was delivered to me in the book Touched with Fire by Kay Redfield Jamison. This body of work in the field of mental disorders such as schizophrenia, bipolarity and manic-depressive illnesses also included a list of artists touched with conditions that either blocked or elevated their creativity such as Robert Schumann (Jamison, 1993, p. 6). Following Jamison’s claim that mental illnesses encompass a variety of temperamental mood disorders (1993, p. 13) I created a form of what has been called a syndromal piece by choosing three common states: normality, hypomanic and depressive.

Collaboration with Polonski required me to compose a piece for the cello that uses a bow hand only; therefore, the comparison had to be made with similar experiments. The history of music registers examples of such practices mainly in the field of piano performance, for example, commissions of piano concertos from one-handed pianist Paul Wittgenstein (1887-1961). The search for new techniques could not cloud the universalism of Polonski’s piece. It was desired that that the composition be widely used by all cello players and (similar to pieces for piano one hand) to extend the repertoire. Fallowfield (2010) argues that the experimentalism with the new sounds often becomes a centre of a compositional structure and sometimes even a basis for the entire composition (p. 4). Therefore, the search for extended techniques and new sonic solutions was conducted in live environment with an extensive collaboration with a performer.

Methodology

A substantial part of methodological approach in this research was an extensive use of autoethnography. To successfully examine the symbiotic relationship, a reflexive approach based on auto-ethnographical experiences was adapted. According to Bartlett & Ellis (2009), such approach enabled a broadening of musicians’ perception of their own artistic self (p. 14) and encouraged resonance on the personal level (p.17). According to the projects’ progress this
research has included personal commentaries in a form of the reflexive narration. The applied narrative enabled to obtain subjective information from all participating sources (involved artists and me) and through analytical channels deliver an objective coherence. Each section of this research describing a working relationship with participating artists was constructed based on a chronological diary model. This method enabled me to incorporate the narrative and proved to accurately display the symbiotic model of each collaboration. Alaszewski (2006) justifies using diaries by researchers who examine “individuals, activities and relationships of particular groups in society” (p. 33). He also argues that diaries can offer the access to specific information about social groups and cultures (Alaszewski, 2006, p.33). In my research such “specific” interactions and individuals have been present therefore I enabled this form to transparent important data. The journal-like narrative accompanied by semi-structured interviews enabled me to construct models of each collaboration including their psychodynamic notions. The action research understood as “performative component” assisted me in collecting the data based on active participation, networking, engaging in production of knowledgeable outcomes that would address practical challenges (Martí, 2016, p. 169). Following Crossley (2007) I describe my own practice (especially in a self-collaborative environment) through exploration of (my) self and identity and building an interpersonal dialogue which lead into a coherent story. This “realist epistemology” operates by assembling a “chain of connections” which links person’s ways of communication (verbal and written) and feelings toward themselves (Crossley, 2007, pp. 131-144).

Due to geographical distances the majority of participating artists have not been directly accessible and therefore a parallel online environment had to be established to enable those collaborations. Kaler and Beres (2016) argue that two types of “fieldwork”: multi-sided and virtual are becoming increasingly popular among researchers (p. 10). Such practice has been adopted by me to accommodate working relationships in accessible locations (local travel) and those separated by geographical distance. Smith (2009), provides a justification of using Facebook and its communicative platforms as a useful and powerful tool for online collaboration (p. 182). The extended capacity of the social media supports a collaborative movement by providing with instant messaging tool, exchanging audio and video files, comments and discussions.

Apart from the creative output this research has also acquired data from the interviews with all participants. This research followed a purposive approach by choosing participants in the way that ensured a diversity of offerings (Davies, 2010, p. 127). For most interviews the following methods proposed by Davies were adopted:

1. Prompting: allow silences, repeat the question, offer examples.
The interviews were conducted during rehearsals, meeting and via email, therefore the structure of each interview was accommodated accordingly. The most common types of interviewing techniques in this research were:

1. Informal, conversational interview for all interactive, face-to-face collaboration where no predetermined questions were asked.
2. General interview guide approach for all email based interviews where the same areas of information were approached. (McNamara, 2009)

The execution of interviews delivered data that enabled me to initiate, develop, strengthen and navigate through working relationships. Appendices D, E, G and H offer examples of email based interviews with selected participants.

An important part of this research was a human observation during collaborations. Following Bresler (1995) the adaptation of qualitative methods such as ethnography enabled a sensitive approach to already existing behavioural patterns (p. 2). Through the process of examining practices and behaviours such methods could appear organic and appropriate (p. 3). In terms of understanding music in context of human behaviour the ethnomusicology also assists to achieve so by proposing the triangulation of methods, naturalistic approach and a field work (Bresler 1995, p. 5). Overall the methods employed are of a collaborative qualitative enquiry with deliverance of detailed notes (diary, correspondence, interview transcripts) based on personal experience (factual detail) and critical self-evaluation of each project.

The Mapping

The process of mapping a symbiotic relationship considered factors such as: diversity of engaged artists, personal and professional relationships and favourable environments. I adopted and slightly adjusted model of Farrell’s (2003) developmental collaborative stages to enable clarification of the symbiosis. The stages of development of collaborative friendship circles presented in his book Collaborative Circles: Friendship Dynamics and Creative Work included:

1. Formation
2. Rebellion against authority
3. Quest: negotiation a vision
4. Creative work
5. Collective action
6. Separation
7. Nostalgic reunion

Firstly, I excluded “friendship” from the modification process as there was no prior personal relationship with some of the artists, for instance, Larry Sitsky or Gary Schocker. The mapping included the action of collecting the data (biography, familiarity with composers’ work and
performers’ techniques) important for establishing a symbiosis during the formation phase. Next two phases were swapped and immediately after formation all relationships began negotiations and probing ideas. The rebellion against authority (me as composer) has never explicitly occurred from participating performers. I, however, challenged and crossed participating composers without undermining their personalities or creative output. The creative work stage combined the solitude of working alone (composition and practice) and occasional communication (whenever participants were in doubt and sought clarification). Farrell (2003) notices that “working alone may run into obstacles” therefore organised and casual meetings became opportunities to “replenish the self-esteem” (p. 24).

Within this research the creative work stage was the most diverse, ranging from traditional to authoritarian style where working relationships were maximised to fully collaborative projects with participants being equally responsible for elements of a creative work. The collective action stage included the involvement of audiences such listeners and critics. In this research such participation was excluded from active examination; however, all data collected from the audience members supplying their commentaries might result with further study where the symbiosis spans beyond just composer-performer relationship. The separation phase in both, Farrell’s and this research, deals with negativities impacting working relationships which included miscommunication and misunderstanding during collaboration or dissatisfaction with the outcome. Farrell expanded this issue further towards inequities in recognition and ownership. Fortunately those issues did not apply to any collaborations in this research. The final stage of nostalgic reunion has been left out for any further research which could deliver comprehensive data about synergies between returning artists.

The remaining third stage of a collaborative process – the rebellion against authority – required, apart from trusting the performer’s instinct, a substantial knowledge on how composers and performers relate to each other. Therefore the following concept required further examination: authenticity of the composer’s intentions in performance. In terms of symbiosis this aspect required a full understanding of a composer’s intentions to accurately manipulate the stage of rebellion without upsetting the collaboration and providing a deconstructive feedback. The authenticity of intentions overarched a greater spectrum of elements including the notation and accuracy of a performer. Davies (1987) encourages striving for faithfulness in performance to achieve authenticity (p. 39). His division between determinative and non-determinative intentions such as pitch and tempo respectively, indicates a performative flexibility during the interpretation which may trigger a rebellious exploration of composers’ work. Such attitude was also governed as a stand against “the intentional fallacy” where the composer’s work could have been criticised according to his intentions (Kivy, 1998, p. 14). Kivy (1998) arguably states that composing demonstrates a different set of skills from performance (p. 163). Such conspicuous statement can relate to technical skills that separate composition from performance and creative skills should prevail within both praxes.
To understand the problem of the composer’s intentions some further methods of examination were implicitly implemented into the mapping process; for example, Dipert (1980) lays out three levels of intentions: low (e.g. instrumentation), middle (e.g. timbre) and high (e.g. effects) which has been considered as directional implication during each collaborative stage (p.205). At times such division was helpful to support intuitive approach in this research. The problem encountered during the navigation of an active collaborative element was to control my mind as composer while working with composers and similarly as performer working with performers (Figure 3).

As a result there was a tendency to propose and discuss changes in compositional process accordingly to my model of a structure and mould my own compositional technique towards universalism and practically to suit the performers.

Figure 3. Other influences present in collaborative actions.
Song of the Shaman – Sonata for an unaccompanied flute: Collaboration with Larry Sitsky.

This collaboration revealed the synergism of a creative working relationship with a distinguished Australian composer Larry Sitsky. It enveloped hypothetical challenges of collaborative work where Sitsky’s seniority and established career could frame and influence the creative symbiosis.

My interest in collaborating with Larry Sitsky (or perhaps requesting to consider a piece for me) sparked in October 2013 during the concert of Lunaire Collective at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University where his *Quartet for flute, oboe, clarinet and bassoon* was premiered. At that time my familiarity with Sitsky’s style embraced only a limited number of his compositions, mainly those involving the flute, and the *Quartet* had certainly sustained my curiosity. I approached Sitsky after the concert, introduced myself and we began a conversation about his music. He mostly was interested in my artistic path and composition style. At the time I was mainly concentrating on music for the flute to meet multiple commission commitments and having an obvious and natural ease of writing for ‘my’ instrument. Sitsky suggested spontaneously: “Write for an instrument you don’t know!” I then decided to merge two challenges: compose a piece for a string instrument and collaborate with Sitsky by commissioning a new composition for flute. Later, both tasks became separate projects which helped me to examine the creative symbiosis between composers and performers.

I made the initial contact with Sitsky regarding a new piece at the start of this research on 6 March 2014. He agreed to be a part of my study and responded positively to the idea of a series of interviews concerning various topics about collaboration. I felt that it was crucial to form a personal relationship and to build a communicative platform with Sitsky to successfully complete this project. Interestingly, nearly a year later, one of the musicians involved in my project expressed his view on importance of intimacy between the composer and the performer:

> What I’d like [in collaboration] is more of an interaction where two human beings who love what they are doing can actually find a way to free each other up and to explore the creating of a work in a different way (D. Montgomery, personal communication, May 15, 2015).

The first meeting with Larry Sitsky took place on 2 July 2014 in the composer’s studio at the ANAM School of Music in Canberra. In our telephone conversation prior to the meeting I offered to bring my flute to present my ‘box of tools’ and perhaps experiment with some of Sitsky’s sound ideas. He did not think of this to be necessary. I then recalled Merrick’s argument that such collaborative interactions can extend from a composer being merely inspired by a performer’s abilities to a fully integrated compositional process.
She further explains that there are many levels of activity possible between those extremes (Merrick, 2009, p. 5). I understood that through extensive experience working with Australian flautists such as David Cubbin and Patrick Nolan, Sitsky was already well acquainted with flute techniques and the instrument’s capabilities. Until that meeting Sitsky did not have any formulated ideas in relation to a new piece, apart from one that it was intended for flute with no accompaniment:

...we might discuss the flute/piano option- although I'm not crazy about the combination, as far as my own music goes ...(L. Sitsky, personal communication, March 10, 2014).

He could have possibly searched for a springboard2 by exploring the literature, however at that point of time there were no clear ideas formed yet. An essential element of the meeting was to familiarise Sitsky with main concepts of my project. I described my work with other collaborators and explained the important role of disability within each component. At that stage the concept of incorporating physical disability – limitations seen as extra-abilities and mental disabilities as formative structures - was transparent enough through all compositions in my project. Sitsky expressed a significant interest in those abstract concepts and commented on them as being fascinating and worth researching. Prior to our meeting I imagined the idea to create a composition that underlines and heals all impairments implied in my other projects. I told Sitsky about it and he immediately found the idea interesting; however, it had not yet become his springboard. The intention of a healing piece was not entirely born without the composer’s influence. Prior our meeting I came across an anecdote from his childhood which was described in his biography (Jim Cotter – Conversations with the Composer, 2004) and then recalled in the interview with Andrew Ford in 2009. Sitsky extracted a memorable childhood experience of a doctor-shaman healing people by using the flute:

I remember our Chinese neighbour falling sick, and the doctor coming, and to my utter astonishment - I must have been, I don't know, seven, eight - the doctor pulled out a flute, and he played to him, and of course, being a kid, you don't have too many prejudices or preconceptions, and I remember asking, 'What's going on?' And my Chinese friends next door said, 'He's healing him'. And I remember thinking, isn't that fantastic! You see, that's something that I still believe to this day. So, these early experiences fostered what you call mysticism, the belief in the power of sound (Sitsky, 2009).

During the first interview I asked Sitsky to reflect further on that experience. In his story I found some direct links relating to my interest in incorporating disabilities within a musical form. I then presented my ideas and the background for Hystheria, Fugue and Schizophonic Toccata and proposed a healing piece based on his childhood experience. The idea hooked Sitsky. A familiar composer at work

---

2 In both interviews with Sitsky the topic of a springboard was often present and it was considered fundamental for initiation of any creative process. The search for a “springboard” can indicate self-collaboration where the relationship with artefacts and external resources (literature, paintings, etc.) may be influential.
expression displayed on his face during our conversation. I am certain that this was the moment of conceiving the piece in Sitsky’s mind and the beginning of our collaboration. The interaction and personal input into collaboration influenced and laid grounds for the further creative work for both the composer and performer. In this case both creative minds mutually communicated and consequently contextualised their ideas. Such practices certainly equalise both roles in any collaborative environment in opposition to non-interactive artistic relations between composers and performers. Those non-interactive practices may be characterised by dictating the composer’s detailed interpretative guide of a piece. Sir Harrison Birtwistle in an interview with Andrew Ford argues the absolute power of the composer:

You see, I think the problem of talking about creativity is that there’s always this idea that the creator is absolutely in control and can answer everything all the way down the line. I don’t think that’s so. I think you’re in control of a certain number of things, and there are also things which happen, which are not accidents, they’re things which are thrown up by context (Ford, 1999, p. 55).

One of those things beyond the composer’s control is the performer who undertakes the role of a messenger and always stands between the composer and the audience. Wagner claimed:

Composers cannot afford to be indifferent to the manner in which their works are presented to the public; and the public, naturally, cannot be expected to decide whether the performance of a piece of music is correct or faulty, since there are no data beyond the actual effect of the performance to judge by (Wagner, 1887, p.24).

Seven months after the first interview was dedicated to Sitsky’s solitary work with no communication between us. During that period, due to venue availability requirements, the date of a performance was set. The date could not be changed or otherwise accommodate the participating artists therefore all composers, including Sitsky, were notified about the deadline for their compositions. Since the concert program consisted of a substantial number of works, Sitsky’s new composition was a tentative inclusion and was awaiting a confirmation of completion of the new work. On 12 January 2015 I emailed Sitsky to check the progress on the piece and inform him about the possibility of the inclusion in the recital in April 2015. Sitsky responded:

I’ve been thinking about the new flute sonata for you and hearing bits of it in my head. [I] Have a couple of things to do before I write it down, so no promises at this stage, but it will probably by OK. It will be called SONG OF THE SHAMAN – I hope you like the title, and it has some connection with the healing topic we were discussing. A one movement work with a highly decorated chant-like line in the middle and exploring the extreme registers at beginning and end. How does that sound to you? P.S. You may think it odd that I begin with a
title, but I find that for me, it colours and affects the way the whole piece turns out (L. Sitsky, personal communication, January 13, 2015).

Sitsky announced the completion of his work on 18 February 2015 and the manuscript was received by me shortly after his message. His new composition *Song of the Shaman – Sonata (no 4) for an unaccompanied flute* was now confirmed in the April concert program. During my preparation for the April’s performance and studying the Sonata Sitsky asked me to create a type-set of the manuscript:

> I thought it would be good for your research and also for me- if you type set the new work and provide an introductory essay- we can then get it published (L. Sitsky, personal communication, February 18, 2015).

The type-set was ready to be emailed back to the composer within a week. Meanwhile some minor changes (mostly clarifications of uncertainties within the composer’s handwritten score) were introduced into the new score. The premiere of Sitsky’s piece took place on 2 April 2015 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University in Brisbane, Australia. *Song of the Shaman* was played last on the program as per my desire to conclude the concert by summing the other compositions and my narration of the project. The healing message within the Sitsky’s *Sonata* has helped to connect with the remaining pieces where the topic of disability was incorporated.

Upon post-recital discussions with members of the audience I noted positive reactions to the composition and its performance as well as the understanding of its message which embraced the journey through possibilities in pursuit of successful reanimation. The overall design of the recital granted further comprehension of the disability/healing synopsis by the audience – compositions linked to disability had been followed by Sitsky’s piece. The video recording was sent to the composer shortly after the performance. In the meantime, during the performer’s preparation period, a date for the second interview was already scheduled. I visited Sitsky on 5 July 2015 in his home in Canberra. The purpose of the second meeting/interview was to follow up on the *Sonata* and discuss a topic of friendship and personal relationships within collaboration. My collaboration with Sitsky concluded after that meeting.

The term *self-collaboration* has reached its popularity within the online based collective groups on communicative and informative platforms. It can also refer to passive forms of collaboration like email, instant messaging, and online chat tools (Cain, 2012, p.86). Over the years the online based collaborative environment has become a useful device for expanding the artistic practices, especially between artists separated by long distances. A part of my own artistic practice also involves an online based communication therefore the exchange of emails between me and Sitsky have contributed wherever there were gaps in conversations or unanswered matters. Based on my observations a part of self-collaborative practice also includes creative individuals who seek out for any external source of inspiration or gaining new knowledge. Many composers, including Sitsky and myself, reach out and
find direct inspirations from the literature, observing the nature or other arts. According to Taylor (2016) a creative process may also be in a dialog with artists’ previous works, however he does not refer to such extent as self-collaboration (Taylor, 2016, p.563).

An important part of any creative work incorporates self-collaboration and demands periods of a solitary work. The topic of solitude and working alone appears to be in balance with a collaborative practice. The book Solitude by Anthony Storr reveals some extreme cases of disengagement not only from a collective work but also from the outside world in seeking for inspiration and creativity. Below is the example of generalisation a socially withdrawn attitude linked with a mental illness, which (as already indicated) also takes a significant place in my project:

In Western society, extreme detachment from ties with others is usually equated with mental illness. Chronic schizophrenics sometimes lead lives in which relationships with others play virtually no part at all. (Storr, 2005, p. 11)

In chapter 10 The Search for Coherence the author summarises: “nearly all kinds of creative people, in adult life, show some avoidance of others, some need of solitude” (p. 146). Collaboration with Larry Sitsky showed characteristics of an artistic creation were the performer was providing the initial idea/concept for a new composition. One of the stages of this particular interaction belonged to the composer working in solitude occasionally searching for an outside influence. An important part of Sitsky’s compositional work is the use of a springboard that feeds imagination and provides inspiration and creative stimuli in a more direct way. The springboard used for our collaboration was found in books concerning oriental mythology and shamanic healing methods. The next stage characterised of my autonomous work where all technical details required to be resolved. In both stages there might be enough evidence to call those solitary actions - self-collaborations.

Based on information gathered from Sitsky and my individual preparation of the piece I can observe some elements of such self-collaboration. Sitsky formulated his ideas after the initial contact with me who supplied a thought and triggered the creative mind. But was my idea an original one? No, it was not. For further exploration of this issue I would direct back to Sitsky’s interview from 2 July 2009 where the shamanic healing ritual was presented in the first place. Figure 4 shows how the idea was transported throughout the initial period of collaboration with Sitsky.
In Sitsky’s case, the self-collaboration continued by reaching further into the self-evaluation of his own childhood’s story and adjusting it to the available literature.

The period from the date of receiving the manuscript to the date of scheduled April performance was dedicated to my solitary work. Since we developed a strong partnership based on mutual artistic needs and understanding a certain step that typically could have happened was omitted. Having a composer available (in person, by phone or email) there may be a temptation to make a contact in relation to his/her work. In case of this collaboration any contact regarding incorporated ideas, intentions and the piece’s programmatic flow was unnecessary because I provided the idea and the main concept for a new piece. Sitsky’s writing style also reflects an extensive experience in writing for flute therefore the piece did not present any impossible or uncomfortable technical passages. In his Sonata Sitsky used a standard notation and only one extended technique – portamenti.
Despite of transparency in Sitsky’s writing I contacted him to:

- ensure the creation of a correct typeset.
- confirm/clarify several interpretative uncertainties.
- provide Sitsky’s commentary/program note to the programme of the April’s concert.

Other elements of self-collaborative work mainly revolved around solving technical problems and a search for appropriate tonal solutions and sonic effects. Examples 1, 2 and 3 display my proposed changes emailed to Sitsky on 23 March 2015:

MICHAL ROSIAK (MR): Bar 19 - is dynamics still forte? Same Bar 30?
LARRY SITSKY (LS): Yes to 19. And perhaps mf in bar 30.

Example 1. Proposed changes to dynamics in Song of the Shaman in bars 19 and 30.

MR: Bar 76, second measure - Quintuplet of semiquavers or demis?
LS: It should correctly be demis.
MR: Bar 176, first measure Db - a crotchet rather than a quaver?
LS: Make Db a quaver and Gb a minim.
MR: Bar 180 - This bar is in 4/4 but not indicated. Unless first two notes are grace notes.
LS: Yes, you are correct. The next bar will therefore be 3/4.
MR: Bar 190 - should there be 4/4 indication?
LS: Yes, you are correct.
Example 2. Proposed changes to rhythm and metre in Song of the Shaman in bars 76, 176, 180 and 190.

MR: Do you intend rit. at the end of bar 87?

LS: Yes, thank you.

Example 3. Proposed changes to tempi in Song of the Shaman in bars in bar 87.

