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Abstract

When Don Banks returned to London in the summer of 1953 after a year of study in Florence, his formal studies in composition were complete. Having arrived in London in 1950, he had worked for two years with Matyas Seiber in such areas as musical structure, form and analysis, and in 1952 had attended the summer course in Salzburg conducted by Milton Babbitt and devoted to a study of serialism. It was later that year that he undertook his studies with the renowned contrapuntalist Luigi Dallapiccola in Florence.

On his return to London, Banks began work on a set of variations for cello and piano, but after writing fifteen pages of sketches he revised his plans, producing instead Three Studies for Cello and Piano. The large number of sketches for the abandoned fragment and the completed work, both of which are serial, allows a detailed analysis of his creative process which demonstrates his increasing confidence as a composer.

Banks did not return to the duo medium until more than ten years later, when he completed Three Episodes for Flute and Piano, which is also serial. Analysis of the sketches for this work reveals that his working methods and basic compositional materials bear a striking resemblance to those employed in the composition of Three Studies. In both cases, his reliance on preliminary sketches decreases as composition progresses and he increasingly writes directly into a score. The remarkable similarity between his serial units and rhythmic motives for both works suggests that the relationship between the two works may have been a conscious one.
I would like to thank my supervisor, Richard Toop for his great wisdom, enthusiasm and humour throughout my candidature and Anna Maslowiec for many hours of expert assistance and guidance with the notation of the musical examples. I am indebted to Mrs Val Banks, without whose consent a detailed examination of the Banks Collection would not have been possible, and to Nelson Cooke for giving freely of his time and allowing access to his collection. My thanks are also due to Lewis Cornwell, Victoria Hartstein, Nicola Young and the library staff both at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music and the National Library of Australia.
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Introduction

It has been said of Don Banks (1923–80) that he never threw anything away and the vast Banks Collection housed in the National Library of Australia bears testament to this. Among the surviving items from a life in music spanning more than forty years are the sketch pages for most of his completed compositions as well as for numerous and often unidentifiable incomplete works. These works, in a variety of genres, reflect his diverse musical interests and studies, which included jazz, counterpoint, serialism and film music.

Substantial sketch material exists for Three Studies for Cello and Piano (1953–54) and Three Episodes for Flute and Piano (1964), the sketch pages for the former including a sizeable series of sketches for a work that never eventuated, Variations for Cello and Piano. Three Studies was his first piece following the completion of his formal studies and Three Episodes his next foray into the duo medium after a decade of accomplishment in a number of genres. The sketches for these two works provide an opportunity to examine in some detail Banks’ compositional process at the outset of his career and at the height of his success while a comparative analysis of his methods and materials provides some insight into how this process evolved, if at all, during the intervening period.

It is intended that the two volumes of this study be used simultaneously, with the re-creation of Banks’ compositional process explained by a combination of textual and notation-based analysis. The sketch pages are reproduced as accurately as possible and any details that remain unclear are accompanied by an italic question mark. All Banks’ work is shown in Roman type while my

1 "He was reputed never to have destroyed a personal document," reads the NLA press release announcing the purchase of Banks’ musical estate and dated June 29th, 1982.
annotations appear in italics throughout. Broken lines tracing relationships between components within the sketches are also mine.

The system of pitch identification adopted throughout is one in which the octave rising from middle C is designated C⁴–B⁴ (as illustrated below). Row forms are identified according to current practice: P (Prime), R (Retrogade), I (Inversion), RI (Retrograde Inversion). Although in Three Studies Banks referred to the prime form as B (basic), at the time of writing Three Episodes he labelled this form P.

The original sketch pages from the Banks Collection at the NLA and from the private collection of Nelson Cooke are reproduced at the end of Volume II as Appendices A and B.
The years before *Three Studies for Cello and Piano*
A brief biography

Before examining the sketch pages for *Variations* and *Three Studies*, it is important to look in some detail at Banks' musical life, interests and influences during his years growing up and studying in Melbourne, and at the breadth of his subsequent studies and musical experiences in the period immediately following his arrival in Europe. In that way, we may place the many diverse musical elements that influenced and shaped his formative years in an appropriate context.

Banks was born in Melbourne on October 25th, 1923. His parents were both musicians, his father a professional jazz saxophonist, trombonist, percussionist and band leader, and his mother an amateur pianist. He began piano lessons at five, and after only one year of study was playing on the competition circuit and performing at regional festivals around Victoria in such towns as Ballarat and Bendigo. He recalled that during his childhood "there were all these instruments always around the house for me to experiment with, [so] I got to know sounds [and] rudimentary techniques",¹ although he didn't study them in any formal sense. His first efforts at composition date from the age of "about ten or eleven, [when] my father asked me to write a theme song for some children's programme."² Our earliest images of the young musician are thus of an extremely talented child pianist with an ability and interest in composition, and an innate curiosity about the workings of all the instruments with which he came into contact.

One major musical influence of his childhood was the piano playing of Teddy Wilson, who was the pianist on several Ella Fitzgerald albums owned by the Banks family. Listening to Wilson's playing inspired the young Banks to try his hand at

---

¹ From a 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg, which is the principal biographical primary source used throughout this study (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).

² Ibid.
jazz, and to his surprise, “I found that I could improvise pretty freely and that I could work in jazz ... I became very interested in this, worked on my piano technique ... and started to play trombone and the saxes in a more serious manner”.

He took to jazz as a teenager as rapidly as he had taken to the classical repertoire in his early childhood, performing whenever possible and earning a reputation as both a talented technician and improviser. He was billed on one occasion as a “sixteen-year-old boogie woogie wonder”, and at eighteen was a soloist in The Contemporary Art Society’s First Concert of Hot Jazz.

Even after leaving school, he continued to rehearse and perform with the jazz band he had formed with fellow students at Melbourne Boys High School, stopping only when on turning eighteen he enlisted in the army.

After initial service in the Signal Corps, Banks transferred to the Medical Corps, working as a clerk at various regional hospitals before returning to base headquarters in Melbourne. There was great demand for musicians in this period, and with regular solo and band engagements on evenings off duty he found himself “in a position where I could save some money ... to go and study overseas.” Tours by American jazz musicians such as Artie Shaw and his Navy Band, and the trumpeter Max Kaminsky, with whom Banks played and recorded on September 19th, 1943, were a particular inspiration for Banks during the war years.

At the end of the war, a rehabilitation scheme enabled Banks to study music full-time. Of this period he recalled, “I’d started to work through jazz. I was listening to classical recordings [and] becoming interested in the work of Ravel and Debussy”.

He spent 1946 studying piano privately with Waldemar Seidel, and harmony and counterpoint with Claude Monteith, and by 1947 felt confident enough to audition
for the University of Melbourne Conservatorium of Music. He was accepted into the diploma course for major studies in both piano and composition where Seidel remained his piano teacher while first A.E.H. Nickson and later Dorian Le Gallienne taught him composition. Those post-war years at the Conservatorium brought together a number of talented composition students; apart from the servicemen Banks and James Penberthy (who had served in the Navy and also entered under the rehabilitation scheme), a slightly younger group included Peter Sculthorpe, Ian Pearce, the New Zealander Ivan Sutherland and Keith Humble, with whom Banks formed a strong friendship that continued until his death. He recalled the three years of the course as “very intensive work [that] never stopped when we left the classroom; we’d go over to the pub and ... argue, then we’d go back for afternoon lectures, then we’d eat together and ... we’d argue till all hours of the morning”.

His compositions at this time included a Piano Sonatina which he performed at the Conservatorium and a Fantasy for String Orchestra that the Conservatorium String Orchestra read through but apparently did not perform.

While he was studying, Banks not only continued to play jazz piano to support himself but also found time to do some commercial work and band arrangements; when Rex Stewart was brought out to Australia, Banks played and did all the orchestrations for the tour, and he assembled the ‘Don Banks Orchestra’ to record his arrangements of four songs for Jazzart Records. Around that time too, after hearing the early bebop records of Dizzy Gillespie and Charlie Parker, Banks formed the first bebop group in Melbourne, the ‘Don Banks Bopet’, becoming known as an innovator in jazz circles and presaging his career as an educator by contributing an article to Tempo in which he explained in some detail “the section of Jazz known as Be-bop”.

---

9 Ibid.
10 He subsequently withdrew both of these works and there are no known surviving sketches or autographs for either.
11 Stewart, who had played trumpet and cornet with Duke Ellington’s band, was one of the first American jazz musicians to tour after the war.
12 Tracks included Cherokee and Wrap Your Troubles In Dreams. The exact date of release is unknown; Whiteoak lists it as either late 1948 or early 1949.
13 An early reference to the Bopet in Tempo, January 1948 calls the band ‘The Donny Banks Bopet’, while a programme for a concert at Collingwood Town Hall on November 30th of that year lists ‘The Don Banks Bopet’. This ensemble, under the name of ‘The Jazz Artists’, recorded several tracks including Five O’Clock Mood with Rex Stewart in December 1949.
Both Nickson and Le Gallienne encouraged Banks to continue his studies overseas after graduating, and Nickson in particular urged him to leave as soon as he had gained his diploma and not remain in Melbourne for an extra year in order to complete a degree. Graduating with first class honours in 1949, he set off for London in January 1950 with the aim of combining private composition studies with work as a jazz pianist rather than undertaking full-time post graduate work at an institution. At Nickson’s suggestion, he first went to see the Australian composer Arthur Benjamin, who looked at his early works and suggested he contact the renowned teacher Matyas Seiber. Coincidentally, Banks had just heard one of the first performances of Seiber’s cantata *Ulysses*, and been “completely bowled over by … its clarity and … brilliance, the way it made musical sense throughout”. He took his compositions, counterpoint exercises and harmonisations of Bach chorales to Seiber, who looked through all the material before accepting Banks as a student with the proviso that he not attempt any original composition for six months. Seiber explained that “I want to influence your thinking and I want you to accept a kind of discipline that is not apparent in your works at the moment.” He believed that Banks had been “looking at the music on too broad a scale, [and needed] to get down to the movement of the minute cells and particles of music.”

Lessons began in the spring of 1950, and over the next two and a quarter years Seiber took Banks through a rigorous course of technical studies, as one page listing homework for the following week shows. Dated “13/11/50”, it includes the topics: Trio — alteration and embellishment, Variation Form, Inventions, Melodic Construction, Dance Forms, Harmonization of Folk Songs, Figured Bass Playing, Ear Training, and Formal Analysis. Banks had weekly lessons, supporting himself on his savings at first, and then finding work playing with a dance band twice a week. During this period, Seiber began to employ him to copy parts for his film, cartoon and commercial scores, and later, to provide piano reductions of his orchestral works as requested by his publishers, Schott & Co.; for example, the piano reduction of Seiber’s *Three Pieces for Cello and Orchestra* is by Banks.

---

15 de Berg interview.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 Seiber was a prolific composer of film and cartoon scores, writing about sixty in total, as well as numerous incidental scores for both stage and radio.
His first piece while studying with Seiber was a *Duo for violin and cello* which was completed early in 1951,\(^9\) and was followed immediately by a *Divertimento for flute and string trio*.\(^{20}\) While working on the latter, he submitted the *Duo* for the Edwin Evans Prize, an annual award for chamber music. Winning the competition, the work was performed under the auspices of the London Contemporary Music Centre on February 26\(^{th}\), 1952, and broadcast by the BBC. The premiere appears to have drawn unanimous praise from the critics, particularly from Arthur Jacobs writing in the *Daily Express*, who was impressed by Banks’ “confident melodies and ingeniously varied rhythms”,\(^{21}\) and Eugene Goossens in *The Times*, who described the *Duo* as “a well written and tautly constructed work”.\(^{22}\)

By early 1951, having had a chance to become acquainted with the music scene in London, Banks noticed that many of the embassies were holding regular chamber music concerts featuring the music of their native composers. So he drew up a list including recent Australian chamber works by such composers as Le Gallienne, Pearce, Margaret Sutherland and Douglas Gamley as well as his own *Duo* and *Divertimento*, and approached the Australian High Commission about the possibility of putting on such a concert of Australian music. But he “came away quite discouraged, actually ... because nobody quite knew what to do about it, so the safest thing [was] to do nothing.”\(^{23}\) Not content to let the matter rest, he approached the British Council for assistance and, through their Student Welfare section which provided a hall complete with grand piano and sent out tickets from a guest list

---

19 This work shows the profound influence of Banks’ detailed studies in counterpoint, form and construction with Seiber; the first section is a two-part invention, the second a theme and variations in which he uses serial technique for the first time (a fourteen-note row), and the third a finale employing rhythmic alteration of limited melodic units.

20 Again influenced principally by Banks’ studies with Seiber, this two-movement work consists of a *Pastorale* in 6/8 followed by a *Rondo*. Both of these ‘traditional’ musical structures are comprised mostly of combinations of short melodic and rhythmic elements in various contrapuntal groupings, and the piece contains Banks’ earliest known use of textural ideas such as *pizzicato glissandi* and flutter-tonguing.

21 Arthur Jacobs, ‘DOUBLE bow’, *Daily Express*, 27 February 1952: 3. The headline refers to the fact that Banks took a double bow, first receiving his prize and then sharing the applause with the performers.


23 de Berg interview.
supplied by Banks, organised “the first concert of Australian music in London”\(^{24}\) which took place on June 17\(^{th}\), 1951.\(^{25}\)

Following this concert, Banks and several of the other Australians living in London (notably Margaret Sutherland) formed the Australian Musicians’ Society, which held its inaugural meeting at Australia House on February 16\(^{th}\), 1952 with a concert less than a fortnight later, on February 29\(^{th}\).\(^{26}\) As the driving force behind its establishment, Banks set down his aims for the Society at the inaugural meeting. These were threefold: to provide an affordable and high quality performance venue for Australians arriving in London; to provide a forum for the performance of Australian music; and to assemble a library of Australian scores which would be available to other musicians and thus raise the awareness of Australian music generally. The recently arrived High Commissioner, Sir Thomas White, was very supportive and when the name of the Society was changed to the Australian Musical Association later in 1952, he became its first president.

In early 1952, Banks was invited to attend the International Society of Contemporary Music Festival in Salzburg\(^{27}\) as one of the two Australian delegates (along with Alfons Silbermann, president of the ISCM in Australia at the time), presumably because his Duo had been selected as the representative Australian work. He was also granted a scholarship to attend the six-week Seminar in American Studies, to be held in Salzburg immediately after the Festival.\(^{28}\) The lectures at this Seminar were given by the American composer and mathematician Milton Babbitt, and were entirely concerned with theories and analyses of twelve-tone music. For Banks, it was “one of those experiences which was to play an important part in my development. Here was a contact with a man I had great respect for as a composer … a child prodigy who had taught both mathematics and composition at

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
\(^{25}\) This concert, which preceded the official premiere of the Duo by eight months, actually included its first performance; but as admission was by invitation only and there were no critics present, the occasion was not considered a public performance.
\(^{26}\) The programme, comprised entirely of premieres, contained Banks’ Divertimento and works by Margaret Sutherland, Douglas Gamley, Noel Mewton-Wood and Keith Humble.
\(^{27}\) Held from June 20\(^{th}\) – July 3\(^{rd}\).
\(^{28}\) A reference dated “19/3/52” by Emeritus Professor Edward Dent in support of Banks’ scholarship application provides some insight into his standing after two years in London. Dent wrote, “He is a composer of great ability … certainly one of the leading Australian composers of the present day.”
Princeton. He was a rare kind of genius.” 29 Babbitt’s theories of integral serialism and combinatoriality were new to Banks, who had not only “never heard a note of twelve-tone music in Australia [and] only a little bit in London”, 30 but also found it difficult initially to “understand [Babbitt’s] mathematically based language”. 31 While Banks was tremendously impressed by Babbitt’s “vigorously working out of his theoretical concepts”, [he decided that he] “could never accept the strictures of integral serialism. But at the same time, it probably had a bigger influence on me than I thought, coming in 1952 [because] Seiber never taught twelve-tone music as such … if you wanted to, he would help you, but it was something you did or did not do.” 32

On his return to London in August, Banks began work on a Violin Sonata. He designed the piece in one continuous movement divided into five clearly defined sections, all based on four main elements stated in the opening section. He completed the score in October and the premiere took place on February 15th, 1953. On this occasion, the critics were far from effusive in their praise; Donald Mitchell, writing in the Musical Times, felt that Banks “did not altogether succeed in achieving the formal unity at which he aimed, nor did any of his sections properly compensate for the lack of a genuine development, but about the unusual excellence of his texture and the exceptional quality of his invention there can be no doubt.” 33 And an unnamed reviewer in The Times believed that “frequent hearings might bring the significance of the music to light, but at first hearing it guarded its secrets very closely and did not exactly prove endearing.” 34 Nevertheless, Banks regarded the Sonata as “a valid piece [with perhaps] too many notes for the effect, [but] a good youthful work”, 35 an opinion presumably shared by Howard Hartog of Schott & Co., who immediately after the premiere requested publication rights for the work.