In the following email from 23 March 2015 I asked Sitsky:

I was wondering if bar 96 [Example 4] could still be in tempo rather than *Meno Tempo*? The grace notes high b and c can be played by a trill key and it's comfortable and sounds good in a faster tempo. Bar 97 however when it says A Tempo - the jump high C to mid B is quite uncomfortable to play in [crotchet equals] 120. How would you feel if I push A tempo to the next bar (98), play 96 in time and 97 slightly pulled back (*Meno Tempo*)? I tried it and it
sounded alright. I also had more time to do cresc and decresc on high G# in 97 when it was a little slower.

Sitsky replied:

These are now interpretive matters, which I am very happy to leave to your undoubted good taste and discretion. I think these smallish alterations should perhaps be embodied in your typesetting, and then enshrined in print. I was after an effect which suddenly slows a gesture, and then returns to tempo. Your suggestion works musically. I'll alter my original score accordingly and put Meno Tempo over Bar 97 and A Tempo over bar 98 (L. Sitsky, personal communication, March 26, 2015).

Example 4. Proposed changes to tempi in Song of the Shaman in bars in bars 96-98.

Those corrections were only minor changes to the composer’s score and would most likely be edited by the publisher. My suggestions regarding the tempo in bars 96 and 97 (Example 4) could probably be left undiscussed and left to any performer free interpretation what has been indicated in Sitsky’s reply. In the first interview Sitsky clearly stated his view on working with a performer:

I don’t usually consult the performer at all. […] I don’t usually sit with the performer and say: what would you like me to write? Or here is the bit where you can improvise. I’ve done all that, but only if I felt that the piece warranted it. So for me composition, it might be related to a particular person, but the act of composition is fairly solitary, you know, you need peace and quiet and you sit there and something happens with a bit of luck (L. Sitsky, personal communication, July 2, 2014).

I have already indicated that Sitsky preferred to work alone without or perhaps limited discussions with performers whether prior or during the composition period. My collaboration with him on the Sonata was not inconsistent with his usual practice. After the meeting in July 2014 and planting the idea of a healing piece there was no further communication between the composer and the performer until the piece was finished. I knew that the idea of a healing music has already attached to Sitsky and that he was in search for what he called his springboard:

---

3 In Sitsky’s manuscript some repeated sections did not follow continuous bar numbering, therefore some discrepancies were present in the typeset.
For me the most important thing in composing a piece, ironically, is non-musical, it’s what I call a springboard for a piece and at some point I should send you my catalogue and you’ll see that most pieces have mythological references, mythological or sometimes verging on religious references but I wouldn’t call myself religious, spiritual maybe but not religious in the sense of belonging to…(L. Sitsky, personal communication, July 2, 2014).

My second meeting with Sitsky exposed more details on his work in progress during the period of composition. Sitsky revealed his springboard and details of his self-collaborative process. He reviewed stacks of books related to Tibetan healing methods looking for any shamanic references. According to him, certain artefacts became to visualise a non-musical background to his new composition: particular dress, animal skins, decorations, small drums. Those elements attached to Sitsky’s childhood story and justified the symbolism in its musical translation. The idea of playing the flute to a patient was now used to depict shaman at work. To perform the ritual of healing, the shaman devoured the spirits and travelled to all three worlds – Lower World, Middle World and Upper World.

In the email from 15 March 2015 Sitsky explained:

I treated the three octaves of the flute as symbolic: middle octave - the Shaman sings, in our world, lower octave - he travels to the nether regions, upper octave - he flies in a bird/spirit body. Musically, this meant that a different kind of music had to be conceived for each region, and that is essentially what goes on in the Sonata.

Sitsky’s composition is characterised by the following elements:

- Traditional notation
- Polymetric and polyrhythmic figures
- Extended techniques limited to portamenti only
- Augmented intervals/chords and pentatonic scale
- Dynamic range P to FF
- Entire range of the flute
- Formal structure based on three different tempi that symbolise three different worlds
  (Middle – Tempo 1 Moderately, Lower – Tempo 2 Slowly and Upper – Tempo 3 Fast)

The Sonata was written as a one movement composition with three sub-movements incorporated within. This compositional effect provided a diversified formal structure overall and worked as musical collage or mosaic (Figure 5):
At the time my perception of the Sonata linked to my other collaborative projects concerning disability. As a performer I assumed that my primary role was to re-create Sitsky’s synoptic intentions and the secondary to metaphysically overarch the contributing compositions during the performance. To help in translation of the shaman’s journey I decided to use distinctly perceptible features such as the instrument’s colour and subtlety of dynamics. The secondary role was ideological and it presumed to deliver a nostrum which required to control the performance stamina throughout the recital. In my preparation period I exploited the available technical tools to musically depict shamanic rituals and attain a sense of recovery that terminates illnesses.

According to Cole (1958), the relationship between composer and performer is a perpetually uneasy one since each is at the same time master and servant. Further he argues that the composer decrees and the performer obeys, but he obeys at his own discretion, knowing that the last word is with him (1958, p. 366). Indeed, the performance part belongs only to performer and the final presentation is out of composer’s reach. As Sitsky expressed during the first interview: “it’s done and dusted and you’re now sitting among the audience and shaking”.

The Sonata was premiered by me on 2 April 2015 in the Ian Hanger Recital Hall at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University as part of the recital Inside the Collaboration. I performed Sonata strictly obeying Sitsky’s prescriptions such as tempi and dynamics and I managed to control the piece’s duration within recommended time of 13 minutes. I, however, allowed myself to introduce one change that has been undiscussed with him. Some of portamenti included in Tempo 2 were substituted by glissandos (finger slides) and some by rolling the mouthpiece inward and outward. During my second meeting with Sitsky on 5 July 2015 he reflected on those changes as acceptable and convincing.
The aim of the second meeting was predominantly to discuss the performance of his piece and explore the influence of interpersonal relationships on collaboration. In a few words Sitsky expressed his positive reception of the recording and praised the technical fluency of my performance. Unfortunately, a disturbing sound of the air conditioning in the recital hall made the recording difficult to listen to, especially in dynamically soft moments. Sitsky also shared his experiences working with other artists and the role of friendship as a factor determining a success or a failure of a collaborative act.

In collaborative projects like this one issues of communication and time management were constantly present and affecting the overall progress. Due to prioritisation of tasks and maintaining own careers by the individuals involved, some delays were usually expected and understood. In my collaboration with Sitsky the communication was periodical and involved online and face-to-face settings. The email correspondence between me and Sitsky usually concerned dates, times and places for meetings but also revision of the manuscript and a recording commentary. The ideas for his composition (program, form, etc.) or progress on his work have not been brought up in discussions. The exchange of emails usually had the character of a follow-up and happened before and after meetings. There was no delay in replying to email from either of us. There was no need to recall deadlines or send out reminders in our correspondence. This was mainly due to Sitsky’s seniority and authority but also there was no need for such actions. Interestingly, Sitsky claimed that he agreed to participate in my project because he had positive feelings about it and he could understand my approach. He therefore allowed himself to be open in exchanging ideas. He also mentioned the Slavonic background of us both which may add up to a mutual understanding and creation of a cocoon built on cultural similarities.

In this collaboration I became a trigger for a musical idea that themed Sitsky’s composition. The question remained: what type of piece would have been written by Sitsky without my direct influence? The fact was that it would still be a composition for flute solo nevertheless. An internal structure of such composition would depend on a programmatic nature (if any) and what Sitsky referred to as a springboard. In the second interview Sitsky admitted that being surrounded by a number of books he often would reach for a poem or, either spiritual, esoteric, religious or mythological in a search for a springboard. Therefore, I suggest that the structure, such as single or multimovement piece or a micro-, macro-form could likely relate to a programmatic nature of the piece. It could, however, be explicitly or implicitly inspired by the performer as this collaborative example has displayed. Apart from suggesting an incorporation of his childhood story, I did not request any structural, formal or specific designs to the piece. The internal structure of the Sonata was based on the shaman’s rituals and the journey to the three different worlds. During creation of the piece no further communication was required between Sitsky and me. Based on my experience the waiting period for the manuscript was typical as for a non-financial agreement and a composition’s
features such as instrumentation and duration. Sitsky admitted in the first interview that he kept ideas and sometimes even the entire piece in his head for an extended period of time which then followed by immediate writing it all down on paper. Noticeably, a reminder email from the performer as well as set up date for the performance could have been a factor influencing the speed of the composer’s work. In my preparation period there was some communication with the composer. Being responsible for type-setting the score from the manuscript I enquired about bars where I felt uncertain and needed double checking the material.

The Sonata represented the type of piece that I would express as performer friendly. Sitsky’s familiarity with technical capabilities of the flute due to his collaborative work with flautists such as David Cubbin and Patrick Nolan made this composition interesting and attractive to work on and perform. This collaborative example shows that the performer can influence the composer with the idea of a piece, even though a part of this idea belonged to the composer himself. It also exposes the importance of personal relationship and professional respect. Face-to-face meetings were considerably the crucial part to successfully finish this collaborative project and maintain a positive relationship for any future work. Through the lens of a detailed examination of the symbiotic process this collaboration illuminates an effectiveness of conducting an open communication and building of another level of relationship with the composer. The performer’s influence credited by the composer’s openness has directed and shaped the initial compositional concept however, in this example of collaborative work, both roles – creator and re-creator remained traditionally understood.
Sail for flute and piano: Collaboration with the composer Gary Schocker.

This collaboration presents a cycle of the symbiotic relationship between two artistically likeminded personalities – Gary Schocker and me. The familiarity with Schocker’s works and style, his exceptional speed in composing large amount of works and busy performing and teaching schedule, evoked my interest in collaborating. The challenge illuminating through this collaboration embraced a construction of a working relationship with an artist who was not only a composer/performer but who was also a flute player. The question I asked before the collaboration commenced was: *Would it be more or less challenging to attempt building a working relationship with someone who shared similar interest and expertise in writing for the flute?*

The invitation to participate in the project and commission of a new piece for flute was sent to Schocker on 27 May 2014 through the social media messenger. I also used the opportunity to introduce myself to him more extensively. Schocker replied instantly and agreed without hesitation to participate in the project. Over the next couple of days we discussed details of a new commission including a fee and a timeframe. Without waiting for Schocker’s recommendations for a piece’s specifications I expressed my interest in a piece for flute solo, flute duet or flute and piano between three to five minutes long. The budget dedicated to all collaborative projects was constrained but adaptable enough to meet artists’ requests within reasonable demands. The next couple of messages concerned a discussion about the budget and the price of the commission. Schocker kindly offered to adjust his fee to the budget’s condition and agreed to a flexible payment plan if necessary.

The recommended timeframe for writing a piece was stretched to up to six months but Schocker indicated that he might be finished with composition much sooner. From that point Schocker and I switched our conversation to exchange of emails which, unlike the messaging platform, allowed for more time to construct conversations. My first email was sent to Schocker on 30 May 2014 and confirmed all the details concerning the commission. I also elaborated on the entire project and invited Schocker to participate in the email-based interviews. One of the points in the email was my proposal concerning the possibility of visiting New York and working closely with Schocker by setting up a favourable symbiotic environment enabling a direct access to him. This proposal was extended to include Schocker’s other collaborations as well as working with his students on various project. Perhaps due to unusual character of this proposal or unclear wording and a few typos in the email that latter idea was not understood by Schocker at first. Several follow up emails did not assist in understanding the nature of a possible visit to the USA and unfortunately built up even more confusion. I noted that a conversation (even over the phone) would be much more beneficial and it would most likely
avoid unnecessary misunderstandings. Schocker’s confusion mainly related to the purpose of my presence and my role during the collaborative process. From my perspective, it seemed that in this instance Schocker envisaged and promoted a traditional hierarchical approach. The conversation about a possible visit was suspended and it was never mentioned again. Instead, Schocker asked me to email him some information about my life and perhaps emerge with a story – “first thing you think of” that could initiate his compositional ideas (G. Schocker, personal communication, June 1, 2014). On 2 June 2014 Schocker sent a first draft of Sail for flute and piano. While I was preparing my story, Schocker was gathering information about me using the social media. Based on my personal posts and pictures he managed to create an image of me and the inspiration for his composition. Those social media posts mainly contained pictures of the ocean and the beach and this marine climate inspired Schocker to create a theme for Sail. Schocker’s accurate choice of a theme captured my fascination with the sea and water. After receiving the manuscript I studied the score and played through the flute and piano part. I immediately recognised and connected to Schocker’s style by finding similarities and characteristics in his compositional structures. The symbiosis that arose in past years had now been revitalised and possibly magnified through a direct connection with the composer.

Sail can be categorised as composition suited for flute students grades 5 and 6 according to similar specifications of the Australian Music Examination Board syllabus. Before commencing practice of the flute part I performed my usual habit of studying the score. In my performance practice an instrument-independent analysis is a vital element of connecting to the composer and receive a basic impression of a musical content. The score analysis offers the opportunity to explore the composer’s intentions and discover the amount of information embodied in the manuscript. Krausz (1993) explains:

The connection is that the composer’s instructions result in performances, and performances are the tokens of the abstract type that is the musical work (Krausz, 1993, p. 125).

During the process of score analysis a number of symbiotic elements have already been developed, for example, establishing the composer’s intentions. Those elements have also included a general feel and mood of the piece as well as impressions of characteristics of style and techniques employed. Furthermore, there has been enough time (allocated three years period) to evolve a personal relationship and further maintain a personal connection with Schocker. This, however, was not a necessity coming from the composer. A possibility to reach out to a (living – or available) composer and clarify uncertainties sets out perfect conditions for a symbiotic environment. I used those favourable conditions to raise a few questions about points found in Schocker’s manuscript. My first question regarded the tempo of Sail and the second, subsequently, its duration. Upon score analysis I imagined the tempo marking: dotted crotchet equals 67 MM but Schocker proposed much slower pace of 46 MM. He also
recommended easy, swing-like feel in two. Interestingly, in search for more undisclosed and
doubtful elements in his score, Schocker offered one of his students to play through the piece
rather than doing it himself. The visual part of Schocker’s score and a graphic representation of
melodic lines reflect on wave-like and ocean-like feel. After having to play *Sail* several times I
noted following observations:

- The piece appeared to be too short (approximately 3 minutes) and gave me an
  impression of a movement from a larger work.
- As for classically composed piece and since the composer predicted a slower tempo, I
  felt that there was not enough technical challenges matching my technique and
  performance flair.

I shared my observations with Schocker in the email sent on 1 June 2014 and asked him to
technically develop or transform the flute part. Again, due to the nature of our communication
avenues, the request might seem out of the context and it could question the composer’s
authority. Schocker replied immediately:

> I don’t think that would work. The piece is carefully constructed. I can’t just add things
to add flash to a piece which is not about that (G. Schocker, personal communication,
June 1, 2014).

The misinterpretation of my request became clear and it was most likely caused by inadequately
developed communication and personal connection on my behalf. By creating *Sail*, Schocker
has focused his interested in my person on the outer image (social media public information -
my interests and surroundings) rather than my profile as performer. This superficial image gave
Schocker enough information for a musical adaptation, programming and a conception a
musical picture or impression. The technical content of *Sail* was strictly designed by Schocker
without any consultation with me. As a flute player, Schocker managed to construct a fully
playable composition without having it confirmed with another flute player. His flexibility in
composing either for himself or any student level allows him to accommodate many techniques
and performance difficulties. In my practice, as composer writing for the flute, I do not consult
other flute players; however, on several occasions I was confronted by performers regarding
tempo adjustments. I, personally, tend to perform faster due to my technical abilities. It was
understood why Schocker acted reluctantly to the idea of making amendments to *Sail*. I,
however, desired to pursue with the request of developing the piece since I financially
committed to the commission. After accepting my apologies for how the question of changes
could have been perceived Schocker explained:

> If the commission was for a bigger piece I could write something to follow which is
more virtuosic, but it would be out of place in the piece I have written (G. Schocker,
personal communication, June 2, 2014).
Effectively Schocker did not change anything in the structure of Sail. He did, however, send another version with refined phrasing and adding two extra notes. Further email conversation concerned the typeset of Sail and Schocker’s corrections to the score. On 26 June 2014 Schocker announced a completion of another composition that could complement the Sail and asked me to consider the fusion. Since the addition of an extra movement was related to a more expensive price for a commission I worried that the project may cost beyond the budget. Schocker explained, possibly after my request for an expansion of Sail, that the new piece is logically connected to Sail and it was a composition written immediately afterwards. This unnamed composition was called a piece in G flat. With no wait for my reply to his offer, Schocker emailed with another proposal. Even though the new piece was thematically related to Sail it was still a slow-paced movement. Schocker proposed to revise his composition from 2010 – Inside Out that has not yet been published and include to accompany the Sail. According to Schocker, Inside Out was rhythmically and technically advanced and the composer thought it would suit my “self-confessed” interest of fast playing and tangibly meet my request for an overall expansion. For inclusion of either, Piece in G flat or Inside Out, Schocker requested an additional fee as I was expecting. He, however, understood the problem of constricted budget and offered more typesetting work in exchange for a new movement. I gladly agreed to create more typesets including Schocker’s other compositions such as pieces for harp and piano solo. The next couple of emails related to the new typesettings of Schocker’s other compositions and it has been put aside from the discussion of which of two pieces (G flat or Inside Out) should be chosen to pair with Sail. On 23 July 2017 Schocker emailed:

I decided to put Sail with another piece called Cove which I had set, and will add the piece (G flat) I sent you earlier. [It] might make the overall title Sail, and subtitle the movement I wrote you.

Sail became a three-movement piece with the original version as a first movement, Cove as a second, and the Piece in G flat as the final movement. Inside Out was not included in the set and since it was the only fast paced composition to be considered, the overall structure of Sail was comprised of three compositions of similar character. All three pieces were written around the same time, therefore, as per Schocker’s explanation, were thematically connected and the sound solutions used displayed similar resolutions. Once the decision was made, both Piece in G flat and Cove required revisions and edits by the composer and several performance clarifications from me. On 11 August 2014 all three movements were allocated subtitles:

1. Early Start (original Sail)
2. Cove
3. Smooth Out (Piece in G flat)
The complete composition - Sail for flute and piano was now finalised and dedicated to me. In January 2015 Sail was scheduled for performance on 2 April 2015 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. Together with the pianist Hana Hart I commenced a technical process of preparation without any contributions from the composer. There was no need for consultations with Schocker due to previous discussions about the piece, its evolution, a clear program meaning and traditional notation. I transferred fundamental information about Schocker’s composition to the pianist to secure a mutual understanding during the working process and achieve a fulfilling result. Schocker’s entire work can be rated as an intermediate grade difficulty (flute) according to specifications of major Australian examination institutions.

Sail was first presented on 28 February 2015 at the Banff Centre in Canada during my presentation Inside the Collaboration. I performed the first movement – Early Start accompanied by a Swedish pianist Kristin Sofroniou. The gathered audience commented on the piece and Schocker-Rosiak relationship including a discussion about issues of adaptability and communication within collaboration. The complete piece was premiered on 2 April 2015 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. My performing idea included a separation of all three movements of Sail with other programmed compositions. The reasoning behind this idea emphasised the fact that the piece had not been conceived as one organism. I used a video projector displaying my social media pictures during the performance which enhanced the reception of Sail. Explicitly this experiment has also shown the specific nature of initiating a symbiotic relationship. A recording of my live performance was sent to Schocker shortly after the recital. Schocker was pleased with the outcome however he commented on the second movement as being too slow and rigid and suggested making changes to the tempo.

Despite occasional communication difficulties and inability to establish an advantageous working environment, collaborating with Schocker delivered an outcome within expected symbiotic parameters. An underdeveloped personal relationship influenced fluidity of transferred expectations and ideas, however, still guaranteed a rewarding delivery due to Schocker’s professional attitude. Sail presented itself as a multicoloured piece where dialog between flute and piano was well balanced. Changing directions within the symbiosis were mostly caused by instigating the composer who remained faithful to his traditional role of a creator.
Collaboration with Katherine Saxon was expected to produce exciting results and offer a gratifying working relationship. Saxon’s personality and openness towards a fully collaborative process laid grounds for establishment of a trusting environment weighted equally between contributions of the composer and the performer.

A working relationship with Saxon began in February 2015 during Artist-in-Residence program in Banff, Canada. Weekly participants-led concerts called Bentley Circles opened up gateways for sharing ideas, performing current repertoire and engaging with composers and performers. Most composers found inspiration among participating instrumentalists to create samples and short sketches exclusively designed for involved performers. Bentley Circles were also a fertile ground for improvisation which again infused new working relationships and showcased instrumentalists’ capabilities. *Quilt 1* was performed on one of the Bentley occasions. Without prior rehearsals, the piece assembled *ad hoc*, although the musicians (including me) were provided parts emailed a few days earlier. *Quilt 1* was a short, traditionally written piece representing slow paced horizons, medieval chant influences and elements of *Klangfarben* techniques (Example 4). That mixture of techniques and simplicity in melodic and rhythmic structures highlighted Saxon’s compositional style and inspired me to collaborate with her.

*Saxon was exposed to my personality as performer during a Banff recital Musical Encounter where I performed my own composition *Toccata* for flute solo. Towards the end of the Banff Residency I approached and asked if she would be interested in working on my project.*

The Banff residency concluded in March 2015 but it took another five months to commence the working relationship. The time between March 2015 and August 2015 was filled with online conversations mainly to sustain the newly established relationship. Social media also enabled us
to reconnect with each other’s professional day-to-day activities. Due to Saxon’s busy working schedule she requested late August 2015 as the best time to commence the writing a new piece. Since the personal relationship (friendship) was already developed we were able to start working immediately. Due to the distance (Brisbane-Los Angeles) the most effective forms of communication became exchange of emails and Skype conversations. In late August 2015 I initiated an email exchange containing a number of general questions regarding Saxon’s experiences working in a composer/performer environment. Along with answers to my questions Saxon asked if there is anything specific about the new piece she should note. I appreciated the question and felt privileged to be able to express my ideas for the composition. Saxon’s attitude towards an open collaborative setting was noticeable throughout the entire duration of our project. I replied that the inclusion of limitations and overcoming mental and physical disabilities would be an interesting addition to the overall project. It could expand established extant data concerning those issues. Saxon’s open attitude towards sharing ideas has developed fertile ground for development of a symbiotic relationship. That relationship advanced as a result of a favourable environment (Banff Residency) which nurtured like-minded organisms (artists) and encouraged interactions.

On 28 September 2015 Saxon sent a first sketch of the new piece titled Hacker and attached the following commentary:

Okay, so I have thought for the past month been thinking about your piece and what I want to write. Originally, I was going to write something pretty and perhaps slow, but then I was thinking about hearing you play and your technical chops, and now I want to write sort of this moto perpetuo thing. And I was thinking about your interest in limitations and ability and... disability... which I suppose can be seen as the break-down of normal ability... the overcoming of which requires often quite a bit of creativity. In some sense I was thinking that those who face this challenge evolve, often beyond our given biology with the aid of technology - they sort of hack the system if you will. So here is the most draftiest draft of my piece... It is Darwin's origin of species in binary [Example 6]. I'm translating it into music through a process, and then adding errors into the code to break it down. It will go sort of fast. I'm not sure how long you want the piece to be. I'm not sure it should be any longer than 5 minutes (K. Saxon, personal conversation, September 28, 2015).

The idea of incorporating limitations, based on mental and physical abilities and inabilities, was captivating and could possibly enrich those parts of my project where such issues have been discussed. I was curious about how Saxon approached the execution of compositional process based on her idea and how it will be translated into a musical language. A week later Saxon sent another email confirming a deadline for completion of the piece and she attached a draft of the beginning of Hacker.

Example 7. Saxon’s first sketches of Hacker.
Saxon asked for my opinion about the draft and how it would fit into my performative perspective already. The truly collaborative process has begun despite of being placed in a virtual world of exchange of emails. The first issue to be discussed was the articulation of notes G and A. These two notes were to establish the “pedal” foundation for the entire composition. We both agreed that slurring of only two notes will be more beneficial rather than slurs over the entire phrase. The binary material sent previously (Example 6) was used by Saxon to generate notes and form melodic lines (Example 7). That translation was further developed and mutated into more complex variations. Saxon admitted in our further email conversation that those ideas were still evolving and changing shapes. Based on what had already been sent by Saxon I produced a recording of my performance to present her with an idea of a sound effect and challenge some already arising technical problems. Saxon admitted that the recording helped her imagination and agreed that the performer may face some challenges such as breathing concerns. Those challenges arose after revising isorhythms, the overall tempo marking and prolonged phrasing. In December 2015 Saxon emailed a penultimate page of the complete draft (Example 8) and commented:

I’m working. It’s too long. I’ve got to chop-chop perhaps, but I’ll have you a complete 2nd draft in a few days. I was hoping by the first, I’ve promised myself by the first damn it! Then you can tear it apart and I will piece it back together (K. Saxon, personal communication, December 30, 2015).

Example 8. Saxon’s draft of Hacker’s penultimate page.
Saxon’s openness and passion towards the collaboration and maintaining a positive working relationship was evident in above email and throughout the entire project. Despite the established friendship and agreement to an unpaid commission, Saxon maintained a professional approach to her work and expressed apologies if any delays were encountered. While working on the draft Saxon was asked to reflect on interview questions relating to her collaborative experience.

On 16 February 2016 Saxon sent a complete first draft of 0r161n. She replaced the original title – Hacker with 0r161n (Origin) which remained unchanged at the end of our collaboration. Saxon explained that the new title was more appropriate to Darwin’s “origins”.

I cut a significant portion of the piece - it was too long - about 12 minutes... Still the pacing is not quite right - partly due I believe to some of the mutations I introduced not being quite the right thing. (Ha... I've been thinking now about a lot of recombinant genetics in this phase of the project what with the splicing I've been doing!!!) Dynamics are nonexistent near the end - somehow I wanted to mutate to more scalar material near the end from the repeated notes of the beginning. I've got about 4 days where I'm not doing anything between now and March 1st where I'm going to try to make this into a good beautiful piece of music....

If you want to give it a once over and share thoughts, I'd love to hear any ideas you have - (for instance - I don't use much of the flute upper register... I'm wondering if the piece feels stagnant in some way because I don't burst into that space?) (K. Saxon, personal communication, February 16, 2016).

Over the next few days I worked on the draft and instantly understood the formal shape of 0r161n as a complete structure. From my perspective, the idea of embodied binary code required the imposition of controlled climaxes and phrasing. I felt that the tempo marking should be faster than indicated by Saxon (Example 9a) and I also came to the realisation that the most efficient way to challenge phrasing and breathing difficulties was to use circular breathing. I emailed my suggestions to Saxon and she confirmed that she was still not pleased with the climaxes and she agreed to a faster tempo (Example 9b).

Score

0r161n

Example 9a. 0r161n – original tempo marking.
Saxon emailed a new version of \textit{Or161n} on 2 March 2016. In the new version of the piece she improved climaxes and the general flow. She also underwent a major editing of the ending (Examples 10a & 10b):

As usual she allowed me to adjust any “clunky bits” and suggest more suitable dynamics which, according to her, were considered as a guideline. Saxon changed the tempo marking but left it flexible and open for interpretation. She also commented:
I was thinking in the back of my head [...] would it be fun to do this as a canon, looping it over itself with a loop pedal? (K. Saxon, personal communication, March 8, 2016)

Since I have not mastered the technique of circular breathing I also thought of using either looping device or a recorded track. The spacing of breaths continued to be an issue even with the faster tempo. It was caused by another feature, namely dynamics indicated by Saxon at the end of ten bars phrase (Examples 11a & 11b):

Example 11a. 0r161n bars 13 to 24 – breathing issues.

Example 11b. 6. 0r161n bars 32 to 42 – breathing issues.

Saxon called those troubled spots “non-woodwind friendly” and decided to make amendments by taking out approximately three bars of each prolonged phrase (K. Saxon, personal communication, March 6, 2016). A new version emailed by Saxon on 8 March 2016 consisted of more breathing spaces and marginally adjusted dynamics (Example 12).
Again, a discussion about the possibility of running a looping experiment was reinitiated. In the end of April 2016 Saxon contacted me asking if the pdf file was received successfully and checking on the working progress. The circumstance, when the composer ascertains the progress of my work appeared unusual if compared to other working relationships conducted simultaneously. The minimal delay in response on my behalf was caused by extremely intense period of overlapping professional commitments. It was not, however, a period without any contact with Saxon’s composition. Over the month of April 2016, I managed to embrace all technical challenges required for performance of 0r161n. I experimented with looping applications such as Loop Pads 24 and Looper but with no luck to produce any substantial and satisfying result. Saxon admitted not having any specific ideas about the looping and she agreed that the piece would be acceptable if it was standing alone. The period between May 2016 and August 2016 was mainly dedicated to my work on other projects but also to master the technical challenges of 0r161n.

Saxon was contacted again on 4 September 2016 with the announcement of the upcoming premiere of 0r161n on 17 October 2016. The piece was not yet finished and there were a number of issues still to be confronted and clarified such as repetitive use of accidentals and its implications. On 10 September 2016 Saxon delivered a new version containing fixed accidentals. In the meantime, I tested possibilities of layering sounds that could produce an effect of continues playing and would eliminate breaths. This would also allow me/the performer to breathe comfortably without having to worry about taking big breaths in short amounts of time. Saxon was excited about the idea of layering sounds like that. In her next email she included the program note of 0r161n:

```
When Michal asked me to write a flute piece for his recital, I knew I wanted to both connect it to his interests and reflect his energetic personality. I had recently watched a
```
TED talk by performance artist Sue Austin, during which she talks about how her wheelchair gives her freedom, and this became my inspiration; I knew Michal was interested in limitation, ability, and disability from our time together at Banff, when he was working on a piece for a one-handed cellist. Watching and listening to Austin’s TED talk, I got to thinking about how technology is used to help people with seemingly limited abilities interact with the world, and how these individuals can sometimes be seen as evolving beyond our inherent biology into hybrid biological-technological beings. This imaginative intersection of biology and technology in evolution was what gave me the idea for 0r161N. Here I have taken the beginning of Darwin’s “Origin of Species” and translated it into binary code, the language of computers – the technology that now infuses our lives. I printed out the code and then slowly translated it into music, in a fashion similar to the way that DNA code is copied. I began with a simple pattern, 0 = G, 1 = A, and slowly introduced mutations and errors that cause the music to grow and change into something utterly unrecognizable. Occasionally, I also spliced (cut) and replicated sections where I felt artistic need. This process was not one of direct translation -- far from it, for as we know biology is a messy business. Rather, it was one of evolution, guided by chance and artistic instinct.

The specific text used to create the binary translation can be found below. Darwin’s Origin of Species begins with this simple observation, one that he would travel halfway around the world to begin to develop an answer to:

WHEN we look to the individuals of the same variety or sub-variety of our older cultivated plants and animals, one of the first points which strikes us, is, that they generally differ much more from each other, than do the individuals of any one species or variety in a state of nature (K. Saxon, personal communication, September 12, 2016).

In October 2016 I sent Saxon a sample recording with layered sounds. One of the discoveries I made during working on the piece was that it demanded a stamina and an enormous discipline in maintaining the tempo. Saxon replied that a layered sound background – mainly exploited as a pedal note or pedal chord – worked very well and she admitted that I was having an input into creation of the piece. As a performer, I knew that as a standalone work, 0r161N would work perfectly well; however, it felt like the piece offered plenty of space for experimentation. From the personal perspective, I desired to test the working relationship between Saxon and me. The experimentation with the recorded track and layered sounds did not introduce any new melodic material. The idea of expansion into multiple voices was based on already existing material created by Saxon. A construction of the soundscape was aimed to provide 0r161N with a static musical background or sound canvas in a form of the drone, where the principal material (moving line) was displayed in a foreground by the live performer. The recorded sounds now
offered a new dimension – a harmony (Example 13). Again, the solo version of the piece enabled the performer to explore the composer’s vertical chord structures. Like many other compositions written for solo flute, achieving harmonies is extremely difficult and it mostly relies on favourable acoustics of a performing space.

Example 13. 0r161n bars 19 – 21. Visual representation of added drone harmonies (appearing together with any new pitches being introduced).

In her next email correspondence from 10 October 2016, Saxon commented on a few details in relation to the backing track. Her comments included the anticipation of a pedal action before the actual note appears in the score. Saxon wanted the pedal note/chord to shadow any first appearance of a new pitch (Example 14). She further commented:

Having a complete triad of some sort in the drones feels very special to me in the context of this piece. I’d like to save it for a place like measure 67, which is one of the earlier climactic points (K. Saxon, personal communication, October 10, 2016).

Example 14. 0r161n bars 19 – 21. Amended drone entries after Saxon’s suggestions.

45
Saxon’s enthusiastic approach to the recorded track sparked an idea of highlighting some of the drone entrances which would give even more breathing opportunities to the performer. Consequently, I applied those suggestions in a new version of a recorded track and during the actual performance I chose to leave some drone spots uncluttered also in unplanned places. Saxon worried that with drones 0r161n would be too short of rests and the texture become too thick. Those concerns sparked the introduction of more rests in the flute part. Saxon also suggested to abandon the drone for a section or two and she listed particular spots where this operation could enhance building climaxes. While Saxon was working on rearranging the piece by removing either the flute or the drone, I was preparing both versions: the solo and the rendition with a recorded soundtrack. More recorded samples were sent to Saxon to assist her imagination.

On 8 October 2016, Saxon sent her version of the recorded drone part written in a form of chordal clusters (Example 15).

Example 15. 0r161n bars 106-110. Scored drones.

Being a week before the scheduled performance 0r161n was still evolving on both platforms: the score and the recording. In the meantime, Saxon and I managed to communicate by Skype having brief discussions that led to clarification of each other’s ideas. Further changes included removing all 5/4 bars which, as per my remark, were disrupting a pulsating flow of the piece and rewriting Saxon’s chordal clusters into separate parts. The exercise with rewriting separate parts enabled enrichment of each voice/chord member with individual dynamics.
The final version of both, the score and the recorded track was sent on 14 October 2016, three days before its premiere. There were no further changes to the score or the recorded soundtrack. 

_0r161n_ appeared as an energetic and driving composition. In a version for flute solo it would work ideally if played using circular breathing. The back-tracking version performed by me on 17 October 2016 offered exciting harmonies and supported the idea of Darwin’s “evolution” by adding and mutating new layers of sounds. During the performance on 17 October 2016 I only experienced one issue caused by technical malfunction. The click track set in my ear provided by the smart phone application malfunctioned whilst playing but I managed to sustain my internal metronome and complete the performance. Due to this technical issue the drone effect was slightly out of sync towards the end of _0r161n_. Shortly after the performance, Saxon received the video file of the performance and commented:

> File received! Thank you so so much :) It sounds fantastic. I couldn't tell till the very very end that the click track had stopped and it got slightly misaligned. But there were some parts in the middle that were better that I could have imagined. Thank you so much for pushing for the tape part it brings out the harmonies and the counterpoint and it harkens back to when I was first improvising the piece (K. Saxon, personal communication, October 31, 2016).

The working relationship with Katherine Saxon was effective and abundant with creative ideas. The piece was evolving constantly which in the non-musical context of _0r161n_ contributed to its symbolic meaning. The collaboration with Saxon was a unique process where the performer was invited to contribute towards the creation of a composition by maintaining open communication. This contribution did not divert nor diminish the authority of the composer but only enabled a full exploration of the creative relationship. Mutual understanding, trust, acceptance and professionalism dominated this collaboration leading to a satisfying outcome.
Journey to Expanse for flute and recorded track: Collaboration with the composer Odeya Nini.

Analogously to the collaboration with Katherine Saxon, the symbiotic working relationship with the American composer and vocalist Odeya Nini commenced as a result of gaining the access to each other working practices through the Banff Artist-in-Residence program. Despite of similarities such as the shared environment at the beginning and the fact that both composers were also vocalists, relationship offered a comparison of interpersonal changing dynamics and contrasting stylistic approaches to a collaborative practice.

The attraction to the music of Odeya Nini was awoken after a performance of one of her own composition during the Banff Residency in 2015. This powerful performance combined expressive vocal textures and elements of modern dance. A theatrical flavour added by Nini’s artistic personality channelled a trance-like musical experience into the gathered audience including me. In her performance, Nini used extended vocal techniques including singing overtones. Prior to this, I have not been exposed to a live presentation of such techniques and I immediately found it fascinating and worth of further exploration. The theatrical element of Nini’s animated presentation also attracted my performer’s mind. The expressiveness of the body movement enhanced the receptive part of an artistic creation and it became a challenge to adopt a similar concept into flute compositions and performances. Unlike the working relationship with Saxon, I suggested writing a flute piece immediately after Nini’s performance. She agreed and recommended Skype discussion about a new piece as soon she arrived back in Los Angeles. The conversation did not happen; however, Nini and I maintained our personal acquaintance through the social media network.

In the middle of June 2015, I contacted Nini and reactivated the idea of a new piece. Some suggestions included writing a composition for flute, clarinet and cello due to preparation for upcoming Artist-in-Residence program in Bundanon/NSW with Farrelly Trio. The idea of writing for a trio was never realised due to Nini’s busy performing schedules and her other commissions. A limited funding of the Farrelly Trio did not promise a successful project as composers usually prioritise their paid work over pro-bono opportunities. During a brief Skype conversation Nini and I decided to abandon the commission from Farrelly Trio and focus only on my proposal of writing a piece for flute. The new composition for flute was to be included in the overall research project. Between June and September Nini was busy touring around the world including Paris and Madagascar and there was no communication recorded. Similar to other artists, Nini was asked to respond to interview questions concerning her experiences working in collaborative circles. She admitted that some interview questions were not related to her practice as composer and performer. In the end of October 2015 Nini requested a deadline for the piece to help her plan other commissions around it. The next few months contained
occasional email correspondences and Skype conversations reassuring me about a minimal progress with the piece and indicating that a tape would be included in the score. I eventually set a deadline for completion of the piece which was March 2016. At that time Nini was half way through pregnancy with her first child and experiences related to her motherhood started influencing the working relationship and the piece itself. The March deadline was not met and Nini was still working on the piece and at the same time prioritising other commissions. She briefly explained the delay:

Of course, it is challenging to prioritise it on top of paid work (O. Nini, personal communication, March 3, 2016).

In June 2016 the performance opportunity in Brisbane arose and I informed Nini about the upcoming Unbound Flute Festival. The Unbound Flute Festival was set in July 2016 and promoted great opportunities for contemporary flute music and encouraged collaborative spirit with composers and other instrumentalists. The plan was to perform the piece at the Unbound. It is worth noting that from the start of my working relationship with Nini to date (March 2016) I did not receive any sketches or ideas nor Nini asked me about my own preferences. In end of March 2016 she asked me a set of questions in relation to the piece. The questions regarded the following issues: playing with a recorded track, being open to theatrical elements, singing and playing, playing alto and bass flutes. All elements indicated above were already integrated in my performance practice of the contemporary music and I did not foresee any difficulties in executing them. Throughout March and April 2016 Nini intensively worked on the piece challenging to meet a deadline for the Unbound Flute Festival. In her email from 6 April 2016 she indicated:

I can tell you now, that it [the piece] is based on the refugee crisis in Syria and has recordings of Sufi sounds (mixed in with many other things). The way I’m thinking of it now, the piece is in almost constant crescendos and decrescendos – the beautiful and dizzying movement of waves and travel.

In the same email Nini asked a question about the maximum duration of the piece. I replied that there were no time limits for the piece but I advised that works for flute alone tend to be rather short. In May 2016 Nini was approaching the end of her pregnancy and she was still aiming to finish the piece before the Unbound Festival. She admitted writing for the flute challenging and at times she needed to hear someone playing excerpts and experiment ideas which she later scrutinised and shaped. She began working with Christine Tavolacci – a Los Angeles-based flute player who assisted her with the experimentations. According to Nini, she found this form of external influence helpful and it made her feel more connected to the piece (O. Nini, personal communication, May 14, 2016). She also decided to use the alto flute instead of the bass flute. Throughout the month of May, Nini continued working with Tavolacci who demonstrated
advanced flute techniques and influenced Nini’s creativity. Having a nearly-completed piece Nini wrote:

> It is not a very challenging piece and plays with wave like motions- ebbing and flowing, crescendo and decrescendo – like the ocean, like contractions, like many things that come and go and reappear. The whole piece is based on that. It’s a combination of inspiration from the Syrian refugee crisis – people have to flee their home and travel across seas (waves), and of course – the birth I am about to experience (the waves of contractions) (O. Nini, personal communication, May 17, 2016).

Nini suggested a video session to check the playability of extended techniques she intended to use in her piece. The prospect for the piece was the use of C-flute and alto flute. Also, since the piece used an audio track, the topic of possible amplification was brought up. The idea of the ocean-like character embraced within the piece corresponded to my interests and exposed similarities with Gary Schocker’s piece *Sail*. Also, the current problem of the Syrian refugee crisis appeared to be a fascinating story to translate through musical channels. The piece, along with Saxon’s *Or161n* was scheduled for performance on 2 July 2016 at the Unbound Flute Festival.

On 2 June 2016 Nini announced that *Journey to Expanse* was completed and she was ready to send the score accompanied by the recorded audio track. In the following email she explained more details about the piece and she attached program and interpretative notes, recorded track and sound files where ideas of contemporary techniques were demonstrated. Nini admitted that working on a piece for flute was challenging and remote. Nini’s experiments with Tavolacci appeared to be fruitful and resulted with a recording of samples. Supposedly the demo recordings were made to assist me in preparation. Nini did not discuss the use of extended techniques with me and she did not ask me for assistance in identifying any of them. At first I was confused and felt separated but I realised that it was easier and practical for Nini to use a local player. Unlike collaboration with Saxon, here I was excluded from the creative process and replaced by another player whose ideas were accepted and implemented. From my perspective using a third person in the collaboration which influenced the symbiotic flow could question the element of trust between the composer and the performer.

I familiarised myself with the scanned score and recording track that Nini attached to the email. I decided not to listen to sound samples recorded by Tavolacci. In my performance practice, I usually consider the score as *tabula rasa* with no influence coming from external sources such as recordings. Consequently, I construct my own sound world and next I may check other interpretative suggestions. The idea of Syrian refugees was very confronting. It has also embraced any kind of a movement from the place of birth and immigration to another country. It felt special to me as I considered myself an immigrant, although moving out from my country.
under different circumstances. The topic of waves and the ocean embraced by Nini within the piece was closely related to my interest. That very topic has also affected another composition from my project - Schocker’s *Sail*. The idea of birth-like contractions incorporated within Nini’s piece certainly has challenged my performing discipline. I imagined the performance to border on theatrical vision of a female experience. I knew that Nini did not intend from the performer a literal description of the childbirth experience but I thought it would have enhanced my performance and the overall reception by the audience. During my study of the scanned score I made the following observations:

At the first glance the score looks clear, and all [extended] techniques are ok – I just may have some different ideas in interpretation. E.g. the whistle tones are more effective when fingered with high pitched notes as they have more room for dynamics (M. Rosiak, personal communication, June 7, 2016).