A few months after the Salzburg Seminar, Banks received an Italian Government scholarship to enable him to study in Florence for one academic year with the

29 de Berg interview.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
35 de Berg interview.
composer Luigi Dallapiccola,\textsuperscript{36} who was highly regarded as a teacher of both orchestration and contrapuntal techniques. In this period, Banks refined his skills as an orchestrator and undertook a detailed study of canon with particular emphasis on the works of Bach, Webern and Dallapiccola himself. Of his orchestration studies he recalled: “I would put down a note on paper and he would say ‘Now, what is the sound of that note?’ We were dealing with things which were quite fascinating and eye-opening for me. My textures were rather undisciplined, there were too many notes in them, they were too cluttered up, and Dallapiccola made me think in orchestral terms, with sounds and colours.”\textsuperscript{37}

Banks’ major work in Florence, \textit{Four Pieces for Orchestra}, was designed to reflect his two principal areas of study with Dallapiccola; the two middle pieces are entirely canonic, full of ‘devices’ such as mirror, inverted and double canons. The writing is highly chromatic, and the fact that parts of the work may be analysed using a twelve-tone approach suggests a latent propensity for serial composition. Returning to London in July, Banks was able to hear the \textit{Four Pieces} performed in a public concert which was conducted by Sir Adrian Boult and broadcast by the BBC. He realised that “things had started to happen for me. I now had a publisher [and] the beginnings of a reputation.”\textsuperscript{38}

There is no doubt that Banks recognised his great fortune in having the opportunity to be exposed to three of the most inspiring and diverse teachers of the period. The differences between their modes of teaching, he reflected, were that while “Seiber had a method and a discipline in teaching craftsmanship, [Babbitt] had his own ... precise theories of what he wanted to do [and] Dallapiccola had ... the most sensitive ears in the music business.”\textsuperscript{39} But he also found a similarity of purpose in the methods of Seiber and Dallapiccola; the insistence by the former that all possibilities must be considered before the most appropriate can be selected was echoed by the insistence of the latter that the sound of every note must be in the composer’s head before that note can be put down on paper.

\textsuperscript{36} From November, 1952 - July, 1953.
\textsuperscript{37} de Berg interview.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
Introduction to the sketch pages for *Variations for Cello and Piano* (1953) and *Three Studies for Cello and Piano* (1953–54)

The Australian cellist Nelson Cooke, with whom Banks had become friendly soon after his arrival in London, requested a work for cello and piano some time in the months following Banks' return from Florence. He responded with the *Three Studies for Cello and Piano*, his “first strict twelve-tone pieces”,¹ which were premiered by Cooke and the pianist Colin Kingsley in the Recital Room of the Royal Festival Hall on March 10th, 1954. The compositional process for this work, Banks’ first following the completion of his formal studies, was not without complications. He began work initially on a set of *Variations* before abandoning that project and starting again with a different row on the first of the pieces he later called *Studies*.

Seventy-four pages housed in the Banks Collection at the National Library of Australia contain the bulk of the known surviving sketches for the *Variations* and *Three Studies*. Sixty-six of these are contained in a single folder in the Music Section, and the remaining eight in the Manuscript Section among various lecture notes, correspondence and miscellaneous papers, and most importantly, alongside two pages of analytical notes for the *Studies* (one written on the first page of the printed score) probably prepared while Banks was teaching at a National Young Composers' Seminar (1970–73), the Canberra School of Music (1973–76) or the Sydney Conservatorium (1978–80). It appears that while preparing notes for the analysis, he removed these pages from their folder and did not return them. The only other known surviving sketch material consists of three pages of a cello part for *Study I* which are housed in the private collection of Nelson Cooke. The whereabouts of all the sketch pages, numbered in the order in which they were found, are shown in Table 2.1 along with the first performance parts and autographs.

¹ From the 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).
Table 2.1 Locations of all known surviving sketch pages for Variations for Cello and Piano (1953), and sketch pages, first performance parts and autographs for Three Studies for Cello and Piano (1953–54).

Sketch Pages
1. Sixty-six pages (referred to hereafter as S1–S66) located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA
2. Eight pages (referred to hereafter as S67–S74) located in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA
3. Three pages (referred to hereafter as S75–S77) located in the private collection of Nelson Cooke

First Performance Parts
1. Piano part (full score) located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA
2. Cello part located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA

Autographs
1. Piano part (full score) located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA
2. Cello part located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA

The seventy-seven sketch pages may be divided into four groups, one for the Variations and one for each of the Studies. Such a breakdown reveals fifteen pages for the Variations, thirty-two for Study I, thirteen for Study II and fifteen for Study III (as shown in Table 2.2). The remaining three pages contain preliminary and non-specific sketches for the Studies, and will be discussed at the appropriate points in Chapters 4–7. Banks’ retention of the Variations sketches among those for the Studies indicates that he regarded the former as simply the first stage of the compositional process, and his removal of the matrices containing the basic pitch materials for both works (S71 and S72) from the folder when undertaking his later analysis of the Studies demonstrates that such was the similarity between the two rows that he was unable to decide at a glance which was the correct one.

Table 2.2 Description of sketch pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Writing Implements</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Other Markings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td>on reverse: rough copy of invoice to Faro Films for copying “48 pages of Piano Score ... General Editing, Transposition, etc.” for <em>A Body Like Mine</em>, in black pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td>“VLN. II ADDITIONAL EFFECTS: (for Seq. 12)” + one bar of music, in black ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>black pencil, with additions in black ink</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td>“Nov. 20th”, in black pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Hexachord variants closely related to both Variations and Studies rows, probably sketched before the former</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td>“TROM. 1 SEQUENCE 15 No. 1”, in black ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>black pencil, with addition in black ink</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Studies I and II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>black pencil, with addition in red pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S46</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Study I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S50: black pencil, with additions and alterations in red pencil, Study I

S51: black pencil, Study I

S52: black pencil, Study I

S53: black pencil, Study I

S54: black pencil, Study I

S55: black pencil, Study I

S56: black pencil, Study I

S57: black pencil, with additions and alterations in red pencil, Study I

S58: black ink, with additions and alterations in black pencil, Study I

S59: black ink, with additions and alterations in black pencil, Study I

S60: black pencil, Study I

S61: black pencil, with addition in black ink, Study III

S62: black pencil, Study III

S63: black pencil, with additions in black ink, Study III

S64: black pencil, with additions in black ink, Study III

S65: black pencil, Study III

S66: black pencil, Studies row with a transposed first hexachord below showing some possibilities of combinatoriality

S67: black pencil, Studies row

S68: black pencil, Study II

S69: black pencil, Variations

S70: black pencil, Variations

S71: black pencil, Variations matrix

S72: black pencil, Studies matrix

S73: black pencil, Variations

S74: black pencil, Variations

S75: black ink, Study I

S76: black ink, Study I
The original versions of all the sketches are in black pencil, with additions and alterations on eight pages in red pencil and black ink. Five pages written in black ink (three with additions and alterations in black pencil) are versions of earlier material specifically rewritten for the first performers of the work: three pages comprising an early version of the cello part for Study I (S75–S77) were prepared for a meeting with Nelson Cooke at which he and Banks first worked through material for that piece, and two pages that comprised the final section of Study I in the original version of the first performance piano part (S58, S59) were substantially revised before Banks decided, in the interests of clarity, to replace them. All sketches, first performance parts and autographs are written on several unidentified brands of twelve-staff manuscript in portrait format. There appears to be no particular system to the paper order, while the same brand is used for the bulk of the Variations sketches and first performance parts, the paper used for the great majority of the Studies sketches (many of which date from the period between those two groups) matches that used for the autographs. It is not surprising that Banks should have such a variety of manuscript at his disposal, given that he had studied in England, Austria and Italy during the previous eighteen months. And with Seiber employing him to copy several scores for animated films on his return, it is likely that he would have been accumulating manuscript at every opportunity.

Ten of the pages contain other markings, of which seven are related to Banks’ work as a copyist. Four pages headed “SEQUENCE 15 No. 1” are discontinued parts for trumpets, horn and trombone which, together with a fifth containing the heading “VLN. II ADDITIONAL EFFECTS (for Seq. 12)” followed by one bar of artificial harmonics for divided violins, may have been intended originally for use in one of Seiber’s cartoon scores. The fact that the sketches for the cello and piano pieces also

---

2 As recalled by Nelson Cooke in an interview with the author in December, 1996.
on these pages cover virtually the entire compositional process, from the Variations (S18) to the last written Study III (S10), demonstrates not only that Banks was in the habit of re-using pages rendered superfluous in his copying work, but also that he didn’t use such pages consecutively or with any apparent system. A sixth page contains several quaver groups written in black ink which are stemmed in various experimental styles (S66). These groups appear immediately below, and so presumably were written after, a sketch of the Studies row in black pencil. The reverse side of a seventh page (S8) contains the rough copy of an invoice from Banks to Faro Films for copying “48 pages of Piano Score ... General Editing, Transposition, etc. Overtime Rates & Audition Fees” for a film entitled A Body Like Mine. The names and addresses on two pages of the pianist for the premiere, Colin Kingsley (S70), and the producer of the concert, Felix Ivory (S49), are probably the result of telephone calls while Banks was working on those pages, and in the latter case the additional direction “off Westbourn (sic) Terrace” suggests that he was intending to visit there. The date “Nov 20” on one of the Variations sketch pages (S16) provides the only clue to the beginning of the compositional period.

---

3 A short film produced by Faro Films, distributed by Hammer Films and released in 1955. As neither a copy nor production records of the film could be located, the composer of the score is unknown.
The sketches for
Variations for Cello and Piano

*Variations for Cello and Piano* exists in sketch form only, the sole clue to the period of its composition the date "Nov 20" which appears at the top of S16, one of the earliest of the sketch pages. It is likely, therefore, that composition of the work began on or shortly before that date. Nelson Cooke, with whom Banks collaborated on the *Three Studies* "during a cold spell in the winter of 1954," 1 has no recollection of the *Variations*, so we may assume that they occupied Banks for a brief period only.

Among the fifteen pages of sketches for *Variations* (shown in Table 3.1) are four containing hexachord lists, reconstructed rows and a matrix (S18, S74, S73, S71). The remaining pages can be broken down into three main groups of ideas. The first (S22, S17, S16, S23) is concerned principally with the structure of the opening Theme and Moderato sections of the work, and the second (S19, S23, S69, S15) and third (S15, S14, S20, S74) with the fashioning and use of twelve-tone rows in various canonic openings. There are also two pages containing ideas unrelated to any others found in the sketches (S21, S70).

Table 3.1 The Sketch Pages for *Variations for Cello and Piano*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>systems 1–2: canonic opening (five bars), expansion of idea on S15, system 4&lt;br&gt;system 3: fragment for cello — R-0 (H1)? (one bar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>systems 1–3: two canonic openings based on row developed on S19&lt;br&gt;system 4: two-part canonic opening (three bars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>top: “Nov 20”&lt;br&gt;systems 1–4: first six bars of Moderato (section 1), continuation of S17, systems 3–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>systems 1–2: opening Theme section complete (according to S22 overview)&lt;br&gt;systems 3–4: two beginnings of Moderato (section 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From an undated programme note by Banks, probably written while he was working at the Canberra School of Music (1973–76). Cooke was also teaching in Canberra during this period, and performed the *Studies* on several occasions.
Before examining the sketch pages, it will be useful to look briefly at Banks’ row for Variations. Only one page of preliminary sketches survives (S18), and it is not certain that the workings it contains are for the Variations rather than the Studies row, such is the similarity between the two.² But as it is more likely they are either for the former or serve as a source for both rows, they will be mentioned now and discussed at greater length in the full comparative analysis of the Variations and Studies rows that appears in Chapter 4.

² The similarity between the Variations and Studies rows is demonstrated by the fact that in preparing lecture notes years later, probably while teaching either at the Canberra School of Music (1973–76) or the Sydney Conservatorium (1978–80), Banks, mistakenly using the Variations row for analysis of the opening phrase of Study I, was still able to make his analysis credible.
The sketches on S18 consist of the 24 possible permutations of four notes (all numbered by Banks) that may follow a predetermined interval (a rising minor third in this case) within a single hexachord. The six notes used are the same as in P-0 (H1) of the Variations row (and the same as in P-11 (H1) of the Studies row), arranged initially in three bracketed pairs, each of which comprises a minor third, with a semitone between pairs (see Example 3.1, system 1). We may note not only the importance of these two intervals in Banks' thinking from the outset, but also the fact that the hexachord consists of six adjacent notes.

The note pairings of the initial S18 sketch are used, though now in a different order, for the first hexachord of the Variations row (Example 3.1, system 2). While the third pair is unchanged, the first and second are swapped, and reversal of the second pair enables Banks to retain an opening rising minor third. The second hexachord of the Variations row may also be seen as three pairs of notes, each comprising a semitone, with the pairs connected by minor thirds (see Example 3.2). The row is thus based almost entirely on minor thirds (6) and semitones (4), containing only one other interval, a diminished fourth between notes 2 and 3.

The importance of the minor third and semitone intervals is emphasised by brackets Banks draws above two figures in the P-0 row of the matrix (S71; as shown in Example 3.2). The first identifies a descending diminished triad (which he labels) from notes 5–7, and the second a descending tetrachord from notes 9–12 comprised of semitones either side of a minor third. One tetrachord is used twice in the row, once in each hexachord; consisting of a rising minor third, descending semitone and descending minor third, it appears from notes 3–6 and 8–11.

**Group One  S22, S17, S16, S23**

The first group of sketch pages includes what are probably Banks' initial ideas for a work for cello and piano. S22 serves as both title and reference page; Variations for Cello and Piano appears at the top, P and I rows at the bottom, and in the middle of the page is a scheme for the overall structure of the work (Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1 Banks’ overview for Variations for Cello and Piano (S22)

Rhythmic transformation—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-I 3</td>
<td>Lyrical</td>
<td>Freer</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>R-RI</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Misterioso</td>
<td>Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderato</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody +</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Misterioso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pizz Cello</td>
<td>(extensive!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

accelerando

The scheme is symmetrical, and as we might expect at this early stage of composition, still very vague. The Theme sections at the beginning and mid-point show an uncomplicated setting-out of the row in all its forms. Banks uses only single words and phrases to indicate his ideas for the content and character of the six sections which comprise the bulk of the work, as well as for general rhythmic ideas. Yet despite the simple nature of the plan, we may still recognise in it the diversity of Banks’ influences, not only his studies with Seiber (“Melody + Development”, section 1, and “Rhythmic transformation”, above the plan), Babbitt (“B-I” and “R-RI” in the Theme sections) and Dallapiccola (“Canonic”, section 3), but his jazz background (“Up Tempo”, section 6) and recent film music copying and arranging work (“Misterioso”, section 5, and “Effects”, section 6). The theme and variations structure would appear, in fact, to be the ideal format for showcasing these influences.

The bulk of this four-page group is concerned with the development and expansion of ideas for the opening Theme and Moderato sections. On system 1 of S22 is the first draft of the Theme opening, a P row phrase in which the cello, beginning at the very bottom of its register, states an eight-note melody (notes 1–5 and 10–12 of the row) over an accompanying piano tetrachord (notes 6–9) played five times (see Example 3.3, variant 1). The melodic line, while based largely on the minor thirds and semitones that comprise ten of the eleven intervals in the Variations row, also

3 Banks labels the original forms of his rows for both Variations and Three Studies B (Basic), in line with the practice of the period. However, by the time of writing Three Episodes a decade later, the accepted terminology for the row as first stated was P (Prime), and it is this initial that remains in use today and will therefore be used in this study.
contains one other interval among its seven. The cello begins with the rising minor third central to Banks’ thinking since his working-out of the S18 hexachordal permutations, and in the course of its eight notes has three minor thirds (the last of which, between notes 6 and 7 appears in inversion), two semitones, one augmented fifth (inversion of the diminished fourth, between notes 2 and 3), and one perfect fourth (between notes 5 and 6, at the point where the two sections of the row are connected). The accompaniment is also based largely on (enharmonic) minor thirds and semitones (or their inversions), with minor thirds in each hand, major sevenths between upper and lower notes of each hand, and an augmented fifth between hands.

Considerable time is taken over this phrase, with dynamic and expression marks added to both parts. This is not the rapid sketch of a composer committing his first idea to paper as quickly as possible, but structurally a virtually complete phrase which in the course of the four variants of Example 3.3 changes only cosmetically. Banks is in two minds regarding metre, however; “or 3/4” appears above the first bar. It should be noted that the P and I rows are written out at the foot of S22, presumably as a reminder during composition. Their appearance there at all provokes speculation that either S22 preceded the matrix on S71 (which seems unlikely), or that even at this stage S22 is intended to be a reference page, complete with title, first phrase, overview and row.

On system 3 of S22 (having just sketched his design for the overall structure of the work), Banks writes another version of the opening phrase (Example 3.3, variant 2). At this point it would be useful to examine all four variants of this phrase, tracing additions and amendments. The piano part remains largely unchanged throughout, its four-note chord played five times in the first two variants and six times in the third and fourth. Each chord except the last is of two beats duration (remembering that the beat varies between quaver and crotchet), with the first chord always beginning one beat after the fifth melodic note.

Variant 2 is in 6/8, and Banks shifts the emphasis at the opening here to the second note by making the first an upbeat. The fifth melodic note (Db) is extended by one beat, thus placing the following note (Ab) on the second beat of the second bar, a
point he emphasises by connecting the Ab and final note E♭ to their simultaneous piano chords. This stretching of the central note of the phrase stresses the Ab–F♭ leap rather than the following semitone fall. An *Andante* tempo indication is introduced for this and subsequent variants.

For variant 3, Banks turns to 3/4, the time-signature foreshadowed above his initial sketch (Example 3.3, variant 3). In both this and the following variant, he labels the row forms and numbers all notes, presumably as he double-checks each phrase. Of the variant 2 modifications, the first note upbeat is retained, and *poco tenuto* annotations are added above the fourth (D♭) and seventh (F♭) melodic notes to emphasise the shapes of the two halves of the phrase. But the fifth note of the melody is returned to four beats, thus restoring the original placement of the second half of the phrase in relation to the accompanying chords. Indeed, until its final chord, this variant is an exact augmentation of the first; thus, with little more than a change from 4/8 to 3/4, Banks has achieved a shape for the opening phrase from which he can continue.

In accord with the overview, the I row is used here for the answering phrase of the Theme. This phrase mirrors the first; the cello line again contains eight notes (this time 1–4 and 9–12), and the piano four (5–8) in chords again played six times. The second phrase is slightly shorter than the first for two reasons: the piano enters earlier (*with* the fourth cello note rather than after the fifth), and the two halves of the melodic line are not quite so widely separated by the central note (B♭), which lasts for three beats rather than the four of the first phrase D♭. The combination of these factors ensures that the Theme gains a certain momentum as it progresses through its second phrase.

It appears that Banks moves on at this point, in line with his overview, to the Moderato section (to be discussed shortly). But after making several attempts to get that section under way he returns to the Theme, sketching a new version on S23. He is obviously concerned about the smallness of scale of his two-phrase opening section, as he more than doubles the length of the Theme now by adding two more phrases, R and RI, and an RI (H1) coda (variant 4; the opening nine bars, containing the first two
phrases in full and the beginning of the third are shown here). In doing so, he deviates from his original plan by using the material he had set aside for the central Theme section of the work (see Figure 3.1).

The time-signature changes again in variant 4, going into 4/4 from the third bar. The emphases and note values of variant 3 are retained with one exception — with a shortening of the final cello note of the first phrase (E₄) by one beat, the fourth note of the second phrase (the point at which the piano re-enters) arrives on the beat. Perhaps Banks’ intention here is to shift the piano chords to first and third beats throughout the Theme section, and thereby give them an additional pulsing weight while maintaining the initial emphasis (via the 3/4 time-signature of the first two bars) on the second and fourth notes of the melody.

A balanced structure for the expanded version of the Theme is once again achieved by ‘telescoping’ the phrases in order to maintain momentum. The two new phrases and coda are individually shorter (as shown in Figure 3.2), but their combined length is slightly greater than that of the originally envisaged Theme section (34 beats as opposed to 32). Both the continuous placement of the piano chords on first and third beats from the second to fourth phrases (as mentioned above), and the ‘blurring’ of those phrases by overlapping each with the next, serve to drive the Theme on. For example, in variant 4, bar 9, the second (I row) phrase is completed and the third (R) begun by the cello while the piano continues, playing the same chord (containing, as it does, the second note (F₄) of the new row) twice more. Figure 3.3 shows that the number of repetitions of each piano chord decreases as the section progresses, and that the twelve chords of phrases 1 and 2 are balanced by eleven in the remainder (phrases 3, 4 and the coda).

**Figure 3.2** Number of beats in each phrase of the Theme (expanded version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase 1: P — 17 beats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 2: I — 15 beats, overlapping with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 3: R — 12 beats, overlapping with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase 4: RI — 13 beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda: RI (H1) — 9 beats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.3 Number of piano chords in each phrase of the Theme (expanded version)

Phrase 1: P — 6
Phrase 2: I — 6
Phrase 3: R — 3
Phrase 4: RI — 5 (2 chords, played three times and twice)
Coda: RI (H1) — 3

Analysis of the expanded version of the Theme reminds us of the extent of Banks’ reliance on his designated intervals both melodically and harmonically. Of the thirty-one notes that comprise the cello part, all but one are involved in either semitone or minor third (or their inversion) motion, and the exception (E♭ in bar 9, first note of R row) is approached and quit by (enharmonic) major third, the only other interval that occurs in the row. As Example 3.4 shows, the same intervals dominate in the accompanying chords.

At this point, we may look again at the second of the bracketed figures in the P-0 row (notes 9–12) of the matrix (see Example 3.2). Comprised of semitones either side of a minor third, and with all notes moving in the same direction, this motive has become an important melodic figure in the early stages of composition. It appears in the cello part of the Theme and Moderato sections both in its original form as the final tetrachord of the row (as shown in Example 3.5, variants 1 and 2), and as a figure derived from other elements of the row (variant 3).

The coda of the Theme is also of interest, having begun life as the basis for the first phrase of the Moderato section (see Example 3.6). After making several attempts to write the latter section, Banks returns to expand the Theme, but does not discard all his ideas from the Moderato. Indeed, it appears that having stated each of the four rows within the Theme, finishing with RI and being in need of a closing idea, he realises that his RI (H1) opening from the abandoned section will serve nicely as a coda.

The original opening of the Moderato consists of an RI row played by the piano largely in trichords over a three and a half octave range, marked $f$, and all sounding within four beats (Example 3.6, variant 1). The central element of this phrase is the
L.H. F#2/F♯2 dyad (notes 5 and 6) which is heard twice. The change from the pp, narrow-ranged and uncomplicated Theme is both sudden and dramatic. Indeed, perhaps Banks feels that his initial (variant 1) opening provides too dramatic a contrast. In variant 2 the phrase is expanded and split cleanly into two hexachords heard over seven beats in a much narrower range (the final trichord is two octaves below its variant 1 counterpart). The F♯/F♯ dyad appears an extra time — it finishes the first phrase, begins the second, and is repeated between the trichords of H2.

The phrase is further stretched in variant 3, lasting nine beats at least — "2/4?" is written and alternative rests completing a 2/4 bar are circled in the second full bar. The F♯/F♯ dyad is now heard four times, twice at the end of H1 and twice (as before) in H2. With H1 followed by one beat of rest (minimum), the two hexachords are separated clearly for the first time. The cello is introduced to the phrase in this variant, its single note at the bass of the first trichord lasting throughout H1.

Variant 4 (the coda of the expanded Theme) retains H1 virtually in its variant 3 format. The minor changes here are: removal of the first two notes (Ab and G♯) from the piano L.H., giving them to cello alone; transferral of the lower R.H. note (E♭3) to the L.H.; and further separation of the two F♯/F♯ dyads — the second one sounds now for the first time after the G♯/E♭/D♯ trichord has finished, which imbues it with an air of finality.

The final set of sketches from Group One traces Banks’ attempts to continue the Moderato section; the three variants of Example 3.7 are the continuations of their Example 3.6 counterparts. This is some of the most texturally dense material from all the sketches for either the Variations or Studies. The cello is still used melodically in its low register, and increasingly dramatic trichord- and tetrachord-based passages are introduced in the piano parts. Each variant (1, 2 and 3a) was probably crossed out in turn as Banks began work on a new idea.

Initially, three rows (all labelled by Banks) are used simultaneously; the cello and R.H. are combined ingeniously with two while the L.H. has a third (Example 3.7, variant 1). The calligraphy suggests that Banks sketched out one row at a time, writing the
parts in descending order. The cello part is carefully and neatly written in full, the R.H. perhaps less so, although close attention is paid (necessarily) to the cello line. The last-written L.H. trichords appear to have been hurriedly jotted down (over previously erased material), as if Banks was merely making a note of them before trying another approach to the phrase.

The cello enters with P-0 (notes 2–12) one beat after the final trichord of RI-0 has sounded, the point being that the last note of RI-0 (C♭) is, of course, also the first note of P-0, and thus acts here as a pivot-note between the two rows. Under the fourth note of the cello row, the R.H. enters with the first trichord of I-8. The R.H. also has a tetrachord (notes 8–11) in the following bar, but the remainder of this row is supplied by the cello in the course of its P-0 row; notes 4–7 of I-8 (F♯, G♮, B♭, Db) appear in retrograde as notes 5–8 of P-0, while note 12 (E♭) is also 12 of P-0. Most of the notes common to the cello and R.H. rows are numbered, probably to clarify their roles as Banks worked on the latter row. Half a beat after the R.H. entry, the L.H. begins R-3 with the first of four ascending trichords spanning three and a half octaves (as had the opening (RI-0) phrase of the Moderato in the preceding bar; see Example 3.6, variant 1).

Only the R-3 (L.H.) row is retained in variant 2, appearing in identical trichords to variant 1, although now split between the hands of the piano. R-3 appears alone, and is followed immediately by a single trichord in the L.H. This C♯/Eb/B♭ chord may be interpreted as the first trichord of either P-0 or R-7, and indeed both options are tried out in variant 3. The cello follows with P-5 (notes 1–9 only, and with the suggestion of jazz-influenced syncopation from notes 6–9), still at the bottom of its range, beginning in a bar containing (probably erroneously) five crotchet beats.

The principal purpose of variant 3 appears to be to find a suitable completion of the row beginning with the trichord C♯/Eb/B♭, the point at which the piano part is abandoned in variant 2. R-7 (incorrectly labelled R8) is tried first in this role (variant 3a), then P-0 directly underneath (variant 3b) and finally what is probably another version of R-7 (variant 3c), which is barely legible and for piano only. Variant 3 begins with an exact repetition of variant 2, and it is under the nine cello notes used in
the earlier variant (P-5, notes 1–9) that the two piano options are sketched. The only additions to the cello line in variants 3a and 3b are the final three notes of P-5 which are followed by the first two notes of RI-0.

The two options are treated very differently. Variant 3a proceeds in the same style as R-3 immediately beforehand — R-7 is stated in trichords, the last three of which are played by one hand, completing an eight-trichord phrase that rises in pitch through R-3 and falls through R-7. A rise in dynamics accompanies the rise in pitch, with a crescendo through the R-3 trichords to f followed by a subito p for the R-7 trichords.

The cello entry at this point now repeats the shaping of the previous piano phrase, with a crescendo added under the rising four-note opening figure. In variant 3b, however, Banks adopts a 'softer' approach (not in purely dynamic terms — the P-0 continuation of the trichord is, like R-7 above it, marked p). Here the row is not restricted to trichords, and when they do appear, they are split between the hands. There are more phrasing and tenuto marks, and the variant becomes altogether more lyrical. The cello part is phrased in three-quaver groups throughout, confirming the earlier suggestion of a jazz influence.

It appears that Banks then sketched another version of the same passage very lightly and rapidly (variant 3c), probably trying again with R-7 as he had crossed out his previous effort with that row. The notes used here are not exactly R-7 however; both the C\text{#}\textsuperscript{7} at the top of the first R.H. trichord and the F\text{#}\textsuperscript{7} in the L.H. below (assuming the L.H. is written in bass clef as it is in variant 3b above) would be misplaced in that reading, while D\text{#} is absent from the row altogether. Of course, the C\text{#} may be just a carelessly written D\text{#}, and the L.H. may have been intended to be in treble clef, which would make the F\text{#} a D\text{#}. On balance, it seems likely that R-7 was intended, since the final note of that row, G\text{#}, appears in the crossed-out tetrachord that follows, along with the first trichord of the labelled I-4. This chord is crossed out, however, replaced by the first pentachord of RI-1 (which also contains G\text{#}); notes 1–11 of that row are written in two chords in the space of three quavers before the section is abandoned.
It is probably at this point that Banks returned to the Theme. Whether he had become impatient with his lack of progress on the Moderato section, or had decided that in his scheme for the work the opening two-phrase Theme section was too slight and required extension, is impossible to assess. What does seem certain is that although he may have become bogged down with the complexities of the Moderato, he was satisfied with the Theme and intended to make it a more substantial section, even though that would necessitate reorganisation of his overview for the work.

**Group Two S19, S23, S69, S15**

Banks' principal concern in the sketches I have designated Group Two is the search for, and subsequent use of, a P-0 row as both opening statement and basis for canonic development. He makes a number of attempts to design a row form that he feels will meet his needs, and having done so, first adds continuing I-0, R-0 and RI-0 phrases, and then uses the row in various canonic exercises.

The openings of this P-0 row (see Example 3.8) and the one used to begin the Theme section (Example 3.3) bear a similarity that far exceeds the obvious one of pitch order. Examination of the final versions of the two (Example 3.8, variant 6 and Example 3.3, variant 4) shows that the first four notes of each are identical not just in pitch, but also in register and duration. It is possible, in fact, that Banks was trying initially with this row to write an alternative Theme section using the same opening passage; certainly, while the P-I format used here is consistent with his S22 overview, as are the R and RI phrases that follow with the added phrases of the earlier expanded Theme, this material does not fit his descriptions of any of the variation sections in the overview (see Figure 3.1). While we may speculate about his intentions, we may at least be sure that Banks' first ideas upon completion of a satisfactory row were not canonic. Although his sketches on the following three pages of this group are canonically based, largely on workings of the final variant of the row, his immediate thoughts (shown in Example 3.9) were merely to introduce trichords and tetrachords on the piano soon after the beginning of the I row.

S19 begins with six variants of P-0 for solo cello (Example 3.8). After four notes of the first variant, Banks apparently rethinks his note placements, inserting a crotchet
rest at the beginning, repositioning the barline and crossing out the third and fourth notes. He thus writes the second variant over the first, using almost immediately the single feature that sets this version of the row apart from other (later) canonic sketches on similar material: a crotchet triplet on the third and fourth beats of the second bar (with its first note tied from the second beat on all but one occasion). Crotchet triplets are used again at the end of this variant and on several other occasions in those that follow, but it is the triplet figure appearing consistently in the second half of the second bar that provides the defining characteristic of the row.

Variant 2 is the first of four containing complete rows. It lasts fifteen beats (including the crotchet rest at the opening), and has its third (B♯) and seventh (G♯) notes emphasised by their placement on the first beats of the second and third bars respectively (whereas the first beat of the fourth bar is de-emphasised by the crotchet tied across it). Its most important structural feature is the rhythmic sequence of the two identical descending phrases (notes 4–7 and 9–12) that incorporate the crotchet triplets, of which, as mentioned above, only the first is retained in the final version.

In variant 3, the row is compressed into thirteen beats by a shortening of the fourth (D♭) and eighth (F♯) notes. With the first note of the first triplet figure no longer tied from the second beat, the variant 2 sequence is removed and the single-phrase row has a greater continuity, moving directly to its final note (E♭) at the beginning of the fourth bar. This placement of the twelfth note, together with that of the eighth note on the first beat of the third bar, and the second bar triplet figure which now comprises the diminished triad of notes 5–7, are alterations that are retained in the final version of this series (variant 6).

Banks' intention in variant 4 is probably to return the tied note to the first of the triplets. He stops at the end of the second bar however, possibly in the realisation that the only way he can keep in place both the tied note and the diminished triad on the triplets (in other words, be on note 5 by the second beat of the second bar) without changing any earlier note lengths is to revert to the construction of variant 1, and move the first note of the row back to the first beat of the bar.
This is done in variant 5, and the final structure is now in place for notes 1–7. In the third bar the row is further shortened (to twelve beats) by the employment of two more triplet groups. This compression has two principal effects; first, the rhythmic impact of the bar 2 triplets is dissipated by the continuation of the same figure throughout the next bar and secondly, the row tails away to its twelfth note (the lowest in pitch since notes 1 and 2) at the end of bar 3. With the P-0 row fitting neatly into three bars here, the I-0 row that follows can begin as an exact copy. Four notes are written for the cello, the last simultaneous with the diminished trichord of notes 5–7 on the piano (see Example 3.9, variant 5a), before the variant is abandoned.

For variant 6, Banks retains the first two bars of variant 5, apparently returning to variant 3 for inspiration in the shaping, if not the actual rhythm, of the remainder of the row. He restores the twelfth note to the first beat of the fourth bar, removes the third bar triplet groups, and increases both the drama of the progression and the diversity of rhythmic cells within the row by the insertion of a quaver rest before the penultimate note. This final version of the row is comprised of two arching phrases (of two bars and one bar respectively) joined by their common note F♯ on the first beat of the third bar.

Although the opening notes of I-0 continue on the cello after each of the four completed variants, it is only after the final two that the piano is introduced. For these continuations involving both instruments (shown in Example 3.9), I have retained the variant numbers of Example 3.8 and labelled the continuations of variant 6 a–d, notating them over four systems (although Banks used only two) so as to show clearly his reworkings of particular bars.

The duration of the combined P-0, I-0, R-0, and RI-0 rows in the final version (Example 3.8, variant 6 – Example 3.9, variant 6a–d) is only seven bars, and in less than four of those the two instruments share the last three rows using no note longer than a minim or shorter than the crotchet triplets (which remain the single most important rhythmic element of the entire fragment). The result is a succession of densely packed and overlapping rows, with Banks numbering many of the notes and
even resorting to Roman numerals at the beginning of the R-0 row to avoid confusion and error. Even so, in variant 6b, bar 5 he mistakenly reverses the numbers of the simultaneous F♯3 and F♯4. Late in the process, he also numbers the bars of the final version of variant 6, but erroneously labels the last bar “8” even though it is clearly another version of the previous bar. If this is an alternative Theme section (to that shown in Example 3.3), it is certainly very different in style from the simple melody and accompaniment of the earlier material.

As mentioned above, Banks gets no further with the I-0 row that follows variant 5 than the diminished chord (in the R.H.) of notes 5–7 (Example 3.9, variant 5), although it is apparently dissatisfaction with the second phrase of the preceding P-0 row rather than with I-0 that leads him to begin again. His liking for this particular diminished chord (B♭/Db/F♯) is revealed by the fact that he uses it again in the same manner in RI-0, where it appears as notes 6–8 (variant 6c, bar 7). We may note at this point that the diminished triad of notes 5–7 is the first of the figures that Banks had bracketed in the P-0 row of his matrix (see Example 3.2). Unlike the second of the figures, the final tetrachord of the row which he had used as a melodic unit (as shown in Example 3.5), the diminished triad is used here accompanimentally.

Returning to I-0 in variant 6a, he writes an expanded piano chord, now a tetrachord comprised of notes 4–7 rather than a trichord, in the same range (with note 4 added above) and in exactly the same place (bar 5, beat 1).

In the second continuation of variant 6 (6b), the piano is introduced two beats earlier, with notes 2 and 3 of I-0. This entry, the opening four notes of which appear in two versions, is considerably less abrupt than that of the tetrachord in the preceding variant. The version for R.H. is probably the earlier (sketched and numbered concurrently with the cello), followed by one for L.H. In the latter, the rhythm is altered to include a crotchet triplet; as a result, note 4 (B♭3) on the piano now sounds after note 5 (B♭2) on the cello, which is unlikely to have happened had the cello line not already been in place.

The texture of the piano part lightens in the revision, with bars in later versions sometimes having fewer simultaneous notes (e.g. the L.H. version of variant 6b,
bar 4 compared with the R.H.), and more rests (e.g. variant 6c, bar 6). That Banks made numerous errors both with accidentals (e.g. in variant 6b, bar 4, the second note of the L.H. appears as C#, although a C# is surely intended) and omissions (e.g. in variant 6c, bar 6 he omits note 4 (D#) of R1-0) within the few bars of this fragment is perhaps not surprising given the complexity of the passage, and is possibly an indication not only of the speed at which he was working, but also of his frustration with his lack of progress after the introduction of the piano. The combination of these two seemingly unrelated facts might on another occasion be considered a non sequitur, were it not for a similarity to the earlier Moderato section (see Example 3.7), in which the piano part was also densely written at first, before being expanded and simplified and finally abandoned for the most part, with only its opening passage retained as the coda for the Theme section.