Nini’s attitude was openminded and she allowed me to interpret and experiment with alternative performance solutions. Such an approach coming from the composer allowed me to explore possibilities based on personal capabilities and knowledge. The manuscript and recording arrived in the mid-June 2016 during my residency in Bundanon/NSW, two weeks before the Unbound Flute Festival commenced. Unfortunately, due to the Festival’s schedule being trimmed and also due to programming clashes the performance of *Journey* was impossible to realise. The piece was eventually scheduled for performance at the recital on 17 October 2016 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. During the time between July and October 2016 I intensively studied the score without any further communication with Nini. This exercise enabled me to complete forming my own interpretation of the piece and make adjust suitable adjustments to sound techniques to reflect on what the composer had intended. However, the time came when some technical issues required resolution. Nini insisted the opening be played on the alto flute due to its velvety and breathy texture. Agreeably, the alto flute suited the “breathy sound” effects exposed in the introduction but it appeared to be less flexible in some other parts of *Journey*. The alto flute does not produce overwhelmingly strong sound in the bottom register and the whistle-tones are also weaker comparing to the flute in C. Example 16 shows the use of whistle-tones in the introduction:

*Example 16. Opening bars of Journey to Expanse (use of whistle-tones, w.t.)*
I found that without the amplification of the alto flute sound the effect of ‘wavy’ whistle-tones will be inaudible for the audience, especially in the large concert hall. Once the idea of amplification was planted in my mind I thought that it could have been beneficial for the entire piece if it was played using a microphone. Nini enhanced the experimentation with sound in the Journey by including a recorded track. This was another point for opting for an additional amplification, as I feared that the extreme volume variations of the recorded track could overpower the subtle voice of the flute at times. Nini replied to my idea:

I guess this is really up to your judgement and how it sounds in the space. If it’s a big space that is not very resonant, it makes sense to amplify. I just don't want to make sure the flute doesn't sound electronic. Also, I intentionally have moments where the track covers the flute, the idea is waves and undulation. If that is lost with the amplification, then it should stay acoustic. The flute and track come in and out of one another. There is a lot of space in the track for solo flute, and vice versa. And YES all the environmental sounds in the track are intentional, I just listened to it again. I had a sound engineer master the track, so it should be balanced on any sound system (O.Nini, personal communication, September 25, 2016).

The microphone was used in the performance and it was kept within a distance to enable closer or further approach while playing. The other issues with some performance elements were related to the ambiguous nature of a graphic score. One of those issues was the use of a multiphonic (Example 17):

![Example 17. Journey to Expanse. Use of a split-tone.](image)

The performance of multiphonics is relatively personal and it depends on individual abilities. From my experience, some multiphonics project better than others which again reflects on a personal embouchure suitability. The multiphonic used by Nini was not the most comfortable
one in terms of having all three tones present with similar intensity. The duration of that split sounds combined with breaths was also unclear for me. Nini left this issue for me to decide. All the remaining issues, mainly concerning any vocal effects while playing, were also addressed. Prompted by Nini to search for a desired effect, I decided to reach out for the audio samples recorded by Tavolacci. After the examination of those mini recordings I found the graphic representation not always be accurate for any further performance. I suggested Nini to revise the score and include amendments to descriptive elements. She agreed. Once everything regarding the piece was clarified I recorded a draft performance for Nini to comment on any further changes she might have. Nini was pleased with the recording but she pointed out a lack of continuum between the flute part and the track. She referred me to Tavolacci samples which again confirmed the unclarity of the graphic score notation. At this point I decided to memorise the piece and perform it sitting down. The multiphonic written by Nini still did not bring me satisfactory results and I decided to replace it with more functional one, and quite similar in tone colour. Soon after I sent Nini a second recording of the Journey. In her comments, she thought that the flow was generally better; however, some sections of the piece felt disjointed and less organic. She suggested “opening up for the piece” and “let the playing be physical, emotional and introspective” [Nini in email from 16 October 2016]. I took her advice and started considering a little more theatrical approach to the performance. Such approach would certainly universalise the piece for any further performances. The third recording made on the eve of the recital was very close to Nini’s idea and she thought the piece, or the actual recorded track, was now too short. *Journey to Expanse* was premiered on 17 October 2016. Over time the piece grew on me and it was enjoyable to perform it. The amplification saved the introduction of the piece that was played on the alto flute. The recorded recital was sent to Nini and she commented:

I am so so impressed by your beautiful concentration and commitment to the piece! I love it!!! I am so so happy with how it sounds! BEAUTIFUL!
Listening to it now I would probably elongate some sections - making the track longer - like the part where you are singing into the flute. I just love that, and wanted to hear more of it! Thank You So much!! Do you think you'll perform it again? (O. Nini, personal communication, December 13, 2016).

The working relationship with Odeya Nini exposed itself as an attractive symbiosis of two artistically strong personalities. Occasional clashes and tensions resolved into a successful product which at the end still offered, as per the title, a further journey to develop and expand the piece. Nini represented an attitude of a composer who is thoroughly prepared, focused and transparently informs about formal ideas and sound effects. Using an alternative player who assisted in designing the flute part (extended techniques) excluded me from an active
participation in early stages of forming ideas. I understood that geographical distance could have been a factor to make such decisions and likely Nini obtained purely technical information on sound possibilities with another flute player. To date *Journey to Expanse* has not been amended by Nini and still awaits its official publication.
2-Pol-Run for flute solo: Collaboration with the composer Aleksander Gabrys.

2-Pol-Run displays an exciting and dynamic relationship between Aleksander Gabrys as composer and me as performer. I expected that Gabrys’s extremely experimental approach to composition and performance practice as a double bass player would convert conservative aspects of my own artistic practice as performer and composer. Those aspects included an acute degree of improvisation, use of extended techniques and theatrical accents beyond traditional performative comprehension. The nature of our collaboration reflected Gabrys’s passionate and combustible personality and ranged from periods of isolation to highly energised and instant generation of ideas.

In a search for a collaborative type of symbiotic relationship I reached out to a composer who was only a little familiar to me. Gabrys was an older colleague during my secondary school education although we had never crossed paths in our professional lives. The connection with Gabrys was restored after the years via social media. Gabrys appeared very active on the social media as a composer and performer working alone and alongside leading European contemporary music ensembles such as Ensemble Phoenix Basel. After watching a number of YouTube video recordings I updated my knowledge and understanding of Gabrys's style and his charismatic (and often controversial) performance personage. Gabrys's experimental style, of both composition and performance, had been appealing, inspiring and confronting at times. Those factors convinced me to challenge my creativity as a performer and seek to work with him searching for new forms of expression.

I first approached Gabrys on 30 May 2014 using the Facebook instant messaging tool and invited him to participate in the project. Gabrys replied immediately with an agreement to participate and emphasised surprise at receiving my message. He also mentioned and praised his recent working experiences with Australian musicians including Natasha Anderson and STELARC. Gabrys asked me about the timeline, duration and types of challenges. He proposed an exchange of recording samples and formulated a concept of theatricalisation: “the action of an aware flautist based on contemporary challenges”. The exchange of instant messages was continued on 31 May 2014. Next, Gabrys asked for samples of experimental sounds played on the flute: multiphonics, breathing into the flute. He also asked for a few samples of my voice (improvisation, speech, single syllables). He titled the project: Through the Earth – Theatrealisation-Action of an Aware Flautist Based on Contemporary Challenges. His initial idea for a format of his work was computerised film-like capture of an exchange of ideas. Those ideas sounded appealing to me and I was ready to record samples of my playing (flute, piccolo, bamboo flute and speech). Gabrys particularly liked the idea of incorporating the
piccolo and producing an effect of a “combination tone”\(^4\) by using extreme dynamics and accompanied by another sound (possibly electronic). He too was interested in a sound of a Chinese dizi flute. Continuously I was being attracted to Gabrys’s ideas and his latitude for experimentation. My composer mind was certainly captivated by producing further ideas such as combination of piccolo and dizi and other possibilities. Gabrys did not deter my creative thinking and encouraged my input by implicitly assisting in setting up a symbiotic environment based on trust and understanding. In June 2014 Gabrys requested more samples and promised to deliver an outline of the script for his composition.

There was no further contact with Gabrys until November 2014 due to his extremely busy performance schedule. I was not sure if he was entirely satisfied with the samples and their quality. In his email from 19 November 2014 he mentioned that it would be helpful to repeat some recordings; however, he could start his work with what had been sent to date. I felt that he expected from me to be more open to experimental techniques and gestural extremes. Gabrys asked if I could use a microphone or any equipment for transformation sound into a digital format. His next idea was to achieve a split sound. Unfortunately I did not work with any electronic equipment, especially digitised sound but I was ready to take up this challenge. In the meantime I mentioned to Gabrys that I had been working with Dominik Polonski on my Hysteria as they had also known each other from school. Gabrys was immediately attracted to the idea of incorporating mental and physical disorders based on my compositional process. One of the recording samples contained my recitation (in Polish) of four mental disorders: Nostalgia, Neurasthenia, Hysteria and Fugue.

Gabrys annexed this idea and formed his first thoughts (email from 25 November 2014) about the composition regarding a bipolar disorder – “Jekyll-Hyde”. Later that day he came up with another title 2-Pol signifying not only the bi-polarity but also two Poles working together. Another idea for a title appeared later in December 2014 and Gabrys named the piece Smile Machine House.

Gabrys disappeared during January and February 2015 due to an accident resulting in a fractured arm. He was also occupied with other commissions at that time. I mentioned to Gabrys that I had already established the date (2 April 2015) for first performances of compositions involved in the project. Gabrys believed that the date of 2 April was too soon and that he would be unable to finish the piece. Gabrys asked, however, how much was I relying on a finished score and if I would champion fractions of improvisational freedom and input in design. Such invitation was welcomed by me as it suggested fully collaborative composer/performer experience. I contacted Gabrys again in June to check on the progress of the new piece. He replied that he had been overwhelmed with concerts that he did not transfer his musical ideas onto a paper.

---

At that time his ideas were still developing and from time to time I was approached with questions such as:

> Are you able to collect old rusty pieces of broken flutes? (A. Gabrys, personal communication, June 26, 2015).

His vision was to picture a landfill of old and broken flutes and a scene of a performer digging up pieces and putting them together. He also asked if I owned a bow but did not explain how it might be used in the piece. The main idea of depicting the bipolar shifting moods, using the voice and the acting continued and developed. During the conversation via email (26 June 2015) Gabrys elaborated further about the idea for his composition:

> I am thinking of a standardised form of bipolarity with elements of ultra-realistic paranoia flavoured with the Asian obedience of rules and the Vatican’s superiority over ‘bulldogs fighting under the carpet’ [...] the sickness is natural and everybody is as sick as they are healthy”. Gabrys’ idea was to shock and display extremes to the audience. A musical material was meant to be based on a collage of random musical excerpts (from classical to pop) and improvisation (A. Gabrys, personal communication, June 26, 2015).

In September 2015 I contacted Gabrys to check on the progress of a new piece. He replied that there had been some delays and “artistic suffering” but he promised to supply a draft within a few days. In the next few messages he sought my approval while continued developing and sharing his provoking ideas, including the title 2-Pol-Run:

- 2-Pol as in Tupolev, the President’s madness ^5^;
- 2-Pol as in Poles (location);
- 2-Pol – two Poles (Polish people) on two Poles (location);
- Run as in Acceleration to Action.

(A. Gabrys, personal communication, September 16, 2015)

Gabrys also included expletives in narration and inserted innuendos regarding cases of paedophilia troubling the Vatican and the Catholic church. Further messages included an agreement on duration of the piece (5 minutes), a change to the title from 2-Pol-Run to Metatron (a song of the angel who sits beside the God) and a confirmation of preserving the piece in an acoustic format. On 18 September 2015 Gabrys emailed the script with descriptive notes. The script contained abstract text of mixed languages and fragments of musical notation.

Gabrys wrote:

---

^5^ On 10 April 2010, a Tupolev Tu-154 aircraft of the Polish Air Force crashed near the city of Smolensk, Russia, killing all 96 people on board including the President of the Republic of Poland and the Polish government officials. (Wikipedia, 2018).
I am still working on multiphonics I wish to include however this music material is based on sung by me a recorded sweet melody. […] Play motifs of that melody alternating with texts spoken to the audience. Your behaviour on stage should reflect on a dog, mixed with barking, shouting, whispering and playing (A. Gabrys, personal communication, September 18, 2015).

As an example and as afflatus Gabrys emailed a score and recording of his composition Avanti, Amico! for clarinet solo. He suggested I should remain uninhabited in re-arranging the musical material not only to suit the text but also to contradict it. I asked Gabrys if he intended to present the material in the form of a notated score and pre-planned chain of theatrical events. He replied that his intention was to produce a clear score and he emphasised that he only supplied draft versions of 2-Pol Run. In the meantime I was working with the score of Avanti, Amico! to find more ideas beyond the abstract melodic outline sent by Gabrys in the script. I adapted the ideas such as quartertone scales (Example 18a), bending notes (Example 18b) and fluttertongued glissandos (Example 18c) from his composition for clarinet:

Example 18a. A. Gabrys Avanti! Amico! - ascending and descending quartertone scales.

Example 18b. A. Gabrys Avanti! Amico! - bending the notes.
In time I developed an original musical idea for improvisation based on a repeating motif of an ascending interval of the sixths (both major and minor). Working with Gabrys’s was challenging in many ways. As the concept of transformation between a human and the dog resulting in personification of the God seemed clear to me, there were certain aspects of written text I could not sensibly fit into the overall context. I decided to remove all phrases written in Polish language except for the first sentence that imitates barking of a dog - *hau, hau* (Pol.) translated as *woof, woof* which is pronounced *how, how*. The decision to keep this phrase was made in connection to the first sentence of the script: *How to do it?* I knew that without further explanation a non-Polish speaking audience would not pick up on this transition between languages. Two remaining languages: English and German were kept. Another part of the script that I intended to remove was the part where I introduce myself to the audience: “*My name is Michal Rosiak and I am a flautist*”. The reason why I decided to remove this part was two-fold: firstly, I objected to associate myself or the remaining text as my opinion and, secondly, I felt the composition would relinquish its universalism.

Between October 2015 and January 2016 I remained occupied with other collaborative projects and the working relationship with Gabrys was on hold. I allowed myself some time to develop ideas for a performing flow since 2-Pol-Run required improvisation based on a collage of events (texts and sounds). I contacted Gabrys on 8 January 2016 asking if he produced further drafts or ideas. He instantly replied that he did not make any changes but he was happy to continue working on 2-Pol-Run. Until April 2016 there was no communication nor new developments on the piece. I informed Gabrys (email from 9 April 2016) that 2-Pol-Run was scheduled for performance in October 2016. There was some sporadic exchange of emails between April and September but no discussion of details of the composition or performance. The last conversation relating to the premiere of 2-Pol-Run was conducted one week before the recital. My final idea for interpretation was messaged to Gabrys:

> I will present a split personality between a DOG (bass flute) and GOD (C flute) using fragments of your text with some modifications and further improvisation. The same will apply to the music material which is based on what you have already written plus excerpts from your clarinet pieces. I know that we agreed to make the piece with no electronic enhancements but I am now thinking of including a recorded track with your
singing (modified by filtering and layering) (M. Rosiak, personal communication, October 10, 2016).

Gabrys was very pleased with the video recording and the effort put in the performance. He admitted that he doubted that the project would be finalised as it was so stretched in time. Upon analysis of the video recording Gabrys suggested to include more “dog-like” movements during the performance. I, however, decided to keep my movements on stage as static as possible. Soon the next recording was sent to Gabrys for comments. The composer still insisted to achieve more barking and howling as well as bipolar spasms of frequently changing moods (e.g.: crying and laughing). He again emphasised an inclusion of “dog-like” movements on stage, for instance – “marking a territory” (A. Gabrys, personal communication, October 14, 2016).

Gabrys also suggested using a greater variety of extended techniques and over-expressive communication with the audience (Gabrys kept insisting that while depicting a mental illness a performer should abandon the perception of normality). I knew that Gabrys would like me to achieve maximum freedom on stage and based on supplied video recordings he felt as though I was still reserved in performance. A total emancipation of extreme behaviours remained an unresolved problem. As much as I could understand what Gabrys expected I kept my reservation from certain suggestions such as spitting and swearing at audiences. At times 2-Pol-Run was becoming too theatrical and too bogged down in descriptive technicalities which, according to my taste, disadvantaged the composition. I thought that a simple approach embraced within only a few theatrical scenes and improvised music could equally serve the idea of bipolarity. I returned to Gabrys asking if we could focus my work on sound material rather than theatricality. The idea of standing sideways and staring at the wall (imaginary audience) during the performance was simple and I decided to preserve it. However, turning into toward the audience and perform a combination of other movements was becoming overly complicated in terms of stage logistics. Gabrys elaborated further that “acting” was misunderstood by me and it should be treated as a by-product of a “meta-musical” experience – “actors act but you need to be yourself”. He then emphasised the importance of transferring emotions through all available channels and shifting to a new level of performing music. My request for a notated score was also declined by Gabrys who wrote:

…pull everything apart, including your classical way of thinking about the piece, choose a phrase, motif or a single note and play for as long as you find a new meaning of it. I wanted to provide you with RULES of the piece not a notated score. This is a creation of a performer based on his own feelings and understanding of a vision. (A. Gabrys, personal communication, October 14, 2016)

Two days before the premiere I prepared the script of a spoken text and a few annotations regarding the musical material. I still aimed to have some sections of 2-Pol-Run improvised
accordingly to my performance flow. I also prepared a recorded track with Gabrys’ voice (a voice track he emailed me at the start of our collaboration) that had been filtered and layered. The performance of 2-Pol-Run was presented during the recital on 17 October 2016 at the Queensland Conservatorium. Unfortunately due to technical difficulties the recorded track did not sound during the performance. As previously stated I used the C flute and the bass flute to reflect on “god” and “dog” relationships. I also remained sideways in a “dog-like” position and did not move during the performance. 2-Pol-Run was received enthusiastically and the message of bipolarity was transparent to the audience. I still feel that the piece has potential for further development and offers many angles of artistic approach.

Collaboration with Gabrys was mostly carried through the social media with a few occasions of exchange of emails. The exchange of email helped to share larger files such as scans and recording samples. Instant messaging proved to be the most successful in exchanging ideas without delays. The overall experience of collaborating with Gabrys was immersed in exciting events such as search for new musical and non-musical performance solutions. A great deal of improvisation of 2-Pol-Run resulted in a minimalistic score (guide) containing text and musical ideas. The collaboration with Gabrys was based on understanding, openness and trust where a demarcation between roles of composer and performers often did not exist.

Toccata and Schizophonic Toccata exhibited the phenomenon of a creative symbiosis within my simultaneous practices as composer and performer. This phenomenon (cognitively) challenged the attitude of separate personalities (if traditionally understood as composer and performer) by combining the roles within a homogenous environment (a single-minded organism). Such a working relationship could be understood as self-collaboration as it concerned a self-evaluation of autonomous creative processes: composition and performance. For this project I chose an existing composition for flute solo (Toccata) to confront my past experiences as composer and performer. In exercising such a confrontation, I expected to observe either attempts to alter and modify the piece or the tendency to remain faithful to its original version. The content of this chapter was gathered based on retrospective details on working processes. A symbiotic consideration here did not concern a transition of a performer becoming a composer (Toccata was a fully notated composition with no improvisatory elements where no creative input was required) but only a composer becoming a performer (the faithful execution of my own ideas).

Toccata for flute solo was composed in 2009 and then later dedicated to Geoffrey Collins (Principal Flautist with the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra). In 2011 the piece was presented at the Australian Flute Festival in Canberra. The composition initiated from sketches consisting of motifs and ideas for further development. A direct influence to flavour the piece with an existing material came from my re-examination of Bach’s Partita for flute solo. Around 2009 a fascination with quoting of other composers’ works surfaced in my practice as composer. Once the overall idea for a composition was formulated, the process of writing it down and completing the work took only a few days. In case of my own practice, writing for the flute was as pragmatic as it was straightforward. I used the instrument on a regular basis to explore possibilities such as extended techniques or review playability of my ideas. During the composition process I managed not use the flute for any music material exploration or difficulty evaluation of Toccata. The only time the instrument was materialised happened after Toccata was completed, to audit its dexterity. All extended techniques included in the piece were already utilised and scrutinised in my other works for flute including Australian Suite for flute and piano (2006). The construction and style of Toccata utilised semantic gestures of the Baroque style, especially the use of conventions of repetition and ornamentation. Toccata has also been augmented by a few extended techniques like finger-slide glissandos (Example 19a), microtonal trills/glissandos⁶ (Example 19b), flutter tonguing and harmonics (Example 19c).

---

⁶ In 1999 I participated in Bohemia Festival near Prague where I was fortunate to meet Ulrike Fromm-Pfeiffer, a Baroque violin expert from Stuttgart. We discussed the idea of transferring the Baroque embellishment techniques of string instruments, such as microtonal trills, into the flute playing. During the Festival I performed Sonata in a minor for flute solo by C.P.E. Bach with the use of microtonal trills.
Example 19a. Toccata bar 7 – Finger slide.

Example 19b. Toccata bars 33-34 – Microtonal trill/gliss.

Example 19c. Toccata bar 21 – Harmonics

The slower part of Toccata quoted J.S. Bach’s Bourrée Anglaise from his Partita for flute solo (Example 20).

Example 20. Toccata: highlighted quotation from Bach’s Partita.
The formal structure of the piece explicitly informed about one movement composition; however, two slower sections (Bach’s Bourrée) implied distinctively the change of character. The change of tempo (Slower) lasted only for a few measures and smoothly transitioned into a tempo. The tempo of Toccata has been indicated as Very Fast with no clear definition of a metronomic time. Such practice of omitting a precise metronomic description was commonly used by me and it allowed for flexible approach in choosing the speed within a given suggestion. To support this application I, again, referred to Bach’s flute music often abandoning tempo markings and presenting demands on flute players to rely on their own “taste” (Donington, 1973. p. 243). Consequently this practice addressed those performers who on a few occasions complained about my indicated tempi being too quick. Finally Toccata allowed the performer to showcase the range of colours throughout all registers as well as use of contrasting dynamics and variety of articulations.

As performer I began working on Toccata in early 2014. I noted that a fully collaborative process of composer-performer interaction occurred during the composition phase, even though there was no use of an instrument at that time. My technical abilities were incorporated within a piece the way I would have wished another composer to do. There was no need for further technical modification of the piece. I exercised self-evaluation which included the rehabilitation of ideas which remained consistent with Toccata’s original subject. As indicated previously I allowed myself to adjust the tempo accordingly to my preference and experiment with other tempi within the suggested marking. The slower section where the Bach’s quotation was present had been played much slower (almost Adagio) than its original representation. I felt the description (Slower) might cause confusion among other performers, especially if they decided to follow the traditional performance practice of Tempo di Allegretto or crotchet equals 108mm. The finger slide glissandos were also given an inaccurate description as not all of them required sliding fingers back on keyrings. Despite all technical challenges being designed accordingly to my individual technique, some parts required further familiarisation with the context and establishment at secure fingerwork. Within a short period of preparation time Toccata was ready for performance. At that point there was no performance scheduled; however, I intended to include Toccata as soon as a substantial collection of compositions was completed.