At this point, Banks returns to variant 6 of his row, using it as the subject for a series of two- and three-part canonic sketches on three separate pages (see Example 3.10). These sketches may be more accurately described as canonic openings, as each of the voices continues for only two notes at most beyond its statement of the subject. The canonic sketches are difficult to place in order of composition, but it is likely that Banks begins at the foot of S23 (the page he had used for the expanded version of the Theme), with a two-part canonic opening for piano (Example 3.10, variant 1). It is certainly possible, given its position, that with this sketch he is actually continuing his score of the work, intending now to follow the Theme with a canonic section. But it is more likely that as the sketch lasts only five bars, is obviously incomplete in the piano and non-existent in the cello (a cello part is indicated at the beginning of the system, but its staff remains blank), he is merely making use of the space at the bottom of S23 for the first draft of a canonic opening.

Variant 1 is in contrary motion, its voices (I-0 and P-3) separated by two beats, and the first (I-0) continuing with the opening of R-6 in augmentation. Perhaps Banks has provided a clue as to why this sketch was abandoned: in bar 4 a line is drawn between two Abs in different octaves (note 12 of I-0 and note 11 of P-3) which are heard simultaneously and therefore constitute a stylistic weakness. Three more sketches derived from the initial two-part idea appear on S69. The first is a
three-part canonic opening (variant 2) in which the first voice is identical to its predecessor. This time, however, I-0 is followed two beats later by P-6 rather than P-3, and with the new voice a minor third higher than before, any incidental note doubling is avoided. Below these two parts is the beginning of a third, P-1 (which becomes technically the second as it begins one beat after I-0 and one before P-6), of which only five notes are sketched before the fragment is abandoned for one or both of two reasons: the fifth note D♭ of P-1 is heard simultaneously (if momentarily) with the sixth note D♭ of I-0, and the crotchet triplets at which the third (P-1) voice has just arrived are proving to be awkward to notate, crossing the barline as they do.

The sketches that follow suggest Banks stopped for both of these reasons. A single-part sketch of P-0 (variant 3), beginning (as had P-1) on the second beat, is started below, his intention probably to solve the notation problem posed by the crotchet triplets. This row stops after the tenth note, however (erroneously written as B♭ rather than A♭), at a point eight beats after the previous barline, possibly as he realises that there is no way he can write the triplets across the bar without sub-dividing. Immediately below, a two-part opening (variant 4a) begins with I-0 once again the first voice and P-0 (replacing P-1) one beat behind. In the second attempt at the second bar here (variant 4b), the triplets in both voices are sub-divided, after which the canon is abandoned without either row being completed.

The lower half of S69 remains empty as Banks apparently moves instead to a new page (S15) to experiment with some more widely spaced canonic openings. Here, for the first time in this sketch series, the cello is specifically written as the first voice (again at the bottom of its register, as in so many of the Variations sketches). The page begins with a three-part canon (variant 5) in which P-0 (labelled by Banks) is retained for the first and third voices, and I-0 used for the second. The second voice enters twelve beats after the first (on its last note), with the third entering only six beats later. This is the first time the number of beats between entries has been varied, and probably represents an attempt to give the passage greater momentum. As in variant 1, I-0 continues with the first two notes of R-6 in augmentation and P-0 (first voice) continues similarly with RI-6. The three voices are heard together only briefly,
in the latter half of the fifth bar, and the sketch concludes after the final note of the initial third voice row.

The following canon (variant 6) is probably in two parts only because Banks abandoned the sketch before adding a third, despite having left room for it initially. The two voices are in parallel motion for the first time; the first voice (P-0) is unchanged from the previous variant, and the second (P-4) enters on the first beat of the third bar, at the structural mid-point of the subject where the first melodic arch finishes and the second one begins. This time the cello follows P-0 with RI-7 rather than RI-6, but the sketch is abandoned at the end of the system after only eleven notes of the second voice.

It is at this point that a significant rhythmic change is made to the material, and the resulting subject becomes the basis for another set of canonic experiments which will be discussed as Group Three of the sketches. Throughout Group Two, Banks uses his developed row (Example 3.8, variant 6) canonically as a whole unit. He tries introducing new voices at various points of the row, but does not to any great extent attempt to continue the openings so as to construct a section of any substance, appearing more interested merely in hearing each new voice with those preceding it.

**Group Three  S15, S14, S20, S74**

On the last system of S15 is another version of P-0 for cello in its low register in which the crotchet triplets are moved forward by one bar to the third and fourth beats of the first bar. This new version of the row (Example 3.11, variant 1) becomes the prototype for another set of canonic openings that appear over four pages and comprise Group Three of the sketches. The positioning of the triplets over the rising notes 2–4 both propels the passage to note 5 (Db) at the beginning of bar 2 (with more first-bar momentum than the previous version) and allows for an exaggeration of the arch of the phrase which falls immediately from that point via the diminished triad of notes 5–7. Greater rhythmic diversity is introduced to the second phrase of the subject by the inclusion of a semiquaver rest that emphasises the drama of the progression to note 9 (A♯), followed immediately by quaver triplets leading to note 12 (E♯) on the first beat of bar 3. The entire row, with the exaggerated contour of its
first phrase and greater variety of rhythmic cells within its second, and all lasting only nine beats, is, I believe, a more intense and dramatic unit than any Banks had designed previously for this work.

But his approach in this sketch is not just one of rhythmic alteration of the material. Having abandoned his previous canon (on the system above) before completing the initial row of the second voice (Example 3.10, variant 6), he takes the time now to write a time-signature (which he had not done throughout the Group Two sketches), and in writing the second voice specifically for piano (both hands), uses a non-contrapuntal element (that of texture) in the Group Two and Three canonic sketches for the first time. The two voices have the same row, also for the first time (although in Example 3.10, variant 5 the first and third voices, which do not overlap, use the same row), the piano entering two beats after the cello with a L.H. tremolo on its first two notes (C\#: and Eb, the same two notes, of course, that the cello has just played). The tremolo, marked \textit{fp} and written one octave below the cello, continues for six beats, its minor third interval a soft rumbling presence under virtually the entire first voice subject. The R.H. has the remainder of the second voice, one octave above the cello. Each of the voices continues for only one note beyond its opening subject with an Eb which is probably the first note of RI-7 (as in Example 3.10, variant 6 above). Having designed a new subject, adding degrees of textural and dynamic nuance for the first time in the development of his most innovative canonic opening to this point, Banks' abandonment of the variant at this early stage seems abrupt and may best be understood when we compare the sketch with the one that follows.

On S14 is a second variant in which the P-0 rows, the order of voices and number of beats between them, and the registers of all lines are retained, and yet the character of the subject is fundamentally changed (Example 3.11, variant 2). In expanding the row from nine to twelve beats, Banks has replaced drama and intensity with a more lyrical line. The first bar remains unchanged, its crotchet triplets on notes 2–4 proving now to be as important a structural feature as are the second-bar crotchet triplets in the Group Two canonic subject (Example 3.8, variant 6). Notes 5–12 are used over eight beats here rather than five, doubling the length of the diminished triad (notes 5–7) from three quavers to three crotchets, and losing, as a result, the rapid and dramatic
movement that characterises the second bar of the first variant. The ninth note of that variant (A♯), which is on the third beat of the second bar, is now pushed back to the first beat of the third bar, its descending semitone (to A♭) at the beginning of the second phrase the most important dramatic element of this row (as significant as is the descending semitone from notes 11–12 in the Group Two canonic subject), while the quaver triplets that drive variant 1 to its final note are removed, a second crotchet triplet now closing the row more peacefully at the end of the third bar.

This variant returns in spirit to the flowing lines of the Group Two canonic subject while expanding the textural ideas introduced in variant 1. The notes are evenly spread between the three bars of the row; the first phrase (notes 1–8) is once again a rounded two-bar arch, while the second phrase, no longer arched, drops away both in pitch and volume from the pivotal accented A♯. The L.H. tremolo is continued under the extended subject until the end of the first voice and phrasing marks are added to both voices.

Another canon begins on the piano immediately after the conclusion of P-0. This time the hands are independent, P-10 (L.H.) followed one beat later by I-7 (R.H.). Although only two notes of each row are written before the sketch is abandoned, the remaining Group Three material, consisting of seven more P-10/I-7 canonic openings based on variant 2 (shown in Example 3.12), suggests that Banks is searching for the right canonic combination of these rows with which to continue from this point. The rest of S14 is left vacant, his intention being possibly to work on the rows elsewhere and return with a final version.

Four canonic openings are sketched on S20 and three on S74. Only the first ten notes of the rows are ever used in this series, the subjects stopping (at the latest) after the dramatic accented quaver ninth note and its descending semitone resolution (see Example 3.12). P-10 appears throughout the six variants in the same low register used in the preliminary sketch (Example 3.11, variant 2), while I-7 is (with the exception of variant 4) either in its original register or one octave above; we may note that Banks' initial idea in Example 3.11, variant 2 was to begin I-7 on G♯⁵, but he subsequently crossed out the note, rewriting it down one octave.
The sketches on S20 all use P-10 as first voice and show Banks working through various combinations of structural, aesthetic and technical factors such as: number of beats between voices; register of the second voice; minor alterations of rhythm; and accurate notation of simultaneous crotchet triplets and quavers. The first variant (Example 3.12, variant 1) begins on the first beat of the bar (rather than the third, as in the preliminary sketch), with the second voice (I-7) starting on Gh⁹ two beats later.

The second variant also begins on the first beat and maintains the registers of the voices while bringing the I-7 entry forward to the second beat. A major structural change to the subject here is the replacement of the crotchet triplets with a quaver/crotchet/quaver figure that will enable Banks to write the row beginning on the second beat across the barline accurately without the need for subdivision (variant 2). The first voice is written out in full (notes 1–10), but despite having removed the awkward triplet movement, he still appears to be having trouble notating the second voice (as he had previously in the Group Two canons; see Example 3.10, variant 4). The first bar of the I-7 row here contains nine quaver beats. Beginning again below (variant 3), he corrects the notational errors in I-7, simplifying the subject slightly by removing the rest between the second and third notes. This time the first ten notes of each voice are written before the sketch is abandoned.

In variant 4a, the rows return to the registers and positions within the bar that Banks had nominated on S14 (see Example 3.11, variant 2). Crotchet triplets are reinstated for notes 2–4, but problems with the notation of the second voice arise again and, after subdividing the passage first into sixteen (erroneously, as he realises after writing only two notes of the first voice), and then into twenty-four in variant 4b (in order to be able to divide each crotchet beat into six), he stops writing once he has negotiated the triplet passage in both voices. His main interest at this stage is apparently in solving the notational problems posed by the complexities of the cross-rhythms; he spends the better part of half a page working on subdivisions and making numerous calculations related to note values and groupings in the margin, finding room also to sketch I-7 (notes 1–8) in diminution at the end of system 5 (see Appendix A, S20).
Three more canonic openings are sketched on the vacant lower half of S74 (the hexachords occupying the upper half will be discussed with the miscellaneous sketches). In the first sketch (variant 5), the voices are reversed; I-7 is lowered by one octave and moved to the L.H. for the first time, and the second voice (P-10) is introduced after two beats rather than one for the first time since variant 1. The placement of the subject openings on the third and first beats of the bar (in that order), which allows Banks to avoid the notational complexities encountered in previous variants, also suggests that he may still be thinking of this canon as a continuation of the S14 material (Example 3.11, variant 2).

In the final two variants (6 and 7), P-10 appears in augmentation (as the first voice in the former and the second voice in the latter), and I-7 returns to the higher R.H. registers of the earliest S20 sketches (variants 1–3). Both variants remain incomplete and become progressively more difficult to read as Banks, apparently working at great pace (and having already partly written out I-7 in diminution on S20), experiments with the rows in combination, one at twice the speed of the other.

In the Group Three sketches Banks both develops his earlier canonic ideas and moves in new directions. While with the Group Two material he is concerned largely with the development and subsequent canonic use of his row in its entirety, in the later sketches he first makes a significant structural alteration to the Group Two subject, then introduces the element of texture to the previously purely contrapuntal canonic openings. Finally, he writes a series of sketches based on rows introduced at the conclusion of the first canon (and possibly intended to follow it) in which he uses only the first ten notes of each row as a subject, dabbling also with the augmentation and diminution of the rows.

**Miscellaneous Sketches**

The remaining sketches for *Variations* comprise eight fragments that use canonic, textural and rhythmic elements individually and in a variety of combinations (contained on five pages, in chronological order probably S22, S73, S21, S70, S14), and a list of interchangeable hexachords (S74) to which Banks almost certainly referred as he combined hexachords to construct new rows (S73). The sketches
cover virtually the entire period of composition, from a canonic idea that appears alongside the second variant of the opening phrase on S22, (Banks' title page), to a fragment lasting less than four beats, for cello only, written below (and so presumably after) Group Three material on S14.

While for the bulk of the canonic sketches in Groups Two and Three Banks uses an entire row as his subject and is concerned solely with matters contrapuntal, his earliest canonic sketch for Variations (S22, system 3) is based on a single hexachord (P-0 (H2)), and reveals immediately his awareness of, and interest in, the textural possibilities of the cello. This fragment, labelled “3” in reference to the overview above in which section 3 is designated as “canonic”, begins with the cello pizzicato in low register (see Example 3.13, variant 1). The positioning of the first voice on the lowest of the three staves suggests that Banks’ initial plan was to begin with the piano L.H. — in other words, the contrapuntal idea predated the textural one. The L.H. enters on the second staff after four notes, one octave above, followed with the same separation by the R.H., a further major sixth above. Only two notes of the third voice are written, leaving doubt as to whether the subject here is inverted or in retrograde (the E♭-F♯ progression is ambiguous, and may be interpreted either way).

The sketch (again labelled “3”) is rewritten at the top of S73, with a number of ideas and queries added regarding tempo, dynamics and expression: “Moderato B — 6–11, \( \frac{4}{4} = 72–80? \), “Balance?”,”Staccatiss” and “Ritmato” all appear before or during the first bar (Example 3.13, variant 2). Surprisingly, considering the number and diversity of these annotations, the second version of the sketch is no more substantial than the first. The cello line continues for three notes only with P-0 (H1) in retrograde (R-0, notes 7–9), the second (L.H.) voice gets no further than its initial entry, and the third (R.H.) voice is not introduced at all. We can only speculate as to why Banks should go to the trouble of transferring the fragment to a new page only to abandon it so soon.

There is one other canonic fragment among the Variations sketches. On S21, a four-note figure (P-9, notes 6–9 or RI-5, notes 7–10) is written for the two hands of the piano (see Example 3.14). Strictly speaking, as the voices do not overlap, the figure
is imitative rather than canonic, but as it is similar in design to the two previous sketches, with the second voice entering after four notes of the first, and one octave away (this time below), it is reasonable to assume that the original intention here was canonic. Only the four notes of each entry are sketched, with those of the first (R.H.) voice slurred, before the fragment is crossed out. This is the only sketch among the Variations pages where less than a hexachord is used as a unit for imitation, and it thus provides a unique link between Banks’ earliest canonic experiments and the finished product seen in the Studies.

At this point we may compare the two types of canonic writing within the Variations sketches, styles perhaps best described as melodic and motivic respectively. In the sketches for Group Two, Banks first develops his row melodically into a thirteen-beat unit (see Example 3.8) which he uses canonically in its entirety (see Example 3.10), and similarly in the later Group Three sketches, he settles on the first ten notes, lasting nine or ten beats, for his canonic opening experiments (see Example 3.12). In both Groups, the row appears mostly in combination with rows of different transpositions and forms, and with considerable variation in the spacing between voices. It is true, of course, that the first Group Three canons do contain a degree of textural nuance (see Example 3.11), but this is in addition to, not to the detriment of, the melodic line of the row. By contrast, the subjects in the miscellaneous canonic sketches comprise a part of the row only (a hexachord or less), and are treated as motive rather than melody, with the notes used in their narrowest possible range and as a single rhythmic unit. For the most part, these shorter fragments appear with the same pitches in all voices, Banks’ principal interests appearing to be in the textural and expressive possibilities of the motif on the different instruments, and the imitative, uncomplicated flow of the motive between voices.

There are two fragments (one for each instrument) within the miscellaneous sketches which together show the diversity of Banks’ textural ideas (see Example 3.15). At the bottom of S21 is a three-bar sketch entitled “head to 3”, apparently an idea for the opening of the canonic section in accord with the overview (see Example 3.15a). While the two previous sketches for section 3 were purely canonic (see Example 3.13), this fragment contains an introductory passage for piano followed by a cello
entry that may be intended as the first voice of a canon (the piano part below remains blank). The piano introduction, consisting of two tremolo chords, each comprised of a hexachord of P-0, expands in both dynamic and range; the first hexachord uses six adjacent notes and the second spreads out with three notes to either side, the whole figure marked crescendo, with pedal down throughout. After this considerable build-up, the cello enters ff and Martellato, every note accented, with P-0 (H2), the same hexachord (and, except for the last note, in the same range) that Banks had used in the earlier canonic sketches for this section (Example 3.13). The abandonment of the sketch at this likely point for a canonic opening within his designated canonic section indicates that, as the heading suggests, Banks’ principal intention here was to make a note of the introductory piano figure, detailing such textural nuances as tremolo, accents, and wide dynamic range.

On S14 is a three-beat sketch for cello probably based on R-0 (H1), although the accidentals needed to complete the final dyad of that hexachord are missing (F# and G½; see Example 3.15b). This fragment, of particular interest because it contains the only evidence of textural writing for the cello apart from pizzicato in the Variations sketches, consists of a two-note legato figure followed by two double-stops (the first played three times) marked both col legno and spic. As each of the repeated double-stops is also marked with staccato dots, the spic marking in this context is superfluous. Such naivety surely indicates that this sketch predates Banks’ discussions with Nelson Cooke.