In the mid-2014 I started preparation for the recording of my CD Angry Tunes and I decided to include Toccata as one of featured compositions. I invited the Brisbane-based flautist Janet McKay to perform Toccata for the CD recording and commence collaboration. McKay did agree; however, she expressed her surprise with the request and asked why I decided to not to record it myself. The explanation of such experiment linked to my self-collaborative period as performer when I became increasingly curious about how other performers would approach the piece. From such an unusual collaborative setting, with composer/performer working with another performer, I expected to discover new information about the dynamics between...
participants. During the rehearsal prior the recording McKay and I discussed the same set of issues as those experienced by me during the self-collaborative phase. Those questions revolved around tempi and notational transparency of extended techniques. Suddenly McKay and I started playing an extract from Toccata simultaneously which conceived a new idea of a simultaneous performance.

The term schizophonic first occurred to me during the lecture concerning the erotic in ethnomusicology conducted by Prof Deborah Wong at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University in September 2014. I investigated further the origin of this term which was first employed by R. Murray Schafer in The New Soundscape (Toronto, 1969, pp. 43-47) and which referred to the split between an original sound and its electroacoustic reproduction in a soundscape. Further searches revealed the existence of at least five albums in Pop genre titled Schizophonic including one by former Spice Girl Geri Halliwell. Strikingly the word schizophonic had thematically fitted into my collaborative projects, mostly because of its presumed relationship to a mental disorder (schizophrenia) and consequently touched on disability. Following this reasoning pattern the term immediately attached to Toccata and my collaboration with McKay. It must be stressed that in relation to Toccata, Schafer’s “schizophony” did not reflect his original electroacoustic idea; nonetheless it bonded with “schizophrenia” as a reversed phenomenon: two already split sound effects (two performers) originating in one source (compositional idea, score). The original version of the piece was not intended to be tied with disability; however, the experimentation and the striking effect on performers and listeners led me into a conclusion of such correlation. Simultaneous performances of the same piece created a new dimension for performance practice and offered new auditory experience. This innocent exercise elicited interesting observations about mutual influences created during those performances. Schizophonic Toccata required an interpretative independency from performers and an ability to block out the other background noise (the other performer). The task seemed to be an uneasy one as the other performer has also been considered as the foreground sound. The first difficulty that McKay and I encountered was to commence the piece, as it required abandoning ensemble thinking and remaining independent. The challenge here manifested itself as participation in a duet formation. Quite naively, the second player could fall into the first’s interpretative suggestions such as: tempo, articulation, dynamics and intonation and then implement them into their performance. Secondly, McKay’s role as a performer required not only an accurate execution of the score but also the

---

7 “This dissociation [the sound being spilt from the makers of the sound] I call schizophonia, and if I use a word close in sound to schizophrenia it is because I want very much to suggest to you the same sense of aberration and drama that this word evokes.” (Schafer, 1969, p. 43).

8 In my conversation with Prof Deborah Wong on the 18th of September 2014 it was apparent that the practice of simultaneous performances has been widely present and active in cultures around the world as well as well documented in ethno musicological writings. However, this concerns usually performances of two or more compositions or improvisations but not of the same piece. I am still in a search for any evidence of synchronous performances (in time and place) of the same composition.
implementation of her own interpretative ideas in juxtaposition with the authority of the composer’s interpretation as in: *he wrote it so he knows what it should sound like.* On the other hand McKay’s performing solutions could have impacted my perception of different approaches to the piece. My retrospective auto-analysis even carried out during the performance, not only questioned my own interpretation as a flute player but also the work’s design solutions from the composer’s perspective. Two questions arose whilst rehearsing *Schizophrenic Toccat*a:

1. **Should we stay in tune or perhaps tune up before we start?**
   The answer was neither. We decided not to match the tuning if we wished to create the impression of independence.

2. **Who should start playing first?**
   We thought that we should leave it up to our own judgement on a day – as per ordinary single player performance and not to pay attention to the other player movements.

It is worth mentioning that whoever started first had to challenge and defend one’s own performance and not falling into the process of reproducing. The considerable difficulty of this entire exercise, for both of us as performers, was to remain focused on our own performances and be able to isolate from the background noise. This very noise was nothing less than a natural (organic) echo and unlike the electroacoustic delay this one was *humanly* unpredictable and never the same.

The premiere of *Schizophrenic Toccat*a took place on the 18th of September 2014 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. The performers were Janet McKay and me. I felt it was necessary to offer a comprehensive explanation to the audience on what they were about to experience. By looking at the program the first impression was a controversy – why two performers are presumed to attempt a piece for solo flute? I stressed that the happening was not intended to be a duet *per se* and both players were required to stay independent in their own performative space. I encouraged the audience to seek multitude choices of perception during the performance:

1. Concentrate only on one performer’s presentation and treat the other performance as a background noise.
2. Switch between performances during the happening.
3. Listen to both performances simultaneously as they created a split sonic experience (or a duet/canon)

The unpredictability of an outcome was a significant factor for the performers and the audience. Even though McKay and I had a clear vision of our own interpretation the outgoing sonic effect was never the same when combined into one performance. The performing challenges affecting perception could relate to the following factors:
1. Volume (degree of dynamic levels). It has been noticed that extreme dynamics created immediate listening attraction from the other player (and the audience).

2. Tempo (different realisation of vague descriptions such as Slow or Fast where precise metronomic tempo indications were absent). This issue was one of the most fascinating and unpredictable aspects of the performance. It could manipulate the gravity of the piece by creating delays echoing effects, syncing players in unison and splitting them apart again. Such gravitational shifts could occur in any stage during the performance or remain constantly delayed due to matching speeds of both performers.

3. Articulation (emphasis and clarity). Similar to dynamics, the changes in articulation could draw attention of both the performers and the audience. It has been observed that changing length of notes (especially in delayed performance) could complement the piece and add a contrasting dimension to its perception.

4. Intonation (no tuning note at the start of performance). The issue of intonation was predicted to blur the actual pitch. The overall sonic experience required to stay in tune with oneself which with highly developed ensemble skills appeared challenging. The performers naturally sought a reference tone to tune in and habitually adjusted the pitch while playing in unison.

I was very curious to find out how the spectators responded to this exercise. A majority of respondents randomly selected from the audience found no difficulty in focusing their attention on only one performance at the time. During the performance McKay and me were situated on opposite ends of stage where the venue’s acoustics helped in separation of sound and assisted the audience in deciding on listening choices. Overall the performative schizo-duet effect was engaging and responses from the audience regarding the unique and non-replicable sonic experience of Schizophrenic Toccata were favourable. This very impression created a dualism between the overall sonic effect which I could profoundly call a überstück (uncontrolled and random subjects, thoughts, ideas or emotions) versus an artefact (scores with intentionally designed ideas, graphically crafted notation and description). The artefact might appear what Stravinsky called “potential music” (Stravinsky, 1970, p. 161). In performance of Schizophrenic Toccata the phenomenon of überstück would always be the final product delivered to the audience and it would never be repeated – interestingly such outcome would also be expected from any other form of music performance, as in: each life performance would never be exactly the same. Even if the audience would choose to concentrate on only one performance, from its beginning to its end, this could not dismiss the presence of the überstück. The state of communication with a bare artefact (the score) would always be exclusive to a performer and it may never go beyond its concrete form. This would mean that the composer’s original thoughts, ideas and intentions could not be replicated. Even in the situation when the composer took a role of the performer, the skin of an executor and interpreter would attach firmly enough allowing the performing composer for another unique recreation of his/her own piece.
As previously stated the audience was given a choice of three way of receiving a performance of *Schizophonic Toccata*. Rationally, if at least one member of the audience was focusing on the particular performance that concluded first, I should have expected a reaction, either positive (clapping) or negative (booing) on conclusion of that performance. Some of the audience members admitted that they could easily separate one performance from another by focusing on a chosen one; however, they did not react until the second performance was finished. The unaccustomed audience could possibly fall into accustomed way of listening and untrained performers (my first rehearsal with McKay) could also engage in perceptive ensemble playing. The overall experience with *Schizophonic Toccata* highlighted my interest in subconscious in perception of musical works in terms of listening and performance.

Both versions, *Toccata* and *Schizophonic Toccata*, were presented by me in February 2015 at the Banff Centre for Creativity in Canada. The performance of the original version took place during the recital Musical Encounter at the centre. In general, my performance was faithful to my own vision and the notated score. The only changes were made to the tempo at the beginning which was slightly slower than envisaged by me as composer. *Schizophonic Toccata* was performed by me during Set on the Edge recital which included slightly more experimental compositions. For this performance I chose McKay’s recording to accompany me as a second source of sound. Inclusion of the recorded track, however, removed the human factor from the experience which could present a new set of questions. To avoid this crucial element being eliminated I decided to engage a person responsible for launching the track. The audio engineer became an active participant of *Schizophonic Toccata* as he was responsible to commence the recording in his own time. Interestingly, such simple exercise appeared to cause temptation for me and the audio engineer to sync performances.

It is important to point out that the topic of *Schizophonic Toccata* was not intended for inclusion in the overall project examining creative symbiosis between the composer and the performer. It appeared as by product of my self-collaborative relationship with my own composition and it warrants further investigation in the future. Experimentations with *Schizophonic Toccata*, although extremely interesting and absorbing, diminished the role of the composer and focused on paradigm of interrelationship between performers and audio reception of the audience. My pragmatic approach to self-collaboration with *Toccata* resulted with relatively epigrammatic process, considering the fact that the piece was already completed. Retrospectively, the creation process included formulating developmental motivic ideas, borrowing the musical material from Bach’s music and utilising elements of the Baroque style. During the process of self-evaluation the symbiosis remained unaltered and only performance issues required minor adjustments.
**Hysteria for cello solo right hand only:** Collaboration with the performer Dominik Polonski.

There were two reasons for asking Polonski to partake in this project:

1. The aftermath of our Facebook conversation on 18 February 2013.
2. My unfulfilled and ongoing desire to write a piece for cello solo.

The Facebook conversation that took place in 2013 belonged to those casual conversations that glides over topics between the family wellbeing and recalling the past. During this online chat I mentioned that one of my recent commissions involved a student-level piece for cello and piano. Polonski was not interested to hear about the new piece (even though I hoped he would be able to take a copy and pass onto his students) but asked me:

> Do you know how much music can be written for just open strings? Do you know how expressive this music can be? (D. Polonski, personal communication, February 18, 2013)

I did not know the answer to those questions but the curiosity had quickly connected to my second point – finally writing a piece for cello solo. In the same conversation Polonski expressed his willingness to visit Australia which during this project was impossible to arrange. I thought, though, that his involvement in this research can virtually transport him to Australia and show his extraordinary capabilities.

Polonski was one of the first musicians I collaborated as a student at the Primary and Secondary Music School, playing in the flute quartet or performing Brahms cello sonatas (with me as a pianist!). Over the years we developed a friendship which was stamped with enormous fascination to not only music making but also living it with every breath. Polonski’s dedication to the cello was like nothing I had ever seen before and for a long time I could not understand it. One of the most vivid memories of such dedication was a day when I was reading a book outside his practice room while he tested one single note for three hours. When he left the room, he said: “I finally found the sound I wanted!” It is important for the reader to comprehend this part of Polonski’s personality to further understand this collaboration. In a peak of Polonski’s performing career something unexpected happened, something that had entirely changed his life. In 2004 Polonski was diagnosed with the brain tumour and underwent a number of surgeries causing a partial paralysis to the left side of his body. The Polish music scene reacted immediately offering great support especially in post-surgery rehabilitation. Being already moved out from our home town I came to see Polonski in November 2005. He was already going through a very promising rehabilitation therapy in Germany and became mobile, even though the doctors predicted a wheel chair for the rest of his life. During this meeting Polonski said: “Until now my career path was straight, and I could even see the top of it, now it is just
slightly twisted but I can still see the goal.” I was utterly moved and I knew that his spirit would bring him back on stage. In January 2009 he indeed came back and premiered *Cello concerto for right hand* by Olga Hans with the Warsaw Philharmonic Orchestra. Since then Polonski has premiered at least 30 new works for cello right hand commissioned for him.

Polonski was officially asked to participate in this research project in December 2013 and he agreed immediately. He thought that it would be interesting to embrace new pathways of *sonorism* (so typical for Polish composers) within my research. The composition process was left untouched mainly due my struggle to put anything on the paper. On a number of occasions between December 2013 and March 2014 I was nagging Polonski to find some time to discuss his performing capabilities. Polonski was extremely busy at that time and he was also awaiting a birth of his son. Our next conversation, this time through the Skype, happened on the 31 May 2014. While Polonski was occupied with his professional and personal commitments I took advantage of collaborating with Brisbane based cellist John Addison. The Queensland Conservatorium cohort offered exciting opportunities to meet extraordinary musicians and most importantly have insight into their practice. I felt that time with this project was elapsing and there was no substantial material written in the manuscript. I thought it would be advantageous to gather some basic ideas on the cello’s extended techniques and its overall sound capacities. My project required to consolidate basic ideas for further development. Addison was very keen to explore a new concept and offered his help. The meeting with Addison took place on 7 March 2014 and lasted for about three hours. During the meeting Addison demonstrated a number of extended techniques used in cello pieces by Penderecki, Radulescu and Sciarrino. Those techniques included:

- Scordatura
- Wood + bow
- “Thumb-Pitched” pizzicato
- Pizzicato harmonics (harp)
- Flicked pizzicato
- Pitched *battutos* (resting chin on strings)
- Circular bowing
- Percussive sounds (swipes, playing behind the bridge)

After the exploration of already existing techniques and those nearly integrated into a cello performance practice it was time to confront their effectiveness while using only right hand. The first question that Addison asked was: “How does Polonski tune his cello?” (J. Addison, personal communication, April 7, 2014). The next step was to place the cello on a right shoulder. This movement changed the concepts of some extended techniques (bowing ones) and introduced some new possibilities (placing of the bow). All the listed techniques were more or
less successful in playing with only the right hand but still the performance was limited to open strings. Only “thumb-pitched” pizzicato offered the ability to create a scale-based melody. The important technique that changed my mindset as composer was to apply different bow pressure on strings and produce harmonic ranges even behind the bridge. Working with Addison benefited my creativity previously stuck with no clear ideas and all his explorative techniques were carefully noted and catalogued ready to be introduced to my compositional process. I mentioned working with Addison to Polonski but he did not react to it. On a personal level the topic of working with another cellist has never been discussed and I had no idea how Polonski would have felt about it. Only on one occasion he demanded to give a premiere of the piece to him not to anyone else. I did not keep that promise.

As a complete neophyte I determined to further study the extended techniques which took me into the world of mathematics and acoustics sciences. I found one research particularly interesting and helpful which was Ellen Fallowfield’s *Cello map: A handbook of cello technique for performers and composers*. I cross-checked Addison’s techniques with Fallowfield and further deepened my interest in applying the bow pressure on strings. Some ideas on how the sound could be transformed came from the simplified diagram created by John Schelleng in the 60’s (Figure 6):

![The Schelleng Diagram](image)

*Figure 6. The Schelleng Diagram shows how the bow pressure and its placement effects the sound*.9

Having a more informed understanding of extended techniques I began first sketches of a new piece in April 2014. Undoubtedly the melodic material was scarce. Working with only four

---
9 (Collins, 2015)
open strings limited melodic possibilities to tunes that can be found in the repertoire of a
beginner cellist. I then decided to add three other instruments and compose a string quartet
(Example 21). With additional instruments the sound spectrum seemed to offer more
possibilities.

Example 21. Rosiak - Bagatelles for string quartet (sketch).

Before my Skype conversation with Polonski on 31 May 2014 I emailed him my ideas for
Bagatelles for string quartet – with a cello part designed for only right hand playing. I expected
that this could give us a starting point for any further discussions. Polonski did not approve any
additional instruments as he thought they would try to make up for his inability to play two-
handed. He called it “an artificial hand” and completely rejected the idea of a string quartet. I
returned to tabula rasa. During the conversation Polonski further elaborated on composers who
write pieces for him and who treat him like a “triangle in the orchestra”. He explained that some
composers still seek for melodic solutions and if they do not find it in the right hand cello part
they move on to other orchestral instruments leaving the solo part brimming with special effects only. Polonski strongly objected this style of writing.

At that point of our collaboration it was already evident that my working relationship with Polonski might be challenging, demanding and even onerous at times. Since we have known each other for many years we allowed for straightforwardness and bluntness in each conversation (this integrated procedure caused immediate dissolution of any doubts and misinterpretation). In our conversation Polonski mentioned other composers who asked him to demonstrate his capabilities and relied too intensely on such practices in their compositional work: “I basically wrote pieces for THEM!”, he exclaimed. It was crucial from my perspective to balance our working relationship equally and work out my own compositional process.

Since the composition of Bagatelles for string quartet had failed I returned to my collection of extended techniques and a blank piece of manuscript paper. I desperately needed to absorb ideas that could trigger my creative thinking. In June 2014 I started exploring the literature concerning disability in the arts and particularly in music performance. The topic was consuming me and through the work of Straus, Learner and Jamieson I was able to find the inspiration for a piece. Straus (2011) and his comparison of a disabled human body (punctured container) to a deformed musical form (and a musical blockage) has delivered the concept of a formal structure for the piece. The theme for the piece was found in Jamieson’s book Touched with Fire where he laid out three mental states that accompany the majority of mental illnesses (1993, p.13). The work title for the piece was Hysteria and the formal structure predicted three movements with some formal alterations.

After Skype conversation with Polonski on 10 July 2014 I began working on a piece for cello solo. A few extended techniques such as thumb pizzicato enabled me to employ simple melodic motifs. I realised however that with such limited melodic texture the piece had to be framed within more developed rhythmic organisation. While I was working on a new draft Polonski proposed a title for the piece Alcatraz Flowers. He said that a topic of “a prison break” would have a special meaning for him as he experienced the escape from entrapment of his illness. The title did not correspond with my compositional idea and I had plans for Nostalgia and Fugue already in place which were related to mental disorders as well. Polonski also mentioned that he tuned C and G strings down a seventh and received a fascinating effect. Another idea of his was to place four C strings on the cello but due to logistics (modifications to the bridge) he only supported it for a brief moment. After all the discussion about scordatura and multiplication of re-tuning experiments, we decided to keep the consensus of four open strings in their traditional use. In August 2014 I emailed Polonski a draft page of Hysteria (Example 22).
Example 22. First version of Hysteria (draft page).

The new draft employed the majority of extended techniques to be playable with right hand, only including my first experiments with the bow pressure. This sketch was too immediately rejected by Polonski who claimed that I still searched for melodic structures and motivic development. He asked me to open up for sonic possibilities without piling up extended techniques to cover up for lack of melodies produced by open strings. After another rejection I was completely devastated as Polonski did not want to keep even a single note. For another three months everything I wrote seemed either trivial or too busy. I decided to put off the work on Hysteria for a while. Polonski was inaccessible during that time due to his commitments including the performance at the Warsaw Autumn International Festival of Contemporary Music.

In December 2014 I asked Polonski to reconnect and schedule time for another Skype conversation. The conversation happened on 2 January 2015 and it was a ground-breaking moment for my perception of approaching the compositional process.
During all my conversations with Polonski the topic of disability and limitation was non-existent as he considered such issue as irrelevant for successful collaboration. For Polonski his comeback to playing the cello meant new discoveries and shifting his mindset to a different level. For me as composer such a world was out of reach as did not experience working with limited resources. The word limited impregnated my work with Hysteria and it was used for the first time in the January conversation.

Michal Rosiak: I'm unable to write anything with such limited resources.

Dominiki Polonski: Ok [long pause]. Can you tie your shoe with only one hand?

Michal Rosiak: I can't.

Dominik Polonski: You see, I can. So, which one of us is limited?

This conversation has changed my approach to composition and allowed for emergence of ultra-ability. Disability had now become extra-ability where the new musical language was to be unveiled. At the end of our conversation Polonski requested a piece to be played on only the D string. I immediately understood the exercise and the importance to grasp possibilities produced by a single string. Polonski then concluded:

Once you managed to write a five-minute piece for one string, you can write a symphony having all four (D. Polonski, personal communication, December 20, 2014).

Following the conversation with Polonski I discarded the majority of extended techniques used in a previous version of Hysteria. Having borrowed a student cello I decided to experiment with the instrument myself. I knew that I did not need the necessary performing skills to contribute into the world of discoveries as my only area for experimentation was to test the bow pressure on strings. Following the remarks of Addison and Fallowfield, I investigated two concepts effecting the sound; firstly, speed of the bow under changing pressure and secondly, placement of the travelled and static bow on a string under changing pressure. As well I discovered that the amount of hair used in both concepts determined a variety of sound possibilities. At the end of January 2015 I managed to complete a draft of Hysteria written in a semi-graphic scoring style (Example 23). The new version included the extended techniques such as circular bowing where the issue of bow and string contact was applied. My discovery of the bow pressure possibilities mainly concentrated on receiving ranges of harmonics. The discovery stunned me as to date I had no realisation of such possibility. My misconception embraced the fact that strings need to be touched to produce harmonics.
Example 23. Hysteria - Graphic representation of the score.

The basic flow and technical content of Hysteria was completed and I desperately tried to reach Polonski to test the draft. Still, the formal concept was underdeveloped and the structure did not represent the final version of the piece. In January 2015 Polonski’s declining health prevented him from regular contacts and he was admitted to hospital. He was also unable to play through the draft of Hysteria.

Months of February and March 2015 were significant for the development of Hysteria. The six weeks Artist-in-Residence program at the Centre for Creative Arts in Banff offered me opportunities to work with other musicians. Apart from establishing new collaborations (Nini and Saxon) I intensively worked with an American cellist Maureen Kelly on the performance possibilities. The working relationship with Kelly was set up spontaneously and came out as fascination of Hysteria uniqueness. Even though Kelly was occupied with her own project she kindly agreed to try out some of the excerpts of Hysteria. The first rehearsal was full of discussions and unanswered questions due to vagueness of the handwritten sketch and my perception of audio results. Kelly’s initial question was: “How do you want me to play harmonics without touching any strings?” I replied with description of my own discoveries validated by Addison and Fallowfield. She then attempted to apply changing pressure and placement on D string and experimented with using various quantities of bow hair. The result
was outstanding and fascinating. The only problem was the ability to control those changes and use the appropriate notation in the score. Consequently, the semi-graphic score seemed to be the best option to capture my intentions. While I was resolving the problem of notation, Kelly requested some time to work on the piece in solitude. It was a good opportunity for me to concentrate on a formal part of the composition. I still considered three mental states (normality, hypomania, depression) as adequate and I sought for solutions how to implement them into a formal organisation. Ideas were circulating during causal discussions with other Banff participants among which the mental states were compared to: deconstruction, antidvelopment and confinement. My creativity fed on those discussions and a new idea proposed a linkage of each mental state to sections of a sonata form (Figure 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPOSITION</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>RECAPITULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF NORMALITY</td>
<td>HYPOMANIC STATE</td>
<td>DEPRESSIVE PHASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. New formal representations based on a sonata form.

This implied formal structure also exposed Hysteria’s programmatic nature. The question remained: how could the “new form” be transparent and understood by performers?

After a week spent working on the piece Kelly presented me with her performance of ideas and suggestions about how to improve the notation. She claimed that imprecise and vague notation would cause performers to misunderstand the piece or abandon its performance due to lack of circumscribed directions and multiple ways of interpretation. Even though I allowed and encouraged multi-interpretation I agreed to clarify my description of used techniques and sound effects. I also presented Kelly with my new idea of a formal structure which we have further discussed. Within the next few days I organised the structure for the piece and provided more clarification of the performance techniques.

Example 24. Hysteria – Crystallisation of the form.
The new version of *Hysteria* separated each motif/technique into individual boxes allowing the performer to collage his/her own mood by correlating and juxtaposing fragments (Example 24). The performer could also omit or repeat boxes as many times as desired. I decided not to specify harmonics on a D string and allow for randomness in performance. It felt important to give maximum freedom to the cellist in organising harmonics (Figure 8) and experiment with the bow pressure.

![Figure 8. Representation of random harmonic series in Hysteria.](image)

Whilst in Banff I took the opportunity to consult *Hysteria* with a visiting artist – Colin Carr\(^\text{10}\). I thought it might be beneficial for my compositional process to discuss the piece and obtain another angle for future development. Carr was keen to explore the possibilities and pointed out a number of necessities to be included in the score (Example 25):

a) Each box should represent a clear indication of tempo or time flow.

b) Use of shorter rhythmic values.

c) Gradual and contrasting dynamics.

d) Direction of a travelled and static bow (e.g.: more harmonics were produced if played downbow towards the bridge).

e) Use of chin to damp strings.

Having considered all above suggestions I produced another version of *Hysteria*. The new version included Carr’s ideas to hold the first note for as long as possible without changing the bow and mark each box with approximate times:

---

\(^{10}\) Colin Carr is currently a professor of the cello at the Royal Academy of Music in London/UK.
Example 25. Changes to Hysteria suggested by Colin Carr.

In a pre-Carr version of Hysteria each box was marked with the appropriate representation of each mental state: Interval of Normality as IoN, Hypomanic State as HS and Depressive Phase as DP. By doing so I already contradicted the idea of performers’ structural freedom and the piece suggested to be played from beginning to end and order “moods” as per my design. In a discussion with Kelly she admitted her preference of an established form without having to self-organise it. To achieve extreme uniqueness of the piece I insisted on leaving the structure open for performers; however, I indicated that they may choose to play it straight through. To give a formal indication without suggesting the flow, I rewrote the score grouping all IoN, HS and DP and implementing majority of Carr’s suggestions (Example 26). Once the procedure was done and a new score came out I asked Kelly to give an informal performance during one of Bentley Circles\textsuperscript{11} at the Banff Centre.

\textsuperscript{11} Bentley Circle was a unique opportunity for the Banff Artists-in-Residence to create their own musical encounter. During those mini-concerts/presentations the artists were invited to present their completed projects or excerpts from work in progress.

Kelly performed *Hysteria* on 24 February 2015. The piece was received with a great interest and it snowballed discussions about extra-abilities in performance among the audience. This topic was thought-provoking enough to expand the argument beyond just performance practice but also arts of creation and listening. The audience agreed to the fact that necessary adjustments would not only apply to composers and performers but also to the audience (new ways of listening). Shortly after the Bentley performance Kelly was asked to talk about her experience with *Hysteria* during my Open Studio at the Banff Centre. She mentioned that despite of her choice to strictly follow the structure of the piece she found each performance being very different. The other difficult part during the performance was to keep the left hand behind her back and tried not to naturally involve it or gesture. At the conclusion of the Banff residency Kelly promised to continue work and record *Hysteria*.

After the Banff period the preparation were underway for the recital *Inside the Collaboration* in April 2015. *Hysteria* was completed and was waiting for Polonski’s approval. Unfortunately he was still unwell both physically and mentally and also awaiting another surgery:

I have problems seeing and accessing reality plus headaches… I can’t turn off the voices in my head…(D. Polonski, personal communication, March 29, 2015).
I put on hold sending him the score until he recovered from the surgery. There was no sufficient time to find the cellist for the April performance who could present a live version of the piece. *Hysteria* demanded a digestion period and mastering the techniques required for right hand playing. I decided to contact Kelly and ask her for a recording which came a few days before the recital. The inclusion of Kelly’s audio recording of *Hysteria* into the April recital could be considered social experiment. I was extremely anxious how the audience would react to it. Similarly to the Banff reception, the audience gathered at the Queensland Conservatorium highlighted the piece as the most interesting out of all presented that night. It is important to note that having just an audio recording removes the visual experience from *Hysteria*’s reception. Based on the first public performance in Banff I suspected that the visual part of performance might be responsible for an elevated recipience. Now I was convinced that the purely musical aspect was successfully achieved. I planned, however, to present a live performance of *Hysteria* in 2016 at my final recital.

In August 2015 Polonski’s wellbeing improved and we were able to reconnect. We scheduled a Skype meeting in September 2015. In the meantime I emailed him the score of *Hysteria* and Kelly’s recording. During the Skype conversation Polonski said that *Hysteria* was constantly on his creative mind and he kept looking for new sounds. He also asked me to explain a few notational confusions such as “chin damp” and a line signifying a crossing between playing normal and behind the bridge. After the explanation of a “chin damp” technique Polonski questioned it and suggested to remove it completely. I also realised that notation of stems up for playing normal and stems down for playing behind the bridge was not clear enough. After this conversation Polonski promised to record his version of *Hysteria* for inclusion in the next recital. I planned then to include both versions: a live and a recorded one. The communication with Polonski in 2016 was very scarce and did not bring any development to the piece which was considered completed. Occasionally I reminded him about approaching deadlines and opportunities for performance. On one occasion Polonski said that *Hysteria* was too short to stand alone in any of his recitals and he encouraged me to compose additional movements. From the start Polonski was a great admirer of the idea of non-existent mental illnesses as musical subjects and he hoped for a multi-movement piece subsequently titled: *Hysteria, Nostalgia, Fugue* and also *Neurasthenia*. *Nostalgia* and *Fugue* were written for different ensemble sets.

The second recital at the Queensland Conservatorium was scheduled in November 2016 and I was in a search for a cellist who would perform *Hysteria* live. After a couple of weeks of unsuccessful attempts – not every cellist was interested in playing with only right hand – I approach Danielle Bentley who agreed immediately. Bentley spent several weeks with the score alone and we conducted two rehearsals to clarify any uncertainties. At the first rehearsal with Bentley on 16 October 2016 it was apparent to me that different cellists would not only have
different interpretative approaches but they could also have contrasting understandings of performance techniques. The score needed further adjustments in its descriptive language, especially in the areas of random/uncontrolled harmonics, repetitions, speed of the bow. I noticed that performers acted apprehensively when approach with the concept of a formal organisation of *Hysteria* and the idea of co-composing the piece. The idea of grouping moods was another questionable aspect from the performer point of view. I realised that leaving each box for free interpretation rather than manifesting a particular mood could give performers more personal and intimate connection to the piece. For instance, the first box indicating a static note being held for approximately one minute could perceive as either normal or depressive interval. For the final version of *Hysteria* I kept the grouping of moods to formalise the piece and direct performers into its programmatic nature.

The live performance of *Hysteria* was presented during the recital Creative Symbiosis on 17 October 2016 at the Queensland Conservatorium of Music in Brisbane. Bentley’s performance was expressive and the visual aspect of one-handed playing enhanced dramatism of the piece. Like Kelly, Bentley remained faithful to my organisation of the score presenting mental states (moods) in a progressive flow, from normality through hypomania and finishing with depression. A final version of *Hysteria* was sent to Polonski shortly after the recital and we reconnected online again at the start of 2017. During the Skype conversation on 21 March 2017 Polonski expressed comments after spending time studying the score:

Dominik Polonski (DP): It’s been awhile since I’ve seen such interesting piece.

Michal Rosiak (MR): Really? It’s all you asked for.

DP: I know.

MR: I tried to embrace everything what we’ve discussed. So, I digested it, thought about it and pushed myself to the edge of agony. It is what it is now.

DP: You did it! When I play it for you, you’ll see that it’s even better than you thought.

MR: I hope so! I think I’m still missing something in other performances.

DP: Because it’s not easy to understand. And the hardest part is to abandon the traditional performance practice and ways of listening. […] notation is only a treasure map and only performer can take you there.

MR: So, everything depends on the performer?

DP: Yes, always… The performer is a co-author and he or she is responsible for the final shape of a piece. Execution of music doesn’t exist because there is no way you could perform in exactly the same style twice.
After this conversation Polonski promised to record *Hysteria* during the summer holidays. In August 2017 he indeed made a recording and he sent three versions of *Hysteria*. All three versions were completely unique in approach and expressive language. This confirmed Polonski’s claim about not performing the same way twice. In all three recordings Polonski “composed” the piece by taking the advantage of the aleatoric form of the piece. He allowed himself to omit certain boxes and repeat others. *Fingernail tremolo* was misinterpreted by Polonski as *fingernail pizzicato* but unclear description of this technique in the score could mislead all performers. Kelly and Bentley had direct access to my explanations during our rehearsals. On several occasions Polonski juxtaposed techniques without respecting the material of entire boxes in all three recordings which enhanced his performance expressiveness. The changing of a bow pressure was extremely well developed by Polonski. It resulted in achieving new effects in the circular bowing such as *scratchy* and violently harsh sound. The most effective response on changing the bow pressure, placement and the amount of hair was audible in Polonski’s tremolos. He not only achieved a range of overtones but also resonating sub-tones particularly audible in the second and third version. Interestingly, Polonski finished his first recording of *Hysteria* with a harmonic which indicates an implied interval of normality and his other two recordings concluded with a pizzicato which could only be found in a hypomanic state.

It may seem biased to work with five different cellists on *Hysteria* and not to rely on Polonski alone. In this case the symbiosis between composers and performers survived established personal relationships but does not thrive without direct access to creative nourishment. Online collaboration with Polonski allowed for instant exchange of thoughts and ideas as well as offered sufficient response time whenever complex answers had to be formulated. In the process of mapping the creative symbiosis this collaboration was the longest due to a main participant’s limited availability and, therefore, the assimilation of other participants. Working in solitude, without direct access to a performer, would possibly cause discontinuation of this type of project. Thanks to open discussions, mutual trust and constant experimentation, working with Polonski and other cellists was immensely rewarding. I was not only able to compose a piece for cello right hand and one string but I was also transformed as musician. The evolution of my creative personality included understanding the limitation in resources as springboard to find new solutions in composition and performance.
Fugue for flute, vibraphone and double bass: Collaboration with the performers Emma Sullivan and David Montgomery.

Fugue exemplifies a working relationship between performers Emma Sullivan and David Montgomery and me as a composer. The collaboration was a spontaneous reaction to fascination with each other’s work practices and activated due to favourable environmental conditions. It was expected that each artist would participate fully in the collaborative process and not be limited to technical contribution exclusively.

The idea of creating a working relationship between Sullivan and Montgomery began shortly after commencing my doctoral candidature. Both Sullivan and Montgomery were enrolled in the same program at that time. Being colleagues and peers rendered an insight into each other works and assisted in utilising the accessible environment for collaboration. Through this collaboration I was hoping to investigate a symbiosis between the composer and a group of performers. I expected that such experiment would mould interactions differently compared to a one-to-one relationship. It would consequently influence the communication between participants and channel the creative energy between through three artistic minds. The basic model of composer – performer (or a performing body such as ensemble) would still remain, even though I was also to perform. The diagram of symbiotic structures was already presented by me in the Introduction and it was interesting to observe how those structures permutate according to the nature of collaboration. The example of Fugue projected an expanded model that encompassed more options (Figure 9):

![Diagram](image.png)

Figure 9. Expanded model of a composer – performer relationship.
As Montgomery was not only an extremely fascinating performer but also a composer, his collaborative input could have impacted his interpretative decision sieved through a composer mindset. Similar to my practice, the decision would have to be made on which persona (composer or performer) might dominate. Both musicians’ expertise, however, was crucial in providing comments and alternative solutions to their instrumental parts. The idea for the piece came from the Jamison’s book *Touched with Fire* where a number of former mental disorders (now superseded or considered obsolete) such as Fugue, Nostalgia or Neurasthenia were contemplated. Those diseases once considered as serious mental disorders are no longer included as a diagnosis in the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Over time they have been absorbed into more complex mental disorders such as Amnesia and Schizophrenia. The piece was scored for flute, vibraphone and double bass and it was titled *Fugue* before any notes appeared on a manuscript. A haunting motif of a walking bass presented itself as a subject for the fugue. The dual meaning of *fugue* reflected not only on the form but also on the name of a mental disorder. At the start the piece was also subtitled a *soundtrack* to indicate a background music for non-existing motion picture – a story about sudden mental escapes. Unlike *Hysteria* and *Nostalgia*, *Fugue* was intended to respond to entire experience of a mental episode – a state of fugue by providing a musical program based on an imaginary script. Through representation of temperamental fluctuations (mood changes) *Fugue* captures the diagnostic criteria of the illness and can be described as a “syndromal” piece (Jamison, 1996, p.14). The structure followed, more or less closely, a traditional contrapuntal form of fugue. *Fugue* was also built upon three elements related to the stages of a mental episode proposed by Jamieson (1993): intervals of normality, hypomanic states and depressive phases. I interrelated those stages with the idea of deformity in musical structures (Straus, 2011) by implying a *sonata de-form*. Here, intervals of normality corresponded to exposition (Example 27a), hypomanic states to development (Example 27b) and depressive phases to coda (Example 27c). Those three elements (unlike in the sonata form) could alternate depending on my idea of a compositional flow (an untold story).
Example 27a. Fugue – a reoccurring motif represents an interval of normality.

Example 27b. Fugue – the example of a hypomanic state (rapid changes in musical expression).
Example 27c. Fugue – a depressive phase implying a coda.

The communication between the performers (Sullivan and Montgomery) and me was conducted mostly verbally as we all have resided in Brisbane. We also took advantage of regular students’ meetings that enabled us to exchange ideas and set dates for rehearsals. Only on a few occasions we communicated via email. In January 2015 Sullivan and Montgomery were presented with a first draft of the score. The draft was not accompanied by any description or a program note. My intention was not influence interpretation or reveal a formal structure. Similar to a sonata form, where the structure is not just visible in the score (repeat signs, motivic development) but also audible, I aimed to provide a listener with the opportunity to hear de-formed elements. I realised, however, that this exercise would require informed listening and knowledge of the structure for both performers and listeners. Subsequently, I asked Sullivan and Montgomery to study their parts and respond with any technical problems they may have encountered. Shortly after receiving my email, Sullivan replied:

I have some notes about Fugue that I have written below: [...] Bar 13: Unsure regarding the articulation for this bar - for a ff dynamic, I think it would be better to have a note per bow and not all in one bow, as this articulation would traditionally suggest. It still could be very legato played that way. Bar 15: This chord is possible but it is across a string (as in the Db is on the A string, the D string is not being played, the C is on the G string) - this means that the chord is completely possible to be played but it will have to be plucked, not strummed. Bar 16: This chord is very difficult to play. Both these notes are usually played on the same string so to play them on different strings to create a chord I would need to move into an extended thumb position just for that beat. At the tempo, I don't think it is achievable. Bar 33: Unsure about where the breath mark is meant to be here - do you want no sound at all on the first quaver beat or a little

Sullivan’s comments were valuable but I decided to not make any changes to the score before hearing it first. Montgomery verbally expressed his preference of discussing his part during the rehearsal rather than via email. Due to my residency in Banff in January and February 2015 the first rehearsal was scheduled in March at the ABC Studios. Due to personal engagements interstate Sullivan was unable to participate in the rehearsal. Montgomery and I took advantage of this situation that allowed us to concentrate on our parts and discuss any possibilities and impossibilities of the vibraphone part. The interactivity of rehearsal brought productive results in terms of shaping the vibraphone part and Montgomery’s understanding of the form of Fugue. I also took the opportunity to interview Montgomery asking questions about his experience in a collaborative environment.

His insights reflected on a rich experience gained through his practice as composer and performer and mostly related to practicality in composer/performer working relationship. According to Montgomery, such pragmatic approach would ensure clarity and transparency during collaboration. Regarding the Fugue, the following technicalities were discussed:

- Inclusion of cues for each instrumental line.
- Inclusion of the vibraphone’s extended techniques (glissandos and harmonics).
- Notation of pedal markings.
- Correction of misprints (missing rests and dots).
- Resolution of ensemble issues.
- Searching for more compelling sound effects overall.

We also discussed the use of descriptive terms to describe or better understand the form. For instance, the implied Coda (Depressive Phase) was later replaced with Disintegration. This move did not only mean to underline the Depressive Phase but also unveil valuable interpretation clues.

The second rehearsal was scheduled two weeks later. On this occasion, the entire trio was present and the practice time mostly considered resolving the ensemble issues. Sullivan and Montgomery were presented with a third version of the score. In this final version, the extended techniques for vibraphone were still not included due to lack of notational clarity. Montgomery claimed that it would take an advanced player to execute harmonics and bending of notes and those techniques would require a precise description and notation. The double bass part was changed according to Sullivan’s suggestions. The rehearsal time, apart from pure ensemble practice, involved discussions about the formal structure of Fugue. The question presented to Sullivan and Montgomery was: Would it be helpful for performers to have three mental states included in the descriptive part of the score? The answer was in unison: No. Like the sonata
form for instance, such experiment should remain discoverable in the score (motives and features enhanced by dynamics and articulation) and audible for recipients.

*Fugue* was premiered on 2 April 2015 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. The performance was well presented and enthusiastically welcomed by the audience. In the introduction to *Fugue*, the audience was informed about the characteristics of the piece, the implied mental illness and the *deformed* sonata form. In a conversation with some of the audience members, not all were able to identify shifts between three different mental states. In collaboration with Sullivan and Montgomery, the symbiotic relationship thrived and conveyed satisfactory results for both performers and me. During this collaboration, I pursued two roles: me as composer and me as performer obeying my own rules. The difficulty was to control each *personality* to avoid overlapping and biasing my own practice. Such uncontrolled situation would possibly not impact the relationship with Sullivan and Montgomery as it would only relate to alternation within the score or the performance.
Nostalgia for violin, horn and piano: Collaboration with the performers Graeme Jennings, Ysolt Clark and Alex Raineri.

Working relationships with performers described in my research were generally shorter than those with composers. The collaboration with Clark, Jennings and Raineri was the quickest in terms of time consumption and outcome delivery. All three musicians were offered a fee for their contribution in this project which certainly accelerated the working process. It excluded, however, a need for any closer personal connectivity.

The idea for Nostalgia project originated spontaneously during a casual conversation with the staff member of the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University - Peter Luff. Luff mentioned that he would be interested in a composition that would recall a traditional setting of a horn trio (horn, violin and piano) and revive the Romantic textural expression for such formation, particularly music of Johannes Brahms. I immediately found this request connected to a nostalgic longing for tonality that illuminates through my musical language. Interestingly the concept of nostalgic syndrome had already provided me with enough information to establish a basic concept for a new composition. The idea of inclusion of two (previously discussed) mental disorders: fugue and hysteria were already in a phase of sketching and the other two: neurasthenia and nostalgia were still considered for further exploration. Now, a new opportunity arose to link nostalgia to Luff’s musical concept. Boym (2007) refers to nostalgia as “home that no longer exists” and a cinematic superimposition of two – past and present (p. 7). My idea for Nostalgia came from the latter. I decided to recycle Brahms’s approach to composition in terms of techniques, structure (form) and instrumentation. Following Boym’s (2007) argument, I linked my personality to a historical and collective memory of the composer to create symbiotic relationship (p. 9). To revive Brahms’s style I kept the suggested setting of a horn trio: French horn, violin and piano. I also imitated the instrumental problematics presented in various Brahms’s compositions, for example: chordal structures, balance and thematic primacy in the piano part (Arnone, 2007, p. 72) and an “unviolinistic” violin part (Lee, 2001, Abstract).

Despite the pessimistic character of Nostalgia I decided to add a non-musical and perhaps a humorous element. Examples 28a and 28b show bars 107 and 112 where Brahms’s name was spelled out using musical notation as graphics. This element can only be discovered through a study of a full score but in performance remains inaudible.
Nostalgia was fuelled by usually tragic outcomes of a nostalgic mental disorder such as depression or a suicide. Therefore, in Nostalgia I implied a de-formed sonata form used in my other compositions (Hysteria and Fugue) but I have omitted a (in-score) description of its formal structure. Since the element of coda suggested a depressive phase I concluded the piece with a musical description of a suicidal horror (Example 29):

Example 29. Nostalgia – final bars.
Brahms’s musical language was used in constructing the introduction and exposure of a main theme.