Three essentially rhythmic ideas are sketched on S70. P-0 (H1) is used for the first two, and a single repeated note (F#²) for the third, with the idea in each case based on a two-note rhythmic pattern (see Example 3.16). In the first fragment (variant 1), headed “vc”, the pattern lasts one bar, with Banks writing four notes (two bars), all f and accented, before adding “etc”. On the staff above and joined by a brace in the margin, is the annotation “Piano Moving”, although whether Banks intended the piano to be a leading voice or to accompany the cello row is impossible to say; both the positioning of the brace and the fact that he left room above (rather than below) for a single piano line suggest that this figure was conceived for L.H., and the instrumental markings added later. The second fragment (variant 2) is based on a
much more rapid pattern of three quavers duration (quaver/crotchet note lengths), the entire hexachord now lasting for one 4/4 bar with quaver upbeat. This pattern is reminiscent of the jazz-influenced cello line of the Moderato (Example 3.7, variant 3b). One staff above is again left empty here (joined this time by barline), but no clues are provided as to Banks’ envisaged roles for either of the instruments. It is only after the third fragment (variant 3 — related, with its similar pattern of note-lengths, to variant 2), which dispenses with the row and notates the pattern purely as a rhythm, that his intentions for the line are revealed by the annotation “etc giving rise to rhythm! or accompaniment”.

Arrows drawn on the matrix (S71) connect hexachords (principally those of the P-0 row) to others of identical note content, and on S74 (systems 1–4) the P-0 hexachords are listed with their three “interchangeable ½ rows” (as the page is headed) in both prime and retrograde forms. On S73 (systems 2–5) are Banks’ experiments with hexachordal combinatoriality; constructing eight new rows, he first combines each of the P-0 and I-0 hexachords with their transpositions by an augmented fourth before continuing with others arrowed on the matrix. There is no evidence of these “re-constructed rows” (as he labels them) being used in any of the Variations sketches. Their position on S73 below what is probably one of his earliest sketches, together with the appearance of the interchangeable hexachords that surely preceded them on S74 above Group Three canonic fragments, places them somewhere in the middle of the compositional process.

The sketches for Variations represent Banks’ first unsupervised efforts as a composer of chamber music following his studies with Dallapiccola. While they are undoubtedly experimental and at times reveal his lack of experience, they also show a great diversity of influences and ideas, and in some cases, imaginative solutions to compositional problems.

The diversity of Banks’ influences is apparent as early as his first full page of sketches (S22). Here, in his overview (Figure 3.1), elements reflecting his Australian background (jazz), European studies (serialism, canon, transformations of rhythm and
tempo), and work as a copyist and arranger of film music (textural effects) are combined. The content of the sketches confirms this diversity; nine are concerned with various serial issues (Examples 3.1–3.9), five with canon (Examples 3.10–3.14), three with textural ideas (Examples 3.11, 3.13, 3.15), two with problems of rhythmic notation (Examples 3.10 and 3.12) and two with jazz-influenced rhythmic patterns (Examples 3.7 and 3.16).

Banks' methods of transforming his initial ideas into the precise forms he requires may be seen in several of the sketch series. At the top of S22 (and preceding even the overview), he writes probably his first sketch for the work, an opening phrase of the Theme, which, complete with phrasing and dynamic markings, is already a carefully considered unit (Example 3.3). In the following three variants, only cosmetic changes are made to the phrase, the two most significant being: alterations to the time-signature which, together with *poco tenuto* markings, give each note an exact emphasis within the overall framework of the phrase; and an experimental lengthening of the central cello note in variant 2.

In contrast, the initial sketch for the Group Two subject consists merely of four notes, and Banks' process of constructing a row form that may serve as both opening statement and basis for subsequent canonic development is a gradual one (Example 3.8). It is only after the considerable trial and error of six variants that he is satisfied with the structure of the subject.

Banks' imaginative approach when solving compositional problems is exemplified by his design for a concluding phrase in the expanded Theme section. Having completed a two-phrase Theme (P, I) and made several attempts to write a Moderato section to follow in accordance with the overview, he returns instead to the Theme, adding two more phrases (R and RI — from the second Theme section of the overview) which almost double its length. But he now has two problems: the balance of his pair of two-phrase sections is not quite right (as Figures 3.2 and 3.3 show), and his extended version of the Theme still needs an ending. He solves both problems by using the RI (H1) opening hexachord of the abandoned Moderato (slightly extended, and now in *diminuendo*) as a coda for the Theme (Example 3.6, variant 4).
His attempts to combine twelve-tone and canonic ideas, while many and varied, remain experimental, and any method of developing a canonic section of substance, elusive. The canonic sketches consist of openings only, with virtually no continuation of voices beyond their initial statement of the subject. It is as if Banks, in search of a starting point and without any firm plans for the section, has notated the openings in order simply to hear a variety of canonic elements in different combinations. Principal among these elements are:

- length of subject (from the full row as shown in Examples 3.10 and 3.11 and ten-note subject in Example 3.12, to the single hexachord in Example 3.13 and four-note figure in Example 3.14);
- distance between voices (in the three-part canons shown in Example 3.10, variant 2 has all voices beginning within two beats, while in variant 5 the second voice enters twelve beats after the first, and the third six beats later);
- series-form (from Example 3.13, variant 2 in which P-0 (H2) is used for both voices, to Example 3.12, variant 6 which is in contrary motion (I-7 and P-10) with augmentation in the latter voice only);
- voice register (from the two voices set one octave apart in the bass clef in Example 3.13, to the two voices spanning almost three octaves in Example 3.12, variant 5).

Not surprisingly, Banks’ approaches to composing for piano and cello here are very different, his assured and technically astute style when writing for the former contrasting to his unadventurous and naïve sketches for the latter. In the fragments in which the piano part is not merely accompanimental, its material is developed from a densely written first variant to a sparser version by the stripping away of notes or entire rows. The sketches for the Moderato, for example, initially contain three simultaneous rows of which two are for the piano; in later variants one is removed, and the piano hands share one row (Example 3.7). And at the piano entrance in the Group Two sketches, the number of simultaneous notes is reduced and rests added, the material thus simplified and expanded as it is reworked (Example 3.9). It is impossible to say whether this compositional process represents a deliberate plan by Banks to include too much material in the early versions with the intention of
whittling away whatever is superfluous in the following variants, or if he inadvertently overwrote his piano parts at first and subsequently needed to lighten the texture for such reasons as improving the balance between instruments or increasing the clarity of the remaining material.

The writing for cello is almost exclusively in its lowest register and with no note shorter than a quaver triplet, no great demands are made on the performer. While the vast majority of the sketches are technically unadventurous, perhaps the various ideas they contain may be better described as preliminary and exploratory, since Banks was composing the fragments with a view to hearing and discussing them with Nelson Cooke. This explanation would also put in context the tautological markings surrounding the hexachordal fragment shown as Example 3.15b; here Banks may have been listing notational possibilities prior to meeting with Cooke.

Having examined all the sketch pages for *Variations*, we may now speculate on Banks' reasons for discarding both his structure and row at this point. It is important to remember that he had long since modified the original variation form outlined in the overview. He had made little progress on all but one of the sections begun, the exception being, of course, the opening Theme, which was not only completed, but doubled in length by the use of material initially allotted to the second Theme section. The combination of these points suggests a certain naïveté in Banks' compositional process from the outset. It is hardly surprising that, having omitted the planning of the bulk of the work beyond the single words and phrases of the overview, he was unable to make substantial headway with any of the variation sections. Neither can it be coincidental that the only two sections he had set out in detail (the two Themes) were the very ones he then decided to combine. The overview offers only the extremes of sections over-planned to the point of constriction on one hand, and vague, descriptive headings that are of no use in a structural sense, on the other.

It seems most likely that Banks decided to begin afresh with a different format because, not having translated his ideas for the variation sections into workable plans, he was not able to expand section openings into sketches of any great substance. We may not so readily find a reason for his change of row — while aware of the
intervallic limitations that Banks placed upon himself with the *Variations* row (see Example 3.2), it is only by comparing this row with the one used for the *Studies* that we may understand his motives. A comparative analysis of the two rows may be found in the following chapter.
The preliminary sketches for
*Three Studies for Cello and Piano* and a
comparative analysis of the *Variations* and *Studies* rows

Banks’ first step after abandoning both his *Variations* structure and row was probably to begin work on another row that could provide the basis for a new piece. While it is not known at what points the title and format for the new work were conceived, there is no evidence to suggest that either was a factor during the initial stages of composition. For the purpose of identification, however, the title *Studies* will be used in this chapter and the likely origins of both title and format will be discussed in Chapter 5.

The earliest appearances of the *Studies* row are in preliminary sketches for the new work on S66 and S72 (see Table 4.1). The sketches reveal a fundamental similarity to the earlier row in the use of chromatic hexachords, which are pitched one semitone higher than their *Variations* counterparts. In other words, the P-0 row here comprises the hexachords B♭-E♭ and F♭-B♭, compared with the *Variations* P-0 row hexachords B♭-E♭ and E♭-A♭ (see Example 4.2). S72 contains a matrix on which numerous arrows connect hexachords of identical note content in the same manner as on the *Variations* matrix. But whereas the arrows on the earlier matrix principally link the P-0 hexachords with “interchangeable” sets, on the present page only one is a connection for the P-0 row. The most remarkable aspect of the placement of the arrows here is that three of them link the second hexachord of P-11, which consists of the chromatic set E♭-A♭ and is therefore an identical pitch-class set to the second hexachord of the *Variations* P-0 row, with all its interchangeable sets.

**Table 4.1** The Preliminary Sketch Pages for *Three Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S66</td>
<td><em>system 1</em>: P-0 row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>system 2</em>: I-0 row, first trichord only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>system 3</em>: 1st hexachord of P-6 — a re-ordering of the 2nd hexachord of P-0, with arrows to both hexachords of the row on system 1 emphasising the combinatorial significance of this hexachord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S72</td>
<td>systems 1–12: <em>Studies</em> matrix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At the top of S66, the new P-0 row is written in full with notes numbered and so widely spaced that the I-0 row cannot be fitted on the same system. The latter is begun below, but abandoned after three notes. On the third system, the first hexachord of P-6, a transposition of the first hexachord of P-0 by an augmented fourth and thus an identical set to the second hexachord of P-0, is sketched and connected to both P-0 hexachords by arrows (see Example 4.1, systems 2–3). Banks’ intention here appears to be to construct a new row by combining the first hexachord of P-0 with its own transposition, which would repeat exactly the procedure in the first of the “reconstructed” Variations rows on S73. For reasons unknown, however, he does not continue his experiments with combinatoriality on this page.

At this point it will be useful to re-examine the preliminary sketches on S18 in order both to demonstrate the degree of similarity between the first hexachords of the two rows and to raise the possibility that the S18 series is the common ancestor of the cognate hexachords. The S18 sketches, it will be remembered, consist of the 24 possible permutations of four notes that may follow a predetermined interval within a single hexachord. Not only is this hexachord an identical pitch-class set to the first hexachord of the Variations row, but the first of the S18 permutations, with its three note pairs in a different order, becomes the first hexachord of the Variations P-0 row (see Example 4.1, systems 1–2). Similarly, the first hexachord on the second system of S18 is identical to the first hexachord of P-11 of the Studies row. It is possible that when redesigning his row Banks not only returned to the S18 permutations (which he had, after all, probably sketched only a matter of days previously) for the first hexachord complete, but also sketched a second hexachord at that pitch (and so at the same pitch as the Variations row). This scenario, in which the P-11 hexachords were the original pitch-class sets of the Studies row, would explain the centering of so much combinatorial activity around the second hexachord of P-11 on the Studies matrix. A subsequent decision to raise the pitch of the P-0 row by one semitone may be explained as a desire to retain the opening pitches of the Variations row, in which particularly effective use had been made of the cello’s C string.

The bulk of the material in the Variations row (nine of the twelve notes) is retained in the Studies row in the shape of three figures consisting of two, three and four
notes respectively (see Example 4.2). Two of these figures occur at the same point with the other one note later, and two occur at the same pitch with the other a semitone higher. The three figures are:

- an identical rising minor third (C–Eb) between the first two notes;
- an identical three-note figure consisting of a rising minor third and descending semitone (B–D–Db) which occurs from notes 3–5 in the Variations row and 4–6 in the Studies row;
- descending final tetrachords comprised of semitones either side of a minor third; this motif is bracketed in the P-0 row of the Variations matrix and appears throughout that sketch series (see Example 3.5).

A comparison of the intervallic contents of the two rows shows that while both are comprised predominantly of minor thirds and semitones, this predominance is less pronounced in the later row (see Table 4.2). The balance between the two intervals has also shifted here, with the number of minor thirds halved and semitones increased. It is significant that with the greater intervallic diversity in the Studies row (five intervals used instead of three), the only interval not contained is the major third which, as the third interval used in the Variations row (from notes 2–3), had played a pivotal melodic role (especially in its inverted form) in many of the earlier sketches. No interval appears consecutively in the Studies row; while the diminished triad from notes 5–7 of the Variations row (comprised, of course, of consecutive minor thirds), had been bracketed by Banks in the P-0 row of the matrix, and so presumably was initially a figure of particular significance, it is possible that the relocation of the B–D–Db figure from notes 3–5 to 4–6 in the Studies row was implemented specifically to remove that triad while introducing its diminished fifth outline (from notes 6–7) as an interval in its own right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variations row</th>
<th>Studies row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minor third</td>
<td>minor third (or enharmonic equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semitone</td>
<td>semitone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major third (or enharmonic equivalent)</td>
<td>major second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diminished fifth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The intervallic regularity which is a feature of the Variations row, with its note pairs comprising three minor thirds in the first hexachord and three semitones separated by minor thirds in the second, is not present in the Studies row. The reversal of the semitone movement from notes 7–8 here not only breaks the pattern and simultaneously introduces a major second (from notes 8–9), but also enables the second hexachord to take on an arch shape (of which Banks makes considerable subsequent use). And similarly, by moving the second note pair in the first hexachord of the Variations row back one place, the succession of minor thirds is broken up and a third new interval, a perfect fourth, is introduced (from notes 3–4). As a result, in place of the three identical intervals, two trichords emerge in what might almost be considered an antecedent/consequent relationship, each containing a rising minor third followed by a semitone, the first of which rises while the second falls.

On balance, it seems likely that Banks returned to preliminary sketches for the Variations when redesigning his row; the particular similarity of two of the hexachordal permutations on S18 to the first hexachords of both rows suggests that that page served as a common source. And with the retention of the vast majority of intervallic and motivic elements from the earlier series, the Studies row may perhaps best be described as a ‘fine tuning’ of the Variations row.
The sketches for Study I

The precise period of composition of Study I is unknown. No dates exist on sketch pages, preliminary scores or first performance parts and it is not possible even to confirm that it was the first of the set to be written, although on S37 a sketch for Study I precedes several for Study II. On the other hand, not only is there no reason to suspect that the movements were not composed in the order in which they appear, but the close resemblance of the opening cello figures in Variations and Study I suggests a continuity between those two pieces.

Among the thirty-two pages of sketches for Study I (shown in Table 5.1) are two scores. The earlier of these, which was probably prepared for a meeting with Nelson Cooke, is incomplete. In its original form, this projected score consisted of four pages (S1, S33, S31, S30) with a cello part of two pages (S75, S76), while another page containing an expansion of the opening section appears to have been added subsequently (S54). The later, complete score comprises five pages (S1, S55, S57, S58, S59, the first of which is common to both scores) with one page for cello (S77, which along with the equivalent pages for piano, S58 and S59, is written neatly in black ink and was possibly prepared for a second meeting with Cooke), and another page apparently added subsequently, this time containing a transposition of the recapitulation (S60). Of the remaining seventeen pages, ten contain sketches for the opening section (S34, S51, S12, S13, S52, S32, S47, S11, S44, S53), seven for a central canonic section (S7, S46, S49, S45, S56, S37, S43) and three for a recapitulation (S32, S49, S46). There is also one page (S48) containing fragments which, while similar to material appearing in the opening section, may not with any certainty be assumed to have been intended for that passage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S1   | top: "I"  
systems 1–3: first page of a projected score — development of material on S47 (autograph bars 2–10) |
| S7   | systems 1–4: probably a continuation of S44 — material for a canonic section (fifteen bars — autograph bars 23–39) |
| S11  | systems 1–3: continuation of S47 (eight bars) |
| S12  | systems 1–2: opening passage (six bars) — development of material on S34, system 3 system 3: another version of bars 4–5 above (piano only) system 4: another version of bars 4–6 above (cello and piano) |
| S13  | systems 1–4: opening passage (eleven bars) |
| S30  | systems 1–2: continuation of S31 — material for six bars of a projected score (autograph bars 37–43) |
| S31  | systems 1–3: continuation of S33 — material for nine bars of a projected score (autograph bars 22–36) system 1: probably a continuation of S52 (four bars — autograph bars 11–12) systems 4–3: fragment containing material for recapitulation (five bars); all material for the recapitulation here is written with the page turned upside-down (and system 4 thus predating system 2) system 2: another version of bars 1–4 above, labelled “Re-cap” |
| S33  | systems 1–3: continuation of S1 — material for nine bars of a projected score (autograph bars 11–21) top: “1” system 1: opening phrase (three bars) systems 2 and 3: two more versions of opening phrase above system 1: canonic fragment (two bars) |
| S37  | systems 1–4: development of material on S31 (fifteen bars — autograph bars 23–35) systems 1–4: probably a continuation of S11, system 1, bar 1 (twelve bars) systems 1–4: development of material on S31–S30, labelled “Towards end of Canon” (eleven bars — autograph bars 33–41) systems 2–5: development and continuation of material on S45 (autograph bars 41–44) top: “I” systems 1–4: first page of a projected score — development of material on S52 and S52, system 1 (autograph bars 2–12) systems 1–2: fragment similar to material used in the opening section (six bars) systems 3–4: another version of the fragment above (three bars) systems 1–3: development of material on S7 — final bars of canonic section and transition to recapitulation (seven bars) |
| S50  | systems 1–4: probably a continuation of S46 (autograph bars 44–53) |
| S51  | systems 4: development of S34, system 3, bars 2–3 (piano only) systems 1–2: continuation of S34, system 3 (cello part) and S51, system 4 (piano part) |
| S52  | systems 1–4: opening passage (ten bars — autograph bars 2–8) system 4: another version of bars 8–9 above (autograph bars 9–10) system 1: probably a continuation of S47 (one bar) systems 1–2: another, expanded version of the previous bar (six bars) system 3: another version of the material on system 2 (three bars) |
| S54  | systems 1–2: two versions of a four-bar passage probably intended to be inserted into the projected score on S33, systems 1–2 (autograph bars 13–16) |
| S55  | systems 1–4: continuation of S1 — material for bars 11–23 of autograph systems 1–4: development of material on S7 (thirteen bars) systems 1–4: continuation of S55 — material for bars 23–35 of autograph systems 1–3: continuation of S57 — material for bars 36–44 of autograph systems 1–3: continuation of S58 — material for bars 45–53 of autograph |
| S59  | systems 2–5: development of material on S59, recapitulation raised one tone — now at final pitch |
| S75  | systems 1–6: first page of a cello part of a projected score — material for bars 2–20 of autograph, probably written at the same time as the projected score pages S1, S33 |
There are few short fragments among the sketch pages for Study I. The experimental nature of many of Banks' ideas for Variations is replaced for the most part by substantial and often full-page sketches outlining entire passages or sections. The structural differences between the two pieces may at least partly explain these different approaches. The design here is an uncomplicated ternary form, with no predetermined structural parameters, in which an opening section and its recapitulation frame a section based on canonic motion. Although we may not be certain of the point at which this form was finalised, clearly it was in place by the sketching of the earlier, projected score, which dates from about the mid-point of the process; this score consists in its original form of a substantial opening section (fourteen bars, compared with seventeen in the final version), the beginning and end of a mainly canonic section with four bars left incomplete in the middle (the whole occupying seventeen bars compared with the final twenty-six), and the first two bars of a recapitulation (which comprises ten bars in its final version). Banks' chosen design obviously predates this score, and his compositional approach, which may be characterised as one of expansion and refinement, is already in place; once formulated, the bulk of his material remains fundamentally unaltered.

Probably the earliest sketch page for Study I is S34, on which three versions of an opening phrase appear (see Example 5.1, variants 1–3). We may note immediately the use both of the upper register of the cello for the first time — the top note Eb in these variants is more than an octave above the highest note written for cello in the Variations sketches (Dh, shown in Example 3.16) — and of the opening rising minor third in the cello part, which had also appeared throughout the sketch series for the earlier work.

The first variant lasts for three bars, concluding upon completion of the P-11 row on cello. This row is dominated by two notes, Dh (note 2) and Cb (note 6), which between them occupy almost half its duration. The two hexachords are treated differently here: the expansive melodic line of the first, in which leaps of a third,
fourth, sixth and seventh are employed over eight beats contrasts to the second, where with all the notes in the same register and with little rhythmic variety over a duration of only three beats, the style is reminiscent of much of the writing in *Variations* (see Examples 3.9 and 3.13).

The piano part contains three rows, with each drawing on simultaneous cello notes for at least one of its components: the first row, P-0, makes use of the first two cello notes as notes 4–5; the following row, P-5, uses the C♭⁵ as note 7 (although it actually begins before notes 5 and 6); and the third row, P-9 (which remains incomplete even though the piano part stops midway through bar 3), also uses the C♭⁵, this time as note 2. The piano writing combines a harmonic function, in which all of its notes appear in groups of two, three or four, with a contrapuntal role in which the points of greatest activity occur during the two sustained cello notes. The activity during the first sustained note is of particular interest; the second and third chords of P-0 are both repeated, providing a quaver pulse for the latter half of bar 1 and making a rhythmic *stretto* between the two instruments possible, with the piano’s rhythm during the P-0 row repeated two beats later by notes 2–6 of the P-11 row. The opening trichord of the phrase contains an immediate and accented ambiguity of tonality, comprising both major and (enharmonic) minor thirds along with a major seventh.

Like the first version of the opening phrase for *Variations* (see Example 3.3), this variant contains some articulation and dynamic markings, but there the similarities end. The present sketch seems to have been written hurriedly, becoming increasingly more difficult to read, remaining incomplete and with the entire passage finally crossed out. Its use both of high register for the first hexachord of the cello melody and of four rows in total could, in fact, hardly contrast more completely to the low cello register and uncomplicated, repetitive nature of the equivalent *Variations* phrase. And perhaps most importantly, it presents the two instruments as equal partners from the outset.

Immediately below, Banks begins the passage again (Example 5.1, variant 2a); this time he identifies the rows, possibly as he double-checks their notes. The second sustained cello note is shortened to a crotchet, still longer than its surrounding notes,
but not now of sufficient duration to contribute to both the P-5 and P-9 rows. The P-5 row, with its second chord (now comprising G₃, F₈₄ and C₈₃ — notes 5, 6 and 8) brought forward to coincide with the C₅ note 7 and with its following semiquaver figure removed, is abandoned after eleven notes; the cello row peters out after ten notes, and the whole fragment is again crossed out. At the end of the system, another version of bar 2 (variant 2b) makes no alterations to the cello part but delays the second chord of P-5, returning it to the sixth quaver of the bar where it had originally appeared, and in so doing, re-emphasising the element of syncopation within the phrase. The result is that notes 5 and 6 now appear again after note 7, and it is perhaps for this reason that the sketch was discontinued.

At the bottom of S34 is another version of the phrase, with the rows labelled as above (variant 3a). The first alteration to the cello part here is to the duration of the C₅, its dotted crotchet length between those of the two earlier variants. The resultant change to the second hexachord is that note 8 (G₈₄) is emphasised by its placement on the first beat of bar 3, where it is also marked tenuto. The arch shape of this hexachord is now expanded slightly, both by its earlier beginning and by the repetition of its two highest notes, 9 and 10 (A₄ and Ab₄) as offbeat (and thus unemphasised) quaver triplets. These triplets also provide extra momentum in driving the row to its conclusion and, in fact, directly into R-4, the first note of which is labelled. Another version of notes 8–11 is sketched above bar 3 (variant 3b); while the initial note begins at the same point as below, the fragment is simplified by the removal of the note repetitions and triplets.

The piano part of variant 3a contains elements of both previous variants: notes 5–8 of P-5 are played simultaneously on the two instruments, as in variant 2a; and the semiquaver motion used in variant 1 also returns — appearing now as single notes ascending through one and a half octaves and marked with a crescendo to f (which coincides with the cello G₄₈), this figure is part of a contrapuntal R.H. line running throughout the P-5 and incomplete P-9 rows. At the end of the sketch, the first tetrachord of P-9 returns as repeated tenuto chords in the style of the opening P-0 material, but at this point bars 2–3 of the piano part are crossed out and connected by an arrow to the last system of S51, where they are rewritten.
Although these two bars (variant 3c) are even more unclear than the preceding sketches, they do show a less densely written piano part than previously, with no chord here comprising more than three notes. The R.H. has a single, contrapuntal line here for virtually the whole of bar 2 before returning to a primarily accompanimental function in bar 3 with three major seventh dyads. The L.H. is also more contrapuntally significant, with all dyads after the first two of P-5 removed. Notes formerly used as components of dyads are dealt with in one of three ways:

1. they are omitted. Examples are notes 5–6 of P-9, B♭ and B♭, which had previously appeared in bar 3, beat 1;
2. they occur consecutively. Examples are notes 11–12 of P-5, B♭ and B♭, the separation of which means that P-9 now begins in the R.H. (on A♭) before the final note of P-5 (B♭) has sounded in the L.H.;
3. they are transferred to the other hand. For example, note 8 of P-9, having appeared in the L.H. as F♭ in variant 3a, is restored to its original register, F♭, where it is now part of a R.H. dyad.

At the top of the same page (S51), Banks continues the opening passage with three more bars for both instruments (variant 3d). The cello part consists mostly of the bulk of R-4 (notes 2–12), another three-bar phrase that may perhaps be seen as the consequent phrase to an antecedent P-11. Certainly, the final descending minor third of R-4 provides a balance to the opening cello interval of the passage, while the fact that both rows end on E♭ may also be seen as a link of some significance. Major seventh leaps predominate here; all notes from 3–8 (the last two of which are repeated) are involved in such movement. In the course of this row, the cello descends to its lowest register, dropping two octaves from the end of P-11 and almost three from the opening bar.

The piano part here provides an opportunity to further examine Banks' compositional process with regard to his balancing of harmonic and linear elements. After completing the P-9 row (in which note 6 on the cello appears before note 5 in the L.H.) begun in bar 3, beat 4 (see variant 3a), he commences P-8, writing notes 2–3 in the R.H. as a repeated-quaver major seventh dyad, similar to those appearing in bar 3 (see variant 3c). This dyad is the last principally harmonic element of the
variant; the remainder of the notated row, notes 4–8, is comprised of a quaver triplet and duplet (shared between the hands) that mirror the immediately preceding cello figure, and the fact that the following bar contains rhythmic fragments only (mostly under the sustained final note of the R-4 cello row), emphasises that the contrapuntal aspect of the piano writing was the priority in the latter half of this phrase.

Below variant 3d, another version of these three piano bars appears (variant 3e). The P-8 row for the most part follows the lines indicated in the preceding variant, and is completed on the second beat of the final bar. The L.H. part in bar 5 is now comprised entirely of two melodic elements used previously on the cello: a sustained note, similar to two appearing in the first hexachord of P-11 (see variant 1); and a two-beat triplet figure, in which the first note is tied from the previous material (see variant 3a, bar 3).

The two phrases comprising this passage are united on S12 (variant 4a). While the cello rows, P-11 and R-4, are complete, with the final note of the latter the only note sketched in bar 6, the fourth piano row is once again incomplete, concluding this time after the first hexachord of the P-8 row. Apart from a few minor alterations to note lengths, and the addition of several dynamic and articulation marks, the cello part is a direct copy of variants 3a and d. The piano part for the first phrase is also largely unchanged from its previous appearance in variants 3a and c. The sole alteration of significance in this phrase is to the second chord of the P-0 row; previously a repeated trichord in the R.H., its two quaver-length components are now tied. The facts that the simultaneous L.H. note (also notated as two quavers previously) is written as a crotchet, and that the annotation “or ~” appears above the R.H. staff indicate that the decision to turn the chord into a single syncopated entity was made some time after the copying of the R.H. part, but it is unclear if the idea occurred between the copying of the parts for the two hands or if it was initially Banks’ plan to give the hands different material here.

From the beginning of the second cello phrase (the upbeat to bar 4), the piano material is less settled. Although initially retained, almost all R.H. repeated dyads are subsequently changed, with at least one note of most pairs crossed out; this paring back of the material, which may also be related to the tying of the bar 1 R.H.
trichords, effectively removes the repeated dyad as a significant motivic element from the passage. The bar 5 R.H. triplet figure sketched in variant 3a is altered both rhythmically and by the insertion of two foreign notes (B♭3–C#4 — possibly 1–2 of R-6) between notes 5 and 6 of P-8. Another version of the piano part in bars 4–5 is written below (variant 4b), but abandoned after the first tetrachord of P-8, perhaps because the erroneous note order resulting from the deletion of one of the notes in each of the C#4/B♭4 dyads in variant 4a and retained here had only just become apparent.

At the bottom of the page, a greatly altered second phrase is commenced (variant 4c). The expanded cello line here, while once again consisting of R-4 (notes 2–12), is a full bar longer than its predecessors, and material for piano is written in bar 4 only. The cello part was probably sketched first and, by all appearances, at considerable speed; the majority of notes in bars 4–5 are either crossed out or written over previous material, and as the R-4 row moves toward its conclusion, the writing becomes fainter. The extended duration of the phrase is due to the repetition of all notes between 5 and 9. Three consecutive beats in bars 4–5 contain numerous indistinct quaver triplet permutations of notes 5–6 (C#4–B♭3), the more rapid semitone movement here replacing the single major seventh of earlier variants, while the following three notes (F♯3, F♯3, E♭3) are used twice, in the same register as their second appearance in variant 4a (bar 5, beat 2). From this point, in fact, the register of the preceding versions is retained. An alternative version of bar 6, sketched above the system and connected by an arrow (variant 4d), was probably Banks’ final idea of the present sketch series.

The brief piano part of variant 4c, also difficult to read, seems to lead in a new direction before being abandoned. The final two notes here are the opening dyad of P-10 (as marked by Banks), and the annotation “B10 (2nd 6)” above the cello staff in bar 5 indicates the intention to continue with that row, making the sudden departure from the series at this point all the more difficult to understand.

The next opening passage to be written was probably at the top of S13, a full-page sketch containing twelve neatly ruled bars of which the first eleven contain a number of fragments, mostly unclear and often crossed out or otherwise altered. Although
much of the page is incomplete, it is significant that Banks was even planning such a substantial section at this stage; it will be remembered that there are no similarly extended sketches for Variations, and the very existence of such a page so early in the compositional process suggests that having failed in his attempt to compose the earlier piece by working principally on small cells which could subsequently be developed and assembled into a larger structure, he is now going to the other extreme and setting out a large section which he can consider as a single entity from the outset. This is not to suggest that the material on S13 is lacking in detail; on the contrary, some of the rows are labelled, and numerous dynamic, articulation, phrasing and expression marks are used and annotated.

Several of the elements used throughout the first sketch series are retained and even expanded in the S13 opening (Example 5.2, variant 1). The initial rising B♭-D♭ in the cello part, appearing as previously on the second beat of the first bar, is at first written one octave below its original register and subsequently marked “8". But although labelled B♭11 as before, that row is not continued; instead, a rising major seventh to C♯ (note 6 of P-0) follows, giving the cello notes 4–6 of that row. This third note, a quaver, is repeated as a longer note that is of the same duration as the second cello note of the earlier series. As before, the piano part repeats its second and third chords (both trichords now that the cello has an extra note of P-0) in a quaver pulse during the sustained cello note, and these repeated chords directly follow the quaver movement initiated by the cello, thus expanding the earlier idea. This opening fragment, comprised now entirely of the P-0 row and extended by two beats beyond its original duration, may be described as a phrase in its own right; with the P-11 row not proceeding here on the cello, the continuity of the previous three-bar opening phrase is lost.

Another example of Banks’ paring back of his material may be seen in the first piano trichord of this phrase; only the R.H. note is sustained now, allowing the cello entry to be heard more easily at its designated mf dynamic. The material for cello that follows the first phrase is also derived from the earlier series; this is the second hexachord of P-11, which remains in its original register and appears as rising and falling quaver trichords separated by a short, accented piano trichord (P-7, trichord 1), the only other material for piano sketched before bar 5. I-6, which follows
immediately on cello, has note 3 omitted and a question mark below note 4 ($G^\flat_3$) suggesting that Banks was aware of the omission.

The next version of the passage is on S52, at the beginning of another substantial opening section (variant 2). The first phrase is retained virtually unchanged, so much so, in fact, that B11 again appears erroneously above the cello staff; the material for cello is written one octave lower, as annotated in the preceding variant, and is now both bowed and articulated. The intervallic composition of the opening piano trichord, major and minor thirds and a major seventh (as discussed earlier), is echoed here in the same register by the cello entry; the first cello note forms an enharmonic major third with the sustained piano note, the second note a minor third with the first, and the third note a major seventh with the second. P-11 (H2) follows as before, but its punctuating piano chord is pitched one tone higher (P-9, trichord 1). One of these piano notes ($A^\flat_3$) is sketched as both semiquaver and minim; the latter, together with the annotation “or”, was almost certainly added subsequently. In this later format, the chord contains one sustained and two very short notes, and so closely resembles the opening chord of the passage, in which the two short notes are now also sketched as semiquavers.

This apparent link between piano chords precedes a more substantial one between cello elements; notes 4–6 of I-6 appear in bar 4 as a direct inversion of the opening phrase, with the final note ($F^\flat_3$) repeated as before. This figure occurs with such frequency in Study I that it may be accorded motivic status, and so is labelled as motive 1 here (see variant 3) and throughout this chapter.1 The cello part of the passage consists now of four distinct components: the symmetrical outer figures; the arch-shaped P-11 (H2), with its own symmetrical aspect; and a figure comprised of I-6, notes 1–2, which is phrased and shaped dynamically as a separate element. P-9 continues throughout bars 3–4 for piano, with note 9 taken from the cello part ($G^\flat$) and note 11 absent. A R.H. major seventh dyad ($D^\flat_5/C^\#_6$) at the end of bar 4 is marked “(echo)”, probably in reference to the preceding cello descending major

1 It may be remembered that notes 4–6 of the Studies row correspond to notes 3–5 of the Variations row (as shown in Example 4.2). Their very retention in the later row denotes a particular significance and it is therefore not surprising that they should play such a prominent role from the outset.
seventh. Like several dyads in the earlier sketch series, this one is crossed out and replaced by the same two notes ascending as quavers (see Example 5.1, variant 4a, bars 4–5). Pitched two octaves lower and notated in the L.H., the replacement figure inverts and echoes the cello figure in the same register. We may note in this variant therefore, the emergence not only of recurring elements in both the cello and piano parts, but also of some annotated interplay between the two instruments.