Example 30 shows all instruments beginning in unison similar to Brahms’ Piano Quintet in F minor Op. 34 or Piano Trio in C major Op. 87. The main theme consists of twelve notes of a chromatic scale which indicates use of a twelve-tone technique of Arnold Schoenberg and the composers of Second Viennese School. There were two reasons for such un-Brahms-like use of melodic structure and reference to Schoenberg. Firstly, Schoenberg was a great admirer of Brahms and he remained in “Brahms’s fog” in his early works (Frisch, 1997, p. 5). Secondly, he discussed and framed the concept of disability (both formally and tonally) within his compositions and writings (Straus, p. 51).

Nostalgia exposed only one musical reference borrowed from Brahms’s music, a modified second theme from his first Piano Concerto in D minor op. 15 (Example 31):
Example 31. Reference to the 2nd theme of Brahms’s Piano Concerto no 1.

I decided not to quote Brahms’s horn trio; however, I used other features of his music to emphasise the presence in Nostalgia:

- Violin part lacks clear melodic structures. Fragmentation.
- Use of intervallic relationship of thirds and sixths.
- Doubling and tripling various degrees of chordal structures.
- Cadential approach in building and resolving climaxes.

Nostalgia was completed in January 2015 and I took the sketches to the Banff residency in the following month. The residency gave me the opportunity to consult the piano and the violin part with fellow musicians. There was no intention of initiating collaboration but only to overlook the playability of those two parts from a technical perspective. Whilst in Banff I did not make any changes to the parts and I took the opportunity to showcase a few excerpts during my Open Studio. That presentation conveyed a discussion among fellow participants about the implication of de-formed sonata form and depiction of a musical suicide.

While in Banff I emailed the horn part to Peter Luff. I also asked him to propose other players (violin and piano) he would have liked to work with. Luff responded that the horn part was completely playable and he proposed the following musicians: Michele Walsh on the violin and Kevin Power on the piano (P. Luff, personal communication, February 27, 2015). These established musicians were also staff members at the Queensland Conservatorium. However, I had no previous encounters with either of them. Immediately after receiving both musicians’ contact details I emailed the parts and a short introductory note to the whole trio. The artists’
responses were delayed and stretched over time due to their professional commitments. I encountered my first difficulty during this collaboration namely to synchronise their responses and schedule dates for an initial meeting. In July 2015 Walsh replied that she was interested in participation if both Power and Luff were secured for this collaboration. In August 2015 Power replied positively towards collaboration also emphasising that involvement of Walsh and Luff was crucial. Between September and December 2015 any attempts to schedule a rehearsal were unsuccessful. I finally decided to suspend the project until 2016.

I dedicated the first half of 2016 to other projects involved in this study and work on Nostalgia was postponed. The trio was emailed again in August 2016 with clearer plans for a performance including a number of possible dates. My plan was to program Nostalgia for the October concert where all remaining compositions involved in this research were also scheduled for performance. Both, Luff and Walsh replied that none of the proposed dates were suitable and they were unable to make amendments to their schedules. Walsh also informed me that due to her heavy work load and other professional commitments she would like to pull out of the project and she suggested to find another musician (M. Walsh, personal communication, September 9, 2016). There was no communication received from Power during that time.

The date for my final doctoral recital in October was already set and I had to make an immediate decision about the future of Nostalgia. Since the trio – Luff, Walsh and Power – insisted from the start that they wanted to work together I did not think it would be beneficial to replace Walsh with another violin player and break up the team. I made the decision to find a new group of players for the project. It is worth mentioning that the trio: Luff, Walsh and Power did not receive any offer of financial gratification for their participation. But, since time was running out I secured a small portion of my budget to invite a new team of players. At the end of September 2016 another two of the Conservatorium’s staff members were approached and invited to collaborate: Ysolt Clark (French horn) and Graeme Jennings (violin). Clark proposed Alex Raineri as a pianist as she recalled some past successful collaborative experiences with him. Raineri also agreed to participate. The new group of musicians had been offered a fee for their participation as I trusted that this move could speed up their work. With only two weeks left for the performance (17 October 2016) the musicians quickly scheduled their first rehearsal (10 October 2016). Prior the rehearsal the trio was emailed a short note about the project and the piece itself. Unfortunately, due to my work commitments I was unable to attend the first rehearsal but I asked the trio to record it for any further comments. I managed to meet Clark afterwards and have a quick discussion on how the rehearsal went. She pointed out that musicians (including herself) were disappointed that the piece did not sound like Brahms. They were expecting direct quotations from Brahms’s music. The rest of the musical material was accessible and the form was also understood. The trio managed to put Nostalgia together in two
hours of rehearsal working mostly on ensemble issues. There was no need to consult any aspects of Nostalgia with me.

Upon listening of the recording, I have noticed that musicians are playing Nostalgia much slower (crotchet = 74 MM) than indicated the score (crotchet = 90 MM). At the next opportunity (usually a coincidental meeting at the Conservatorium) I asked Clark about this. She responded that musicians felt that a more settled pace would make certain fragments more “ensemble friendly”. The next rehearsal happened on 17 October 2016 a few hours before the recital. This was my only opportunity to work with the trio; however; the structure of Nostalgia (form, description, ideas) and professionalism of performers (interpretation) made my presence completely unnecessary. I asked the performers about the speed and we all agreed to a faster tempo. The performance on 17 October 2016 at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University was successful and I was satisfied how the performers understood and interpreted the piece. The trio was presented with the recording of the recital and asked for a feedback. All three performers mostly criticised ensemble issues rather than the composition or collaborative work.

Due to the compositional nature of Nostalgia the project did not require a collaborative structure and communicative path between the composer and the ensemble. Following the nostalgic ideas and inclusion of Brahms-like elements I decided to use traditional notation and familiar to me instrumental capabilities. The elements of symbiotic relationship only illuminated through compositional features such as precise notation of ideas and a program note and from the performers’ perspective: through understanding of those ideas and re-creating them. Nostalgia did not offer explicit opportunities for creative input of performers and the symbiosis was predominantly possible through the artefact of the score. Paradoxically, even when the composer was available and easy to reach out for, such occurrence did not take place. Nostalgia was a traditionally notated contemporary composition displaying the composer’s hierarchical domination. Such authority might have impacted the performers’ decision to avoid submitting any alterations to the score.
Conclusion

Based on examination of included projects this study has demonstrated morphed variants of symbiotic relationships between the composer and the performer. The symbiosis has been shown here as either a wholly executed artistic process where creation, interpretation (re-creation) and reception (if including the audience) were achieved, a process where the outcome was achieved within a limited portion of a collective work or a hybridised mix of approaches. Predominantly, the study has revealed that a personal relationship and communication between composers and performers become main ingredients to develop an integrated and satisfying working relationship (commonly described as artistic collaboration). Since this study did not intend to exclusively examine and define collaboration as a technical process, it has elaborated on a cross pollination of influences within the composer-performer symbiotic environment.

Evidently, a creative symbiosis is the relationship where composers and performers benefit from each other’s artistic insights and contributions to a project. These artistic connections cause synergies that may manifest in a range of working relationships:

1. Self-collaboration whenever the composer is also the performer;

2. Traditionally established and hierarchical roles maintained through connections to artefacts such as scores, program notes, anecdotes;

3. A fully collaborative process of shared authorship.

In the introduction, I have already explained the origin and rationale behind the choice of each participant. The main criteria were: geographical distance between me and an artist, familiarity with an artist on personal and professional levels and an artist’s established career. Figure 10 shows a comparison of each project’s characteristics against those criteria:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Distance to travel</th>
<th>Personal connection at the start of projects</th>
<th>My familiarity with an Artist’s professional work</th>
<th>Artist’s familiarity with my professional work</th>
<th>Career, Seniority, etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Sitsky</td>
<td>Long (within Australia)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Established, Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schocker</td>
<td>Long (outside Australia)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Established, Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksander Gabrys</td>
<td>Long (outside Australia)</td>
<td>Existing, not too well developed</td>
<td>Not too well developed</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Emerging, Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Saxon</td>
<td>Long (outside Australia)</td>
<td>Existing, developed</td>
<td>Not too well developed</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Emerging, Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeya Nini</td>
<td>Long (outside Australia)</td>
<td>Existing, developed</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Emerging, Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominik Polonski</td>
<td>Long (outside Australia)</td>
<td>Existing, well developed</td>
<td>Very well developed</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Established, Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Sullivan &amp; David Montgomery</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Existing, developed</td>
<td>Not too well developed</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Established, Emerging, Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Raineri, Graeme Jennings &amp; Ysolt Clark</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Existing, not too well developed</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Some/None</td>
<td>Established, Emerging, Superior/Peer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Collaborations and their characteristics.

The process of mapping the symbiotic relationship during this project involved commencing, strengthening and maintaining forms of interactions/interrelations – both on professional and
personal level. Based on the outcome analysis of above working relationships it has been revealed that existing interpersonal connections (friendships) and acquaintances enabled to execute a complex symbiosis where mutual advantages were delivered. Since the biological definition of symbiosis refers to “interaction” between organisms, those interactions have been fundamental and entirely visible through projects such as *Hysteria, Or161n* and *2-Pol-Run*. It is worth noticing that “interaction” between the performer and the composer meets the definition requirement of collaborative process proposed by authors such as Alan Taylor, Sam Hayden and Luke Windsor. In each project the importance of connecting on a personal level has been perceived differently (subjectively) by composers and performers. I have noticed that seniority, established careers and peer environments would not affect the establishment and maintenance of personal connections. Those factors, however, would impact working relationships in areas of communication and problem-solving situations. Regardless of the level of personal engagement (pre-existing friendship or past collaborations) each project has formed a brand new working setting where working relationship was undertaken. Long-term friendships required the establishment of a new level of a professional commitment conveyed alongside the existing personal relationship and helped to maintain an effective communication based on emotional understanding, allowing a greater intimacy of expression. The projects with less developed personal connections were based on mutual respect on professional level, however, they sometimes prevented from complete openness and allowed occasional misunderstandings and misinterpretation in communication.

A long-term friendship has been a crucial factor in working with Dominik Polonski. Familiarity with each other personality and attitude enabled us to stimulate each other during workshopping *Hysteria*. A complete openness allowed us to channel honest judgements and express expectations and desires. Knowing each other’s personal musical preferences (likes and dislikes) was also causing *predicted* and *expected* clashes; for example, purposely setting up conflict situations by recalling (linking them to) past interactions and behaviours concerning emotional engagement, aesthetics and other contrasting opinions. The input of intimacy and levels of emotions in *Hysteria* project made the collaborative journey a rollercoaster charged with uncontrolled turns in communication (language) and recalling past experiences (usually mishaps). Although, the same elements have made *Hysteria* a successful and fully executed working relationship.

An antipodal collaborative structure has been articulated during my work with Gary Schocker where there has been no pre-existing personal nor professional connection. The challenging factor during this project has been the establishment of both of those relationships. Since the communication with Schocker has been limited to exchange of emails and Facebook messages it still enabled us to work and connect on a professional level but did not allow to structure a solid personal relationship. Interestingly, familiarising ourselves with each other’s private lives
(who am I working with?) has not been a part of exchange of emails. For instance, Schocker used my personal Facebook page and pictures to impose my personality. The view of my online profile has exhibited enough information to construct an artificial relationship and find an inspiration for his composition.

Working with Larry Sitsky has forged and sustained a personal relationship together with a professional one. My visits to and interviews in Canberra have certainly helped and broken any false presumptions about each other’s personalities that could generate if we decided to continue our communication based on exchange of emails. Sitsky has emphasised (in interview from 1 July 2015) that shared Slavonic background was also a factor in finding common artistic language. Even though Sitsky was promptly replying to emails and the conversation flow could have possibly sustained to the end of our project I still travelled to Canberra to maintain a personal connection. Two three-hour interview sessions benefited with familiarising with each other personalities, enabled to explain and clarify the project’s objectives and expectations. Interaction and open structured interviews (including recollection of memoirs and stories) allowed me to gather valid information about Sitsky’s attitudes and opinions towards collaboration particularly his ways of contextualising this issue. During the project with Sitsky there were no unclear and misunderstood situations and overall satisfaction was achieved on both sites.

Similarly to the biological term certain symbiotic relationships can be initiated thanks to a favourable environment. Farrell (2003) observes that “the members [of a collaborative circle] may be no more than acquaintances who happen to be in the same place at the same time” (p. 18). Due to such beneficial circumstance I established the relationships with the following artists: Odeya Nini, Katherine Saxon, David Montgomery and Emma Sullivan. The Artist-in-Residence program in Banff created an opportunity to work with other artists attending this program and on some occasions working with those outside the classical music discipline, such as writers, scholars or country musicians. The Banff residency offered the exchange of experience corresponding to nurturing collaborative settings recalled from my early education. Those offerings being concert series and workshops exclusively delivered to participants. This opportunity resulted in introduction to music of two composers: Odeya Nini and Katherine Saxon. During the residency, the composers and I managed to acquaint with each other’s personalities and listened to each other’s performances. Saxon admitted that hearing me playing live enabled her to crystallised ideas and shape her music accordingly.

The residency in Banff had not only influenced the births of new composer/performer relationships but also granted interactions with performers. It has also accommodated my presentation of selected topics that had been extracted from this research such as: working progress on Hysteria with Maureen Kelly, performance of Schocker’s Sail and my own compositions: Toccata and Schizophonic Toccata, excerpts from Fugue and Nostalgia.
The opportunity for interactions with performers enabled me to obtain their opinions about the project’s compositions, audit the playability of parts and, like collaboration with Maureen Kelly, further engage in the process of compositional development.

Another example of having access to performing artists and working closely with them was set at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. Taking advantage of interaction with other doctoral candidates Emma Sullivan and David Montgomery brought to life my composition *Fugue* for flute, vibraphone and double bass. Sullivan and Montgomery, despite of having busy performing and travelling schedules, offered their availability, time and expertise. Apart from working with peers, the Conservatorium’s habitat has opened a prospect of engaging with the staff too. The idea to compose *Nostalgia* came directly from a French horn player and Deputy Director Peter Luff and engaged instrumental lecturers: Graeme Jennings (violin) and Ysolt Clark (horn).

A specific working setting was formed around Dominik Polonski and his request for a composition for cello solo right hand only. In this case the untraditional approach to composition was required and immediate symbiotic environment had to be created. Knowing the performer’s limitations and extra-abilities by working closely with him was crucial to execute a complete set of compositional tools. The overall project has shown that a favourable environment has certainly been advantageous for either birth or evolution of certain compositions such as *Hysteria, Fugue, Journey to Expanse* and *0r161n*.

None of the projects experienced major delays but some, like *2-Pol-Run* were spread out over two-year time span and *Hysteria* over three-year time span. Each project was allocated sufficient time for composing and performing and it was taken under consideration that all artists involved had to maintain their artistic and private lives. All composers involved have been offered twelve months for completing their commissions with a possibility of an extension for another three months. Performers usually insisted to confirm a concert date as quickly as possible to adjust their schedules around it. Paid collaborations (*Sail* and *Nostalgia*) were delivered within a short period time. The duration of remaining (unpaid) engagements, both composers and performers, varied between four months (*Fugue*) to three years (*Hysteria*). For composers like Aleksander Gabrys and Odeya Nini, contributing to my project was an *ad hoc* task when writing a piece had been left to periods free from touring and performing. Larry Sitsky confessed that he carried his composition in his head and waited for the moment when it needed to be written down. At times, it was necessary to set deadlines for upcoming performances which helped to plan rehearsals and deliver scores on time. All composers and performers complied with deadlines and nobody requested additional time or failed to deliver their symbiotic contribution.

As mentioned above, a paid working relationship has proved to deliver expected outcomes within short timeframes and secured a high level of priority in composers’ and performers’
work. The professional relationship within those two projects has been well maintained whereas personal relationship had not developed. It is worth noticing that closest familiarity (work place and previous professional engagements) with some of performers made those artists feel responsible and in charge of a project. They prioritised communication with me and other artists as well as organised a rehearsal schedule. Since the absence of the performer/composer intimate relationship the level of satisfaction remains unknown in regard to participating artists. The symbiosis has only been seen through the medium of a score produced in solitary and translated into a language of musical performance.

Unpaid projects have been characterised by more extended waiting periods where the artists first responded to their commitments such as work, family and paid engagements. Those projects have been characterised by more developed communication, openness for experimentation and exchange of ideas whilst professional engagement was further maintained. The artistic fulfilment after completion of unpaid projects has also been greater than the paid ones. I have observed that prioritising collaborative tasks, both paid and unpaid, has been depended on personal qualities of each artist and their communication capabilities.

Even though multiple communication platforms were available, not all of them were utilised in working relationships. The most effective type of communication was personal interaction which was also available for long distance collaborations (Skype, social media). Social media messenger allowed me and Gabrys for a quick exchange of ideas in a cyber world where collective work was undertaken in a solitary environment. It was also a beneficial introductory tool for setting up a relationship with Schocker. For all types of working relationship (long and short distance) the easiest and most reliable tool was email exchange. This communication tool created a sufficient space for setting up meetings, deadlines and discussions about technicalities. This research has revealed that the exchange of emails was unsuitable for conversations/discussions, brainstorming ideas and any creative work. It was evident in the example of collaboration with Schocker, where misunderstandings, unanswered questions and often lack of conversational fluidity have stalled the working relationship. It is worth mentioning that the email exchange between me and Schocker was very active but no other communication form was ever initiated. The fact of restricted communication between me and some of the artists (usually paid engagements) did not disable a delivery of the product. I did, however, leave the question of successful dynamic between personalities and satisfactory outcomes. Face-to-face communication appeared to be the most effective in discussing ideas for compositions and performance and enabled an interactive approach during meetings and rehearsals. Regardless of forms of communication, however, the outcome was achieved in all instances.

The overall project embracing all eight collaborations (not including Toccata and Schizophonic Toccata) has illuminated the importance of communication as a fundamental ingredient for a
successful working relationship. The main research question: How can self-initiated collaboration influence a symbiosis and its creative outcome? focused on multiple collaborative approaches and the journey through the life cycle of a musical composition. This research has presented the evidence that regardless of the degree of a symbiotic relationship the outcome was achieved. It has also shown that a one-sided initiative could affect the trajectory of a musical evolution. Both composers and performers, could choose the degree of personal engagement which consequently impacted the symbiosis leaving them merely developed or completely flourishing. The answer to the sub-question: How does a symbiotic relationship work? can be delivered upon this research. It has been demonstrated that all collaborations produced symbiotic relationships that have been controlled and shaped to a certain degree by participating composers and performers. Those contributions include elements such as supplying ideas, technical development of instrumental parts, changes to scoring and finding mutually beneficial solutions. What is the hierarchy of collaboration? The role of the creator still sits firmly above the executor as per traditional understanding of composer-performer relationship. Even in a fully collaborative setting where both parties contribute equally, the credit for creation of a piece would be given to the composer. Any attempts of jeopardy towards such hierarchical division may result in upsetting or collapsing working relationships.

Since this research excluded the audience participation as another dimension of a creative process, it is in my interest to develop knowledge about this topic, investigate future collaborations and commit to expansion of the music repertoire.
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APPENDIX B

Recorded Performances:

Inside the Collaboration Recital 2 April 2015 QCGU Ian Hanger Recital Hall (USB 1)


https://youtu.be/TU2ycY9f72Y

G. Schocker – *Sail* for flute and piano. Performers: Michal Rosiak (flute), Hana Hart (piano).

https://youtu.be/IHr7zpHvOpA

https://youtu.be/XYesB0wVGpY

https://youtu.be/6n7YV9m-YPg

M. Rosiak – *Hysteria* for cello solo right hand only (audio recording). Performer: Maureen Kelly.

https://soundcloud.com/michal-rosiak-midoros/hysteria-for-cello-solo-right-hand-only

M. Rosiak – *Fugue* for flute, vibraphone and double bass. Performers: Michal Rosiak (flute), David Montgomery (vibraphone), Emma Sullivan (double bass).

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rJGgBxZCpGU

Creative Symbiosis Recital 17 October 2016 QCGU Ian Hanger Recital Hall (USB 2)

M. Rosiak – Hysteria for cello solo right hand only. Performer: Danielle Bentley.

https://youtu.be/bAa2GokkgL4

K. Saxon – *0r161n* for flute and recorded track. Performer: Michal Rosiak.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HS4- qdrjVw

O. Nini – Journey to Expanse for flute and recorded track. Performer: Michal Rosiak.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nEFNHmXf0Rk

A. Gabrys – 2-Pol-Run for flute solo. Performer: Michal Rosiak

https://youtu.be/hzH3ddsLw0
M. Rosiak – Nostalgia for horn, violin and piano. Performers: Ysolt Clark (horn), Graeme Jennings (violin) and Alex Raineri (piano).


Other performances (USB 3)

Composers Showcase 18 September 2014 QCGU Ian Hanger Recital Hall:

M. Rosiak – Schizophrenic Toccata for flutes. Performers: Michal Rosiak and Janet McKay.

Angry Tunes CD Recording session November 2014 Old Museum Building Brisbane:

M. Rosiak – Schizophrenic Toccata for flutes solo. Recorded by Michal Rosiak and Janet McKay.

Banff Centre for Creative Arts


Other

M. Rosiak – Hysteria for cello solo right hand. Recorded by Dominik Polonski (Poland). August 2017, Lodz (Poland)
## Composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleksander Gabrys</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Double-bass player based in Basel, Switzerland. Gabrys has been giving recitals in numerous festivals in Poland, Germany and Switzerland. He has been a member of Ensemble Phoenix, Ensemble Novum and others.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.worldbassfestival.info/index.php/en/the-artists-of-the-1-festival/450-aleksander-gabrys-poland-switzerland">www.worldbassfestival.info/index.php/en/the-artists-of-the-1-festival/450-aleksander-gabrys-poland-switzerland</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeya Nini</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Composer and vocalist based in Los Angeles, USA. Nini has collaborated extensively with dancers, filmmakers, and theatre directors as both a composer and soloist. She has worked with and appeared in works by artists and ensembles such as Meredith Monk, Butch Morris, Lucy &amp; Jorge Orta, and others.</td>
<td><a href="http://odeyanini.com/listen">odeyanini.com/listen</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Saxon</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Composer and conductor based in Los Angeles, USA. Saxon has written a wide variety of music that ranges from large-scale choral works to intricate chamber music. Her work received the first prize in the San Francisco Choral Artists’ 2012 New Voices Competition.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.katherinesaxon.com/biography.html">www.katherinesaxon.com/biography.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schocker</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Composer, flautist, pianist, harpist and teacher based in New York, USA. Schocker has performed worldwide with orchestras, chamber ensembles and as a soloist. He has written music for almost every orchestral instrument and his work has received multiple recognitions. Schocker is a faculty member at the New York University.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.garyschocker.com/about.html">www.garyschocker.com/about.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Sitsky</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Composer, pianist and teacher based in Canberra, Australia. Sitsky has received numerous awards and grants for his composition. He has had works commissioned by many leading Australian and International bodies, such as the ABC and Musica Viva.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.australiancomposers.com.au/composers/larrysitsky.html">www.australiancomposers.com.au/composers/larrysitsky.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ysolt Clark</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>French horn player and teacher based in Brisbane, Australia. Clark has performed with major Australian Orchestras and ensembles.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southernxsoloists.com/cms/about/meet-the-members#Ysolt%20Clark">www.southernxsoloists.com/cms/about/meet-the-members#Ysolt%20Clark</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Jennings</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Violinist and teacher based in Brisbane, Australia. Jennings has been a faculty member at the Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University. He has worked with the Australian Chamber Orchestra and the Queensland Symphony Orchestra.</td>
<td><a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Graeme_Jennings_(violinist)">en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Graeme_Jennings_(violinist)</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Montgomery</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Percussionist and composer based in Brisbane, Australia. Since 1994 Montgomery has been a Principal Percussionist with the Queensland Symphony Orchestra. His composing experience ranges from full orchestral experience through to professional theatre.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.qso.com.au/musicians/orchestra/david-montgomery">www.qso.com.au/musicians/orchestra/david-montgomery</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominik Polonski</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Cellist and teacher based in Lodz, Poland. Polonski has been a prizewinner in numerous competitions for cellists. He has been the only known string performer using only one hand while playing. Polonski has appeared as a soloist with major Polish orchestras and he has been a faculty member at the Academy of Music in Lodz, Poland.</td>
<td><a href="http://translate.google.com.au/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=pl&amp;u=http://culture.pl/pl/tworca/domink-polonski&amp;prev=search">translate.google.com.au/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=pl&amp;u=http://culture.pl/pl/tworca/domink-polonski&amp;prev=search</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Raineri</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Pianist based in Brisbane, Australia. Raineri has been a recitalist, concerto soloist and chamber musician in Australia and overseas. He has been regularly broadcasting on ABC Classic FM and the MBS networks. Raineri has also been a prizewinner of major piano competitions.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southernxsoloists.com/cms/about/meet-the-members#Alex%20Raineri">www.southernxsoloists.com/cms/about/meet-the-members#Alex%20Raineri</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Sullivan</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Double-bass player based in Melbourne, Australia. Sullivan has been a principal double bass with Melbourne Chamber Orchestra as well as appearing regularly with Melbourne Symphony Orchestra and Orchestra Victoria. She has received awards in numerous competitions including the Peter Mitchell Churchill Fellowship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D


**Michal Rosiak (MR):** Are collaborative circles formed by friends? Where and how do you meet your collaborators? Are you more than just acquaintances? Previous experiences or relationships?

**David Montgomery (DM):** Friendships can emerge from collaborative circles. In my experience some kind of professional (or discipline-related) circumstance brings potential collaborators together and they then choose to continue on beyond the original project or circumstance - friendships and collaborative output can develop at the same time - in fact, I believe the basis of friendship (actually liking, respecting and appreciating each other) is a necessary component for meaningful collaboration. This doesn’t mean that you would necessarily socialise with collaborator/friends outside of working together, rather that the collaboration process is the nature of the friendship. And, like all relationships, we get better at it the more we work on it.

**MR:** In relationships between composers and performers, who is the authority? How often do you disagree either with a score or a performance? In what circumstances are you intended to preserve conservative values and in what circumstances are you against them?

**DM:** The relationship between a composer and performer is entirely different if it is happening in real time. That is, if they are working together, either on a new piece or a new performance of an existing work. In this circumstance, the relationship is always negotiated and the ideal is to get the best outcome for both parties. To achieve this, there must be mutual respect for each others expertise - this can be enriched if each have insight into the others process - in my experience, the more knowledgeable the composer is about performance practice, the better the experience from the performers perspective. It is not so important from the opposite perspective - that is, a performer doesn’t really need to know about the composers process - however, if a composer is ignorant of the instrument(s) they are composing for it is unlikely that it will be a positive experience for either party. If there is no composer present when a performer is working on their piece, then the authority is the performers interpretation. Ideally, this is the end goal of composers - having multiple repeat performances of their work, in which case it would be impossible for them to be present. In this regard, the quality and precision of information the composer includes in their work becomes their authority, which a respectful and experienced performer would (hopefully) always take into careful consideration.
**MR:** Is there a need for negotiations? If yes, what do you negotiate? As composer or performer or maybe as both? Is arguing and clarification a path to build a consensus about the value of your work? "Moments of discovery" - when do they happen?

**DM:** It is likely that collaboration on a new work will raise questions that need to be resolved from the perspective of the composer and performer - that is the intrinsic value of the relationship. Consequently, negotiation will and should take place but this doesn’t necessarily imply conflict. The quality of the relationship will always depend on how adept the collaborators are in dealing with each other. Wisdom and maturity will come from experience - in the absence of experience, an open mind and willingness to work together toward a positive gestalt will do just as well. Inevitably “moments of discovery” will occur.

**MR:** Where do you work? Alone in your studio? With others? What is your view on “third places” - unpretentious settings away from work and family? Coffee place, public place? Could solitary work create a dead end and burn out?

**DM:** There is a lot of solitary work for creative practitioners. The instrumentalist with many hundreds of hours of individual technical development - the composer alone with their process and materials for output and inspiration (manuscript, notebook, computer notation program, piano or other instrument, or any other stimulus/media) - many of the skills necessary for being good at performing or composing need to be developed away from distraction - the very skills that enable quality collaborations to produce great results. The skills required to interact with others are obviously best developed through collaboration but those skills also require reflection, which is often best achieved in a more solitary environment. Humans are social animals and we need both solitary and group activities to creatively thrive. Creative practice may be more productive in certain environments but it is not limited to any particular environment, so “third places” are perfectly fine - it is probably more a question of suiting the environment to the process.

**MR:** Would labelling and criticism addressed to your group affect the group identity or self-concepts of its members?

**DM:** It can do - however, any criticism that is not productive (if it is just the opinion of a critic for example) or simply states the obvious (occurrences that the group is already clearly aware of) should be taken with a grain of salt. It is a fair assumption that the participants of a collaborative production/performance/event have been and are applying critical reflection and analysis to their
work. Once work is presented in the public domain, control over how it is received must be relinquished - the responsibility of the group is to contribute their utmost best to present their work at an accomplished level. There is value for creatives who produce output for the public domain to appreciate the difference between useful criticism and opinion, and the degree to which either of both are fed back into their creative processes. It probably shouldn’t be a guiding principle to the creative process however, as it may discourage risk-taking. Presenting publicly will always have a certain level of risk and the courage to do so is to be supported rather than undermined. The balance between criticism, risk and courage can be fragile and an awareness of this is a useful safeguard in filtering relevant from irrelevant criticism.

**MR:** At what point of your collaborative process the Separation Stage is likely to occur, if ever? Would this issue impact on personal relationships and friendships? Please reflect on this: "Behind many of the conflicts is a sense of resentment and betrayal because of confusion about ownership of ideas and inequities in recognition”.

**DM:** Collaboration on a project can often be the first stage of a friendship. A friendship, or at least further collaboration is likely to occur if the first experience was positive. If that wasn’t the case then the collaboration is more likely to be a one-off event. Not every collaboration is going to be successful but unnecessary conflict can be avoided by actively keeping open and direct lines of communication. Discussing attribution and other acknowledgements can and in some cases need to be part of the collaborative process to avoid any “sense of resentment and betrayal” at the separation stage. In many professional instances such things are dealt with contractually. Without being overly formal, some of the principles in professional/contractual collaborations can be applied in spirit in less formal collaborations to avoid later conflict, confusion and upset.

**MR:** How likely would you be working in the same collaborative circle again? What are the main factors for reunion? Would the existing friendship be one of them?

**DM:** Success and enjoyment in an initial collaboration are important factors for further collaboration. How these factors are measured depend on the circumstances of those involved. There are too many variables to forward specific solutions, but any model would dependant on the needs of the individual collaborators being met. These needs can range from time availability to financial cost/gain to willingness between friends. Each circumstance has to be viewed on its own merits and needs, and knowledge of the potential collaborators of each other’s requirements is a necessary starting point.
APPENDIX E


**Michal Rosiak (MR):** Please comment on this quote:

*The best things come...from the talents that are members of a group; every man works better when he has companions working in the same line, and yielding to the stimulus of suggestion, comparison, emulation. Great things have of course been done by solitary workers, but they have usually been done with double the pains they would have cost if they had been produced in more genial circumstances* (Henry James 1909, 31)

**Katherine Saxon (KS):** You would think that a composer would not like working in a shared TA office, but I found that I was really quite productive the years in which I was a TA when I shared the office with some fellow grad student musicians whom I greatly respected. I listened to a lot of practice and I got a lot of work done and I had a lot of interesting conversations. I would sometimes write while one of my compatriots was practicing something else. If you had told me I was capable of that before, I would not have believed you.

**MR:** Are collaborative circles formed by friends? Where and how do you meet your collaborators? Are you more than just acquaintances? Previous experiences or relationships?

**KS:** I suppose I have two collaborative circles. One was formed during my Masters degree at the University of Oregon. I met two people the first of school, one was a guy named Jeremy, a year ahead of me in composition program who was also a singer, and wanted to start a new music singing group. Later that day I met a girl named Lauren, who was also taking entrance exams and she said she was starting a conducting program so I asked if she wanted to form a singing group with me and this other guy I just met this morning? We began the next school year with a concert in town. Afterward this guy named Jerry walks up to us and just asks if he can be in our group... turns out he is a new composition/conducting student at the U of O.

I created another chorus at the University of California, Santa Barbara called New Century Voices. Two people I knew from the University of Oregon, one wanted to sing in my other group (but we didn't take undergraduates) and the other who was our first tenor both joined my chorus. A number of these people are now my good friends and colleagues.
**MR:** In relationships between composers and performers, who is the authority? How often do you disagree; with a score or a performance? In what circumstances are you intended to preserve conservative values and in what circumstances are you against them?

**KS:** I believe that when it comes down to creating a successful performance it is ultimately the performer who makes the last set of judgement calls as to what works and what does not. Now if the composers is alive they can hash out problem spots and try to find some sort of happy medium between what the composers was trying to express and what works in the real world of sound production. I've been part of bringing a number of people's first choral pieces to life with a small vocal ensemble or with a chorus of dedicated amateurs, so somethings just don't work very well - like lots of divisi. If I think a composer is asking something unreasonable and that they should have know better, they need to know and chorus will work up suggestions or work arounds. For my composition Kubla Khan, I wrote fourteen different versions of page seven, changing it every week until I got it write. It is a running joke in the chorus now.

**MR:** Is there a need for negotiations? If yes, what do you negotiate? As composer or performer or maybe as both? Is arguing and clarification a path to build a consensus about the value of your work? "Moments of discovery" - when do they happen?

**KS:** In the group that we started at the University of Oregon, many of the singers were also composers. We all were very interested in Early Music and to get the singing off the group the ground we started as a sight singing club. Clarity happened when we lost our tenor (he moved to CA). This inspired us to go back to being a trio and we decided to pursue our goal of singing new compositions by writing some ourselves and asking the rest of the student composer community to contribute. That summer we went on a retreat to workshop a full concert and took it on a short tour. There is most certainly a need for negotiating. But I think the negotiating happened pretty naturally in this group where we wrote the music for ourselves. In the next few years as we acquired more composer/singers and as we wrote more music for each other we all learned each others strengths and weaknesses and there developed a sort of "Sospiro"-style. We were certainly a group influence by the Middle Ages and Renaissance and the music we wrote reflects stylistic aspects of those periods (imitative entrances, trading duets, drones) and too, you can hear aspects of each others music begin to cross pollinate each other's styles. Sometimes I think it was easier to negotiate with other composers who were not in the group because we were speaking performer/composer to composer rather than performer to composer.
New Century Voices was run a lot less like a collective: in point of fact, I was in charge, being the oldest, most experienced person. My goal was to facilitate the performance of student compositions, as a result, there was even less of a cohesive style that developed, since it was not a similar love of a particular era of music that bound us together.

**MR:** Where do you work? Alone in your studio? With others? What is your view on "third places" - unpretentious settings away from work and family? Coffee place, public place? Could solitary work create a dead end and burn out.

**KS:** I work mostly in two places in my house, the living room, where the piano is, and the back room where my "studio/office" is. Sometimes I've gone to work at coffee shops but only if it is the sort of work that doesn't require me to think music in my head, because most coffee shops play music - and I like to be able to walk there from my house. Most of the projects I am working on at the moment have some sort of collaborative aspect - and that is really refreshing. It always makes me feel recharged after I get to talk with my collaborator(s). I also talk about my work with my friends and family and share my progress even if they don't understand it at all. (Sometimes they have great ideas). It gives me a sense of accomplishment. I think if I didn't do this a little I might feel sort of sad and pointless I guess.

**MR:** Would labelling and criticism addressed to your group affect the group identity or self-concepts of its members?

**KS:** None of the groups I've been apart of have even had much notoriety. I don't think that the Sospiro group identifies itself as such anymore, since the current members disbanded. The group still exists at the University of Oregon, but under a rather different purpose.

**MR:** At what point of your collaborative process the Separation Stage is likely to occur, if ever? Would this issue impact on personal relationships and friendships? Please reflect on this: "Behind many of the conflicts is a sense of resentment and betrayal because of confusion about ownership of ideas and inequities in recognition".

**KS:** Most of us moved away from the University of Oregon. Most of us remain close friends. The two other original members Lauren and Jeremy are married to each other. I don't think that our ensemble really had any ideas that were there to have "ownership" of. We each took something really different
from our experience in the group. For example: I learned a lot about conducting and ensemble leadership, which is how I make my living. On the other hand, Lauren, who was going to be a conductor, was introduced to Trecento music, which became the subject of her professional research. To this day me, Jeremy and Jerry continue to share our music with each other for inspiration and critiques.

**MR:** How likely would you be working in the same collaborative circle again? What are the main factors for reunion? Would the existing friendship be one of them?

**KS:** Sospiro always talks about trying to get in the same place, probably because we enjoy each other's company. We spent one summer together at the Madison Early Music festival (Jerry got us in for the student rate because of some people he knows). The main factor for a reunion at this point would be getting a purpose/program together, like a concert, and then securing the time and funding to make it happen. Actually, most of early members of Sosipro, many members of New Century Voices, along with some other people I've sung with over the years will be coming together for my wedding in two weeks where they will sing a new piece of mine. Here existing friendship is the reason they will all be collaborating together.
APPENDIX F

Emma Sullivan (personal communication, May 20, 2015):

Hey Michal,

Hope you are well! Sorry it has taken me a little while to get back to you with this. I just listened to the recording - it sounded pretty good actually! I think it was a good performance, particularly since it was our first one is that piece.

I thought that the pulse and rhythm stayed really strong throughout and that we all kept the same tempo when we had entries, which is great! It also felt really steady and almost mechanical in a way, which I think suits that rhythmic figure - not sure if that is what you wanted! I think the ensemble seemed really tight - those sections that we focused on in rehearsals were executed well in performance. Even if something small wasn't quite right, I would need a score to notice it.

Listening back, I think the sections of manic activity are really clear for the listener - it really jumps out at you. I think that is potentially more obvious when you are listening than when you are playing it, which is really interesting.

It may have just been the sound quality when I was listening (I was listening on a computer) but I think that potentially my really soft pizzicato sections are too soft, particularly at the very start and end of the piece. It is always quite hard to hear pizzicato on recordings.

Maybe one thing we could have done more effectively is have more obvious dynamic contrasts. Whenever we had the more manic sections where we were all playing, they all seemed the same dynamic. Maybe it would be more effective if we had them tiered in a way so there was more contrast.

Anyway - I hope those comments are helpful and the kind of thing you were looking for! I think it is a really effective piece! I hope you are happy with the recording.
APPENDIX G

Interview with Gary Schocker (personal communication, June 2, 2014):

Michal Rosiak (MR): Do you find working with a performer satisfying and advantageous? Or perhaps unnecessary?

Gary Schocker (GS): Depends on the person. If the person understands my music it can be gratifying.

MR: Could you please reflect on your collaborations with other flute players and other instrumentalists?

GS: Collaboration is not accurate for flute pieces. If I have someone over to play through as I prepare for publication I invariably make small changes and clarifications. For a non flute piece, like a guitar piece, I will hear what I have written and then make adjustments, often asking them to try things this way and that and asking which is easier to play. Usually if it feels good it sounds good.

MR: Do you think of a particular performer (perhaps yourself) before commencing writing?

GS: I always imagine myself playing because I use my instruments to compose.

MR: Could you please reflect not only on compositions for flute but other instruments as well?

GS: Already above. Commissions or spontaneous writing.

MR: What is the degree of freedom in a performer's interpretation? Do you allow performers to make changes or adjustments? In notation, dynamics, tempo.

GS: I do not like people adding things to my music or making big tempo changes. Although some of my pieces a have a popular or jazz inflected quality, they are carefully made and additions are not welcome.

MR: What is your approach to your own compositions if you become a performer?

GS: I tend to play what I have written, making adjustments in dynamics and colors but not notes.
**MR:** Live concert environment for example, do you allow yourself to improvise or make changes on the spot?

**GS:** No. Improvisation is not part of my performing, rather, the performance should appear to be improvised which is another thing.

**MR:** Can you reflect on the title a bit? Why "Sail"? Is there any relation to your experience or imagination?

**GS:** More to do with photos I saw of you and the nature of the music. I always title after I write.

**MR:** When you said that you were imagining yourself playing (working with the flute), do you approach your writing from the performer perspective? First playing then writing or reverse?

**GS:** I always play what I write unless it is a bassoon piece or something like that. Even then I use the flute for the solo line when composing. No good to just write melodic instrument lines on piano, learned that years ago.

**MR:** Have you ever experienced any contrasting collaborations (e.g. disastrous or extremely wonderful) both as a composer and performer? Do you think the performer (and the composer) personality is important for successful collaboration?

**GS:** Well it certainly is nice to get paid as a writer. Otherwise it is just royalty and residuals on sales. The only significant income for a chamber composer is from commission. The performer also can, I feel, draw confidence from being married and exclusive, so to speak, to the piece from the start.

**MR:** So, how can the performer obtain a good understanding of your music?

**GS:** To best understand my music would be helpful to listen to a lot of it and hear me play it myself. I think hearing a composer is a fantastic opportunity.

**MR:** Have you ever been asked to include any particular requests (e.g. theme, title, mood, technical problems, tempi) before commencing a piece?

**GS:** Yes, I have been asked for specific orchestration. In one instance I was asked to reference a folk song in a piece and even told which instruments should start and end. I found that bizarre but did it just to see if I could. I don't think commissioners should go in with those kind of expectations!
**MR:** What about the interpretation? Do you agree with Stravinsky's model: good execution + good interpretation = good performance?

**GS:** A good performer is someone who can bring the music to life. Performances are alchemy, not science. I usually prefer less perfect players who give themselves to what they do in the moment. Getting all the notes right is a nice bonus when it happens. Mostly I try when I play to let go. When I work at my instruments I try to find the easiest way to play everything so when I am under pressure my body is less prone to log jams.
APPENDIX H

Interview with Danielle Bentley (personal communication, November 10, 2016):

**Michal Rosiak (MR):** How would you describe the composer's role? (influential, essential, creator, authority, etc)

**Danielle Bentley (DB):** The composer’s role was intrinsically essential as *Hysteria* comprises a set of parameters set by the composer which are highly detailed in terms of direction as well as allowing — or rather demanding — a strong degree of interpretation by the performer.

**MR:** Was the composer-performer relationship transparent (own practice, ensemble practice, the composer's presence during rehearsals)? (connectivity, proper realisation, etc)

**DB:** Yes. First, Michal provided the score to allow me time to interpret it on my own. We then worked together for a couple of rehearsals which enabled me to ascertain both the composer’s intent as well as the degree of interpretation assigned to the performer.

**MR:** What were main points of focus during preparation time? (technical, interpretation, etc)

**DB:** More than any other piece I have personally worked on, I found that mental preparation (interpreting the score without cello in hand) to be as important as physically practising the piece. The main points of focus were interpreting the score into creative and sometimes new — for me at least — ways of playing the cello within the confines of the D String and no left hand. e.g. extended techniques and sound production.

**MR:** Was the composer's availability (phone call, email, presence) crucial to execute and interpret the piece?

**DB:** *Hysteria* could be prepared with just the score alone. However, in my particular experience of preparing it, Michal’s advice helped me to understand the scope of both freedom and direction available in terms of the score’s dictates, the composer’s intentions, and my personal contribution through interpretation.

**MR:** What is your understanding of a symbiotic relationship with the composer?
**DB:** One in which the performer understands, or seeks to have an understanding of, the composer’s intentions. Depending on the composer and the work this can manifest in many ways.

**MR:** Did you or would you suggest any changes to your part? (uncomfortable fingering, unclear form, impossibilities, etc)

**DB:** There were some technical impossibilities in the score and I interpreted these to be emotive/expressive indications. I really enjoyed the challenge of finding ways to create an expressive landscape through attempting the impossible through new approaches to playing my cello.