Both the dimension and tempo of the opening passage are clearly defined for the first time on S47 (variant 3). On this first page of a projected score, the annotation “Pochiss. Rall” during the bar 4 cello figure confirms the conclusion of the passage and the marking “$\frac{\text{C}}{4} = 88–92$” at the beginning establishes a precise tempo. While three of the four figures comprising the cello part are fundamentally unchanged, the insertion of a tenor clef before the second (previously P-11 (H2)) seems to lead to considerable notational confusion. The second trichord of the figure ($A\flat^4$, $F\sharp^4$, $E\natural^4$) is retained, but the first now consists of $F\#^4$ (as before), which is crossed out with $C\natural$ annotated above, followed by $C\#^5$, $D\natural^5$. The evidence of the following page in this sketch series, S1 (variant 4), indicates that the use of a tenor clef before the first trichord was erroneous, and that the notes $C\natural^4$, $F\#^4$, $G\#^4$ (comprising R-5, notes 6–8) were intended. In other words, the first two notes in preceding versions appear here as notes 2–3; the arch of the overall figure thus remains, with the initial tritone meaning that both halves begin with disjunct motion and continue by semitone steps.

The piano part in variant 3 contains numerous additions and alterations, and may perhaps best be described as experimental. A trichord added at the end of bar 1 and constructed, like the preceding chord, of one sustained and two short notes, contains an ambiguous R.H. component ($B\flat^3$) which was probably intended to be a quaver. This trichord, consisting of P-0, notes 4–5 in the L.H. ($B\natural^2$, $D\natural^3$) echoing in the same register the opening dyad of the cello part and the P-0, note 9 R.H. $B\flat$ brought forward from the first trichord of the second bar, is not retained in subsequent variants. P-9 is again used throughout bars 3–4, but here the first trichord (now
comprised of one short and two sustained notes) is followed immediately by the
fourth trichord (notes 10–12) of that row, an addition which, like that in bar 1, does
not re-appear later in the sketch series. Several versions of the central section of P-9
follow here, with crossings out, transferral of notes between hands and registers, and
overlapping of versions all contributing to a densely packed fragment in which the
order of ideas is impossible to determine. Banks’ plan with this material is
apparently to employ quaver-based movement over the two beats beginning on the
sixth quaver of bar 3, using notes 4–8 of the row. However, it is not until the first
performance piano part (variant 5), where for the first time there is no continuous
quaver motion, that he finds a satisfactory combination.

Two lines are drawn in bar 3 of variant 3. The first, connecting the initial trichord of
P-9 to the first cello note of the bar, $Ab^4$, was probably drawn when Banks realised
that the cello note, originally included as a component of P-11 (H2), was also note 4
of P-9. The second line connects that cello note to the L.H. $Ab^3$ two beats later
which functions as note 4 of P-9 throughout the sketch series. This line not only
confirms his awareness of the repetition of pitch-class, but also suggests a conscious
link between the figures for the two instruments at this point; in other words, the
imitation resulting when both $Ab$s are followed by a minor third (or enharmonic
equivalent) as they are here, may have been intentional rather than inadvertent.

Some time between sketching the opening material on S1 (variant 4) and writing out
parts for the first performance, it appears that Banks decided to increase the dramatic
effect of the passage. His plan was to separate the entries of the instruments and thus
imbue each with a greater significance. Accordingly, in order to move the initial
piano trichord forward by one beat, thereby doubling the time between entries, he
added a bar at the beginning of the work (variant 5). The sff trichord in this final
form of the passage might now decay for two beats before the cello entry which, in
turn, might be written $p$ without fear of being rendered inaudible ($mp$ was originally
written here, as in the three preceding variants, but probably revised during the
rehearsal period for the first performance).
Numerous sketches exist for the bulk of the first section of the movement, and as these all predate Banks' introduction of the additional opening bar, his original bar numbering will be employed here. Owing to spatial constraints, these bars will be examined in this study as two separate sketch series, Examples 5.3 and 5.4.

The material for bars 6–10 first appears in two versions at the end of the opening passage on S52 (Example 5.3, variants la and b). Initially, the piano part is abandoned after bar 7, with the cello continuing alone for a further two and a half bars before being crossed out (variant la); the cello line is then rewritten from bar 8, and this time a piano part is also notated (variant lb). Perhaps the most significant feature of this passage is the use on three occasions in the cello part of a second unit that may be accorded motivic status in Study I, and so is labelled here and throughout the chapter as motive 2 (see variants la and 2). This motive, derived from the final tetrachord of the prime row (as shown in variant la), is comprised of descending semitones either side of a descending (enharmonic) minor third.² Appearing for the first time in the movement in bars 6–7, it occurs initially as part of P-9 (H2), then as the first tetrachord of RI-5 in bars 7–8, and finally as an independent entity (the first tetrachord of RI-10) in bars 9–10. It may also be noted that this last appearance combines elements of the two principal motives by concluding with the repeated-note element of motive 1.

The cello material in variant la, marked Intenso and f, combines several short units of conjunct motion (notably bars 7–8) with a number of leaps (principally major sevenths). Written mostly in quaver duplets and triplets, the passage descends through more than three octaves to its dramatic conclusion on the repeated open C string. In its revised version (variant lb), bars 9–10 are virtually unchanged (the duration of the final note apparently an oversight), while the alterations of register and note length in bar 8 increase the range and continuity, and therefore the dramatic effect, of the passage. This version shows the cello part in almost its final form; the only enduring additions in variant 2 are a ff on the G⁴ in bar 8 which is now the highest note in the passage, and a molto marcato in bar 9, both of which serve to

² Like the earlier motive, this figure appears in both the Variations and Studies rows (as the final tetrachord; see Examples 3.5 and 4.2).
further heighten the drama of the line. Two other alterations in variant 2 are not so enduring: a tie joining the repeated final C\textsuperscript{5}s, thus emphasising the syncopated aspect of the phrase while removing the last step to the climax, and itself deleted in subsequent versions; and an alternative register for note 1 of RI-5, C\textsuperscript{5}, which appears in brackets in variants 2 and 3, possibly reflecting Banks' concern that the technical difficulty involved with leaping to and from C\textsuperscript{4} at this point might be excessive. The fact that this alternative note is missing from the first performance cello part is probably due to a meeting with Cooke which assuaged his fears.

The piano part remains homophonic throughout most of the passage, with linear motion introduced only in the latter half of bar 9. Syncopated, often accented or \textit{tenuto} trichords and tetrachords are used before that point, which by variant 3 is marked \textit{ff}, the climax of a \textit{crescendo} that had begun with the first trichord some two bars earlier. A certain flexibility may be detected in Banks' adherence to "strict twelve-tone"\textsuperscript{3} writing at several points in the passage: first, while the bulk of P-6 is completed by the piano in bar 7, the cello provides notes 7 and 8 (C\textsuperscript{5} and D\textsuperscript{5}) in reverse order (the latter appearing before notes 4–6 in the L.H.); secondly, the sustained R.H. C\textsuperscript{4} in bars 6–7 has no serial function (C\textsuperscript{3} appears as note 11 of P-6, as a component of the final tetrachord of that row); and after two chords containing elements of P-8 have been played in bar 9 of variant 1b, the final note of the preceding I-0 row (G\textsuperscript{5}) appears in the L.H.

Banks annotates his rows throughout variant 1 and in parts of variant 2. The fact that as with the opening cello row of the piece, the annotations are at times incorrect suggests that his first step on such occasions was to make note of his intended row but not erase or replace it subsequently when changing to another row. In bar 8, B9 is written below the third beat tetrachord, but although the L.H. notes at this point (A\textsuperscript{4} and C\textsuperscript{5}) are the first two notes of both P-9 and I-0, analysis of the phrase supports an I-0 interpretation. And from bars 7–9, the cello plays RI-5, which Banks had (probably) labelled RI-9.

\textsuperscript{3} This is how Banks described the \textit{Studies} in the interview with Hazel de Berg. His remark is quoted in full in Chapter 2.
In bars 9–10, P-8 appears twice on the piano. Both series are incomplete, the first missing notes 2 and 10, and the second discontinued after note 8 (although its final tetrachord is taken up by the cello and will be shown as the opening material in Example 5.4). While the two rows begin as separate entities, by variant 3 the first has been extended and the second brought forward so that they overlap. As early as variant 1b, the annotation “or sustain” accompanying the tying of notes 5, 8 and 9 (B♭3, E♭4 and F♯4) over the barline indicates that the possibility of lengthening the first P-8 row was in Banks’ mind. The second row at this point is derived from the opening phrase of the movement; two repeated piano chords outline a quaver pulse, with the whole unit continuing the quaver motion initiated by the repeated notes on the cello (see Example 5.2, variant 1). The overlap is achieved in variant 3 when the first chord of this series is brought forward by one beat and sustained in the L.H. The second chord, still repeated in the quaver pulse, now imitates the cello open Cs two beats later, and so is reminiscent of the earlier imitative figure shown in Example 5.2, variant 3.

The material that follows this passage evolves from a fragment of less than a bar on S32 (following Example 5.3, variant 1b) to a six-bar passage that completes the opening section on S55, the second page of the later, complete score. The sketch series tracing this development is the most extensive of the entire work, encompassing eight pages, such is the scale of the series that its six variants are shown here over two pages (see Example 5.4, pages 1 and 2).

The pivotal figure to which Banks returns repeatedly throughout the series is the final tetrachord of P-8 (motive 2), which completes that row over the sustained R.H. trichord of notes 5–7 (the last notes of Example 5.3, variants 1b–3). Accordingly, each appearance of this motivic figure is labelled here as a new variant. It is always written for cello at the bottom of its register, the first three notes pizzicato (the earliest use of any texturally diverse ideas in the Studies) and the last repeated in a quaver pulse, as in the immediately preceding phrases for both cello and L.H. The first variant, consisting only of this tetrachord, is crossed out and followed immediately by another version (variant 2) in which the notes are separated by quaver rests, becoming a succession of off-beats. Interestingly, the final interval in this figure throughout the series is a major seventh rather than a semitone; the
separation in register of the last note may suggest that even at this early stage, when no following material exists, Banks is considering assigning that note a pivotal role. While such an idea may appear to be mere conjecture, and although it is impossible to assess what he had in mind at this point, the evidence of subsequent variants indicates a significant function for both this C# and the major seventh in general. A faint, barely legible bar containing almost continuous quaver motion and approximate pitches follows here for piano. This bar, which appears to contain only seven quaver beats, is crossed out along with the rest of the variant.

While variant 3a (the continuation of Example 5.3, variant 2) also contains one bar for piano alone after the cello tetrachord, the intended time-signature for this bar (marked *Ritmico*) is even more ambiguous, with the R.H. containing seven quaver beats and the L.H. eight. It seems likely that Banks was planning to continue with the 4/4 time-signature; the very existence of the tied R.H. Ab^3 quavers suggests that either the first was intended to be on the fourth rather than the third quaver of the bar and therefore that the preceding note (Gh^3) was intended to be a dotted crotchet, or that the first Ab was meant to be a crotchet (an alternative supported by the similar R.H. part in bar 17 of the following variant). The R.H. has a carefully articulated, essentially *legato* and apparently syncopated row which, stopping after note 4, consists solely of motive 2, and contrasts to the *staccato* L.H. accompaniment which is based on parts of two different rows in groups of one, two and three notes.

This bar, the last on S47, is crossed out and rewritten at the top of S11 (variant 3b). The labelled rows are continued in the same style here until the end of the following bar, where note 10 of the R.H. row (R-2) is omitted and notes 11–12 appear in the L.H. P-8 returns in bar 14 in a similar format to its previous appearance some four bars earlier (on S47); notes 1–8 are again played in two piano chords, this time with notes 6–8 (rather than 5–7) sustained under a cello entry identical, except in pitch notation and position within the bar, to its previous entry. The facts that the preceding bars are not crossed out and that this bar is the last on the system both suggest that this appearance of the earlier material was not intended as another return to the opening of the passage. Bar 15 is, in turn, similar to bar 14, but with all elements raised by a semitone; the piano now has P-9 (notes 1–8) instead of P-8 and the cello RI-0, notes 1–4 of which are identical to P-9, notes 9–12. The latter figure
is no longer syncopated, returning almost to its original form (see variant 1). As bar 14 is crossed out while bar 15 is not, it appears that Banks' intention with the latter was as a replacement rather than a sequential element, although this reading is tempered by the very presence of the bar number. On balance, it seems more likely that the number 15 was written in earlier and simply not corrected at the time the preceding bar was crossed out. Bar 16, another seven-quaver bar which continues the cello RI-0 row but contains nothing for piano, is also crossed out and apparently revised in the following bar (now with eight quavers), where the R.H. also has RI-0, but in the same style it had used at the beginning of this variant.

After sketching eight bars on S11, Banks writes another version of the passage on a new page (S44; variant 3c). He returns to the middle of the piano phrase in bars 12–13, probably in order to write a new conclusion for bar 13 (although the only alteration here is that the R.H. notes are respaced, which clarifies the fact that note 9 of R-2 appears after notes 11 and 12). P-8, which had followed in variant 3b, is now omitted, and P-9 brought forward one bar. It precedes a new, more lyrical phrase for cello (marked *Poco Rubato*) based on I-1, under the first note of which (C#3) the piano has notes 1–8 of I-7. The decision to cross out the first two bars of the variant, leaving the C#3 as the first cello note of the passage, means that that note may act as both the final note of P-8 (the opening material in this series; see variants 1–3a) and the first note of the solo I-1 phrase. The crossed-out piano material used in bars 12–13 and 17–18 of variant 3b is not discarded entirely; it re-appears at the opening of the central section of the piece, which follows the passage discussed in this sketch series.

The appearance on S53 of a sustained cello C#3 in a single-bar fragment labelled as bar 12 (variant 3d), suggests that Banks has indeed abandoned the material with which he had previously followed his initial P-8 tetrachord. This impression is confirmed immediately in a six-bar sketch in which he returns to the original motive and ties its final C# to the sustained one, thus overlapping the P-8 and I-1 rows (variant 4a). The solo cello phrase is expanded here, with most note lengths at least doubled; its clarity contrasts to the incomplete piano part, which appears to be hastily written, with both precise pitches and accidentals unclear. Interestingly, crotchet
triplets appear for both instruments here (in bars 11–12) for the only time in the series. Below, Banks revises the cello part only (variant 4b), restoring most of the note lengths to their original (variant 3c) durations.

The cello part refined in variants 4a and b is virtually unchanged in variant 5a (the continuation of Example 5.3, variant 3). The use here for the first time of a notated 7/8 bar (surprisingly, perhaps, for the previously 4/4 cello motive in bar 11) and the employment of I-7 for piano again during the sustained cello C# (it had been used at that point in variant 3c) are the principal alterations to the passage. Banks was apparently dissatisfied with the second bar, circling it with a reminder to “see [the] new version” on S54, where two expanded versions of that bar are sketched. The first of these (variant 5b) consists of four bars in which the cello sustains its C# throughout. The piano has a phrase containing continuous quaver movement for more than two bars, dotted with repeated major seventh dyads and based initially on RI-5 (as used in variant 3d, but with note 6 appearing erroneously as Ab instead of Bb). The first R.H. dyad and last L.H. figure of that row are repeated at the beginning of the second bar and followed in turn by a succession of major seventh dyads of various durations that do not belong to a common row. These dyads become sparser and softer as the phrase draws to a close after just over three bars for piano.

The second version is for piano only (variant 5c). RI-5 (H1) is retained here, with P-9 (used for the first time since variant 3c) occupying the following bars; its sustained first tetrachord (including note 3, C#, on the cello) is clearly the climax of the phrase, after which the remaining four dyads appear in the L.H. as major sevenths. Bars two and three are further refined, with fewer notes written and all of those short except the last, thus providing another example of Banks cutting back his material in later versions. And with the opening and closing dyads now the only repeated notes, the symmetrical nature of this arched phrase is more pronounced.

The passage is not assembled in its final form until the later, complete version of the score (variant 6). The opening cello tetrachord is restored to 4/4 here, dynamic and
articulation marks added to the central piano phrase, and the final solo cello phrase annotated in considerable detail.

Approximately half the central section is taken up by canonic motion. Three two-voice canons, all similarly constructed with the cello as first voice and the R.H. as second voice, occupy all or part of thirteen of the section’s twenty-six bars in its final version. While the format of the canons thus remains constant, diversity of such details as their duration, separation of voices, and the interval between voices not only ensures considerable variety, but also provides a means for Banks to develop the momentum that drives the section to the recapitulation.

Before examining the development of each canon individually (in Examples 5.5–5.7), it will be useful to note several of the more important relationships between them. The first canon, lasting more than six bars, is the most substantial of the three. With four quaver beats between voices, the second of which enters a perfect eleventh higher than the first, it also has the greatest separation of its parts. The second canon lasts less than one bar in its earliest version and begins almost immediately after the conclusion of the first. Initially, it uses precisely the same subject as its predecessor, at the same pitch and with the same interval between voices; the difference here, however, is that the voices are only three quavers apart, and this brief telescoping of the previous canonic opening creates an immediate increase in momentum. The third canon lasts for four bars and has an octave between its voices, which are now only two quaver beats apart. This canon leads directly into the recapitulation, and its combination of the further telescoping of the voices with their commonality of pitch-classes serves to focus the drive to the final section even more intensely.

The material for the opening of the first canon subject appears initially at the bottom of S44, as probably the final notes of a projected score comprised of the pages S47, S11 and S44 (Example 5.5, variant 1). These notes for cello are written more than a bar after the piano part has been abandoned, and there is no indication that a canon is intended to begin at this point. The possibility exists, therefore, that Banks only subsequently decided that this figure could initiate canonic motion. Significantly, the last three notes here are labelled I8; they follow an R-9 row directly, with the final four notes of the sketch thus comprising motive 2.
The first canonic idea is sketched at the top of a new page (S7), beginning at the midpoint of bar 20 (variant 2). The same notes appear here, again labelled I8, but now with R12 written over the top (shown here alongside). It is this latter row with which Banks continues, allotting the A♭\textsuperscript{2} a pivotal role as both the last note of R-9 and the first of R1-2 before proceeding with notes 2–4 of that row, which are identical to notes 1–3 of I-8. The first hexachord of R1-2 is sketched in a quaver pulse, and the inclusion of a quaver rest after the first tetrachord divides the phrase into two distinct cells within its seven-quaver duration. The rest coincides with the R.H. entry below, which appears to have been sketched quickly, consisting only of the rhythm of the first three notes and the annotation R17. The combination of these elements is sufficient to confirm a canonic intent on Banks' part while suggesting that he had not yet decided on a register for the second voice. The similarity of this passage to several canonic fragments in the Variations series may be noted at this point; in the earlier series, the second voice also entered after four quavers of the first (see Examples 3.13 and 3.14). The additional component in the present sketch is its cross-rhythmic nature; the defining feature of the subject even at this early stage appears to be its subdivision into short cells which allow a syncopated, and what could perhaps be described as a 'jazz', feel to pervade from the outset.

The register of the second voice a perfect eleventh above the first is established in the following bar (indicated by Banks with bar numbers). Three more unpitched and crossed-out bars follow, their very existence emphasising the fundamental importance of the rhythmic aspect of the subject. The opening row is then completed in both voices, the second cello hexachord beginning, like the first, on the sixth quaver of the bar, and thus introducing an element of rhythmic sequence into the subject. The completed R1-2 is followed by P-4 (H1), in which the short, syncopated cells are retained; a rhythm then outlined for cello alone combining staccato and tenuto elements (see Appendix A, S7, system 3) indicates that the canon in its earliest form has concluded.

Banks returns to this material on S56, where he undertakes a series of experiments with material that may follow the initial row (variants 3a–g). There is no indication that he is planning to expand the passage; these seven fragments deal with the third and fourth bars of the canon only. In variant 3a, R1-6 follows R1-2. Significantly,
the final note of the latter (D#₃) is held for two quavers here, with the dual results that the jazz-influenced syncopation in this bar is enhanced by greater emphasis on the first, fourth and seventh quavers which produces for the second consecutive bar a 3–3–2 quaver pattern, and that RI-6 now begins on the sixth quaver (as had both hexachords of RI-2 in the preceding two bars), thus continuing the rhythmic sequence. This extension of the D₃ (RI-2, note 12) is retained in subsequent versions. In the following bar, which begins system 2, the cello part is placed below the R.H. and apparently labelled as the mistake is realised. The positioning of the voices suggests that the second predates the first here; Banks is more likely to have erroneously sketched the cello line under an extant R.H. than begun the system on the L.H. staff while the staves above were empty. The cello part is certainly the less distinct of the two, and it is not clear whether the double and triple-stops on quavers 4–6 were intended or new ideas were being sketched over old ones. In any case, the second row is abandoned in both voices after ten notes, at which point the two bars on this system are crossed out.

Another version of these bars starts immediately, and the use this time of only the first tetrachord of RI-6 in the first voice is another development which is retained throughout the series (variant 3b). P-4 (H1) follows, and increasingly brief, rhythmically altered fragments of that row appear again in variants 3c and d (the latter for cello only). In variant 3e, the relative positions of the voices are reversed once again, with the R.H. sketched on this occasion on the cello staff; the R.H. was probably written first, copied from the equivalent material in variant 3c which is directly above on system 2, with Banks mistaking the empty L.H. bar on that system for the cello system 3 bar. I₆ is marked here for cello, and notes 1–5 of that row appear with the order of the first two reversed, the syncopated rhythm from quaver beats 4–8 (F#₄–Eh₄) following the same pattern as in the previous two bars (see variant 3a). A fresh start on system 4 (variant 3f) introduces a second use of RI-2 (which seems to be labelled erroneously as RI9), the first note of which, Ah₃, was last sketched in variant 3a, where it appeared also as note 3 of RI-6. This continuation of the subject again makes use of the syncopated rhythm from quavers 4–8, but the row remains incomplete in both voices. A further attempt with the same
material for cello alone (variant 3g) gets no further than the first hexachord of RI-2, and another version of that fragment also appears at the top of S37, where the second voice is added before the sketch is abandoned (variant 4).

The next appearance of the canon is on S31, the third page of a projected score which was probably prepared for a meeting with Cooke (variant 5). Like variant 3a, this version lasts for four bars before being abandoned and, in fact, breaks down in the same place, the material following the first tetrachord of RI-6; the same passage in the cello part written out around this time ends with that tetrachord (see Appendix A, S56, system 2). P-3 (H1) is tried here (labelled "B3 1st half"), but an attempt to continue the rhythmic sequence in the second half of the bar (as sketched two beats later in the second voice) is marred by an erroneous accidental on the fifth quaver (F⁴ instead of a tied F#). At this point, Banks decides to leave a three-bar hiatus in the score (to which he does not return) and continue after that point with different material (the third canon, which will be discussed as Example 5.7).

The following version of this passage provides the breakthrough which sees the completion not only of this canon, but also the earliest appearance of the short second canon (S43; variant 6). The first hexachords of four rows (all labelled by Banks) follow the RI-6 tetrachord, appearing as short, cross-rhythmic cells which, owing to their durations (in the cases of the first three) of six or seven quavers, continually overlap with the previous second voice cell. In other words, the style of the preceding phrases is maintained. The strict canonic motion ends after the third of these hexachords and the offbeat writing continues with the voices now moving together for another bar before the second canon commences.

The fundamental importance of the continuous syncopation throughout this canon may be better appreciated in the context of the complete score (S57), where thorough dynamic and articulation marks accentuate the shape within each cell and the L.H. part is added for the first time (variant 7). Consisting entirely of short notes on crotchet beats, this line provides a pulse containing approximately equal shares of chromatic and disjunct motion. It is comprised for the most part of trichords and tetrachords, with occasional notes that may not be attributed to any set.
As mentioned above, the initial appearance of the second canon is on S43, where it follows the earliest complete version of the first canon. The new canon begins almost immediately the previous one has concluded, and therefore Example 5.6, variant 1 is a continuation of Example 5.5, variant 6. This canon takes as its subject initially the first hexachord of the first canon subject (RI-2 (H1)), with both voices appearing in the same registers as before but now separated by only three quavers. While the first begins as previously on the sixth quaver of the bar, the second voice enters at the beginning of the following bar, overlapping the opening statement of motive 2 by one note, and thus introducing what may be described as an element of stretto. Using this interpretation, in which the two canons are seen as components of a single contrapuntal unit, the second would be classified as an abbreviated stretto version of the first, and the brief intervening material defined as an episode. After their hexachords, both voices have major seventh (or enharmonic equivalent) leaps followed by quaver rests that continue the alternating rising and falling pattern begun with the last two hexachordal dyads. The motion here is in free rather than strict canonic style, however; the first cello movement after the hexachord is up a minor sixth to Eb, whereas the R.H. rises a major sixth to A#. The leaps occur simultaneously, always in contrary motion, with the voices now moving together much as they did after the first canon.

We can only speculate about the stage at which Banks decided to incorporate this passage, based as it is on the preceding one with one fundamental difference, into the canonic section. The three-bar lacuna in the projected score that predated S43 (S31) shows that his intention was to insert some material, but no indication of the type of material is given.

The next version (variant 2) is on S57 (a continuation of Example 5.5, variant 7), where transposition down a semitone of the R.H. dyad following RI-7 (H1) increases the subject length by those two notes. The simultaneous cello dyad is also transposed down a semitone, which means both that the harmonic relationship between the voices at this point is unaltered from the previous variant, and that the final imitative writing of the passage for these two voices, between this cello dyad (Eb–F#) and the following one for R.H., is at an octave. This last figure,
together with another imitative dyad that follows immediately between cello and L.H. (D#-C#) and is also at an octave, may be seen as presaging the voicing in the third canon. The introduction of an incomplete L.H. part shows all lines working in concurrent three-quaver cells from the second beat of bar 30 until the restatement of motive 2 at the end of the next bar. This homophonically based writing contrasts to the motion throughout the first canon and following episode of the two syncopated, contrapuntal voices over a pulsing bass line.

Many details in this passage are not finalised until the piano part for the first performance (variant 3). Nuances of note length, articulation, dynamic, register and notation are all clarified or revised here, perhaps in some instances as a result of hearing the piece in rehearsal.

The third canon dates from the same stage in the compositional process as the first, appearing initially on S7 after the original canonic sketch of the earlier series (see Example 5.7, variant la). Between the two canonic fragments on that page are three bars of unpitched, often cross-rhythmic ideas, mostly for cello, which contain no hint of any canonic intention. It seems likely, therefore, that the section was developed on S7 with only these two canons in mind.

Three significant differences from the first canon are immediately apparent here:

- a unanimity of rhythmic units — the subject is comprised of five phrases composed entirely of quavers, with the phrases separated by quaver rests;
- a *legato* nature — although only the first three phrases are so marked, the evidence of the following variant suggests that the subject is intended to be *legato* throughout;
- the tendency of phrases to rise — all phrases rise, and with each starting at a higher pitch than the last, the subject as a whole rises through more than three octaves.

From its earliest appearance, this canon is designed to lead directly into the recapitulation, at which point motive 1 is used in inversion (variant 1a, bar 33, beat 2). Unlike the other canons, we may detect a sense of purpose here in the gradually rising cells coupled with unvaried rhythmic motion and commonality of
pitch-classes. With the second voice an octave above and only two quavers behind the first, the pitch-classes are echoed and the strettò nature of the passage is emphasised by the focusing of attention on the rhythmically uncomplicated contrapuntal motion. The shape of the canon suggests that a gradual increase in dynamic is intended, and this impression is confirmed by the addition in variant 2 of a crescendo beginning under the second phrase which climaxes on ff at the recapitulation.

Each of the first four phrases of the subject is greater in duration and/or pitch-range (between first and last notes) than its predecessor; the first phrase contains five notes within the range of a ninth, the second has six notes within a tenth, the third has six notes within an eleventh, and the fourth has nine notes within a thirteenth. The subject thus expands with each subsequent phrase while rising in pitch though five bars in its original form. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this canon is the composition of its individual cells and their relationships to those around them; in variant 1a, the entire subject is comprised of components of the P-0 and P-6 rows which, it may be remembered, are hexachordally combinatorial (as noted by Banks on the matrix (S72) and discussed in Chapter 4). P-0 begins as the dominant partner, with notes 1–5 comprising the first phrase, notes 2–6 beginning the second phrase before note 1 of P-6 is introduced, and notes 3–6 beginning the third before P-6, notes 1–2 takes over. Each phrase therefore begins on the second note of the previous one, and P-6 gradually assumes the dominant role. A corollary of this pattern is that the opening notes of the first four phrases also outline the first tetrachord of P-0.

The second voice is abandoned during the fourth phrase and the whole passage is crossed out from that point. Immediately below, those bars are rewritten (variant 1b) with semitone alterations to the third and fourth notes of the final phrase (now C#⁴–D#⁴ instead of C♯⁴–D♯⁴); P-0 (H1), marked by Banks, thus concludes the canon, which brings an element of symmetry to the subject. The recapitulation in variant 1b is pitched a minor sixth higher than the preceding version, its first note for cello four semitones above, rather than below, the final cello note of the canonic section. The first full bar of variant 1a contains five crotchet beats while the last bar
of the canon contains only three; in variant 1b, the latter is notated as 3/4, but it is perhaps not until the time of sketching the next version that the former is identified and standardised, which in turn allows all subsequent bars to remain in 4/4.

The next appearance of this canon is in the projected score (S31–S30) after the three-bar lacuna that follows the first canon (variant 2). The two voices appear as before, with the additions and alterations mentioned previously: *legato* is marked for all second voice phrases; dynamics emphasise the overall direction of the passage; and the bars are uniform in duration. The first bar, which is the last on S31, is crossed out, possibly as Banks momentarily considers starting the canon afresh on a new page. The R.H. chord at the climax contains an A♭⁶⁶ semiquaver where a C⁰⁷ had appeared in variant 1b. With the present trichord, now consisting of R-4 (1–3), retained for the next version of this material (variant 3b) and in kind throughout the series, it is likely that the earlier use of C⁰ was erroneous.

An expanded version of the passage appears on S45 (variant 3a). A first tetrachord of P-0 is added at the beginning in the same register as the original opening phrase, but is marked *staccato* and *pp*, the first time a starting dynamic has been indicated. This tetrachord functions as a transition figure between a bar of unpitched *pizzicato* quavers outlined in the preceding bar and the pentachordal beginning of the present passage. The canon is delayed by more than a bar here, with the second voice not entering until midway through the third phrase (the second of the original subject). The first voice is also extended by two bars at the end, and the subject is altered as early as the fifth phrase (bar 38, beat 4). Two dyads separated by a quaver rest introduce an element of syncopation into the passage in bar 40, before the last four bars of this voice are crossed out and rewritten on the R.H. staff below; the first note of bar 39 is now raised a semitone to D⁵⁴ (arrowed by Banks) and the final three bars are revised in full in the first voice before the sketch is abandoned. The use of R-0 and RI-9 (both also hexachordally combinatorial with P-0 and P-6) marks the first appearance of new material in the canon, while letter names written below the sixth and seventh bars suggest the use of P-0, at less than half the speed of the canonic voices, in the L.H.
On S46, Banks experiments further with the final bars of the canon (variants 3b–e). In the earliest fragment (variant 3b), which is sketched over four staves, the first voice initially varies the revised subject in variant 3a with a phrase comprised of the first tetrachords of P-6 and R-0. Another bar is then added; this includes the first tetrachord of I-3, the last of the rows hexachordally combinatorial with P-0, P-6 and R1-9, which leads in turn to the recapitulation at the pitch designated in variant 2. The second voice remains incomplete, its second full bar rewritten on the staff below; but this version too is incomplete and appears hurriedly sketched, beginning with two notes a semitone higher than in the cello part. On the fourth staff, a L.H. part is added; as in the previous canons, it moves in a crotchet pulse although, in keeping with the style of this sketch series, it is written legato. With P-0 (H1) initially — in the same register as the original second voice — this line may also be interpreted as an entry of the subject in augmentation. The L.H. ascends almost continuously, concluding on a unison Fb with the cello at the recapitulation.

Two more versions of the incomplete second voice are sketched below (variants 3c and d), the latter completing the canon as notated in the first voice in variant 3b. Finally on this page, Banks begins writing out a full version of the final phrase (variant 3e), probably in order to clarify the workings in the three preceding fragments (variants 3b–d). But he still appears unhappy with the cell, crossing out one of the L.H. notes (which he does not replace) and leaving the second voice, which was probably the last sketched, unfinished. We may note at this point Banks’ tendency to use substantial sections of these rows (between six and eight notes) which may overlap by as many as four notes, a procedure that surely reflects his intellectual approach to the compositional process.

The canon does not appear in full until the complete score (variant 4), the final two pages of which (S58–S59) are written out neatly in black ink in a style similar to that used for the probably contemporary cello part (S77). The neatness of the calligraphy here suggests that they were prepared for Colin Kingsley (the pianist in the first performance), perhaps to enable Banks to hear a section of the movement while composition was still in progress. Although the second voice initially enters at the beginning of the third phrase, all its material before the sixth phrase (bar 40; the
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beginning of a *stringendo* leading back to the original tempo at the recapitulation) is subsequently crossed out. As a result, the L.H. enters more than a bar before the second voice with the first dyad of P-0 (pitched an octave below the first voice entry) followed by the eight notes previously sketched in variant 3b: P-0 (H1), P-6 (1–2). That particular octachord appears twice here, as the bass line of variant 3b follows although the canonic voices are not retained. The first appearance is *staccato* and second *legato*, over a range of almost four octaves. Interestingly, while the cello begins with *legato* phrases which are replaced by detached, separate bows, the two piano lines move in the opposite direction, marked "*staccatiss" in bar 40 and slurred in bar 42. The opening of the recapitulation is crossed out and raised a tone, beginning a semitone above the final cello note of the central section rather than below it. It is possible that the alterations both at this point and in the delaying of the second voice entry were as a result of hearing the passage played by Cooke and Kingsley.

The first performance piano part (variant 5) shows the final form of the third canon, with only about half the passage now canonic. The second voice and bass, which now enter simultaneously at the end of the fifth phrase, are marked *staccato*, while a *stringendo* annotated at that point is crossed out, possibly after being tried in rehearsal. The *staccato* and cross-rhythmic writing over the pulsing bass, which is now *staccato* throughout, is more reminiscent of the first canon (see Example 5.5), but the defining characteristic of the present passage evident since its earliest appearance — its sense of direction — is emphasised here by extremes of dynamic (*pp* to *ff*) and range (*C#2–F#5* in the canonic voices and *C#1–A#4* in the L.H.).

The earliest material for the recapitulation consists of two versions of an opening passage on S32. The piano part in the first of these fragments is mostly illegible, and little more than the four-bar cello phrase can be discerned (see Appendix A, S32, where these fragments appear upside-down). Immediately below, a clearer version of the phrase is written and labelled "Re-cap". "I4" is marked for the cello and "I3" for piano, but as was the case in the sketches for the opening of the movement, the latter row is actually used for both instruments; the piano has the first trichord and the cello the second (motive 1), with the whole cello passage an inversion of the opening four bars as sketched on S52 (see Example 5.2, variant 2). It seems likely
that these fragments, and possibly the idea to invert the opening material in the recapitulation, date from that time.

The next three appearances of this material are openings only, those following the third canon sketches on S49, S30 and S46 (see Example 5.7, variants 1–3b). These raise the register of motive 1 in stages (by more than an octave from its original pitch on S32) and also change the format of the opening phrase; the initial descending minor third now becomes the first dyad of the row and the minor third that follows comprises notes 4–5, while the piano sustains note 3.

The sole fragment showing the development of the section from this point to the ten-bar version that appears in the complete score is a full-page sketch on S50. This page contains alterations in both black and red pencil, suggesting it was revised at least twice. After the initial four-bar phrase mirroring the opening passage, the cello (the clearest and almost certainly the first written part) returns gradually to its lowest register over an increasingly sparse and unclear piano part. The movement concludes with a P-2 row for cello that descends over nearly three bars, followed by I-2, notes 4–6 (Example 5.8, variant 1); in other words, the final material here is motive 2 followed by motive 1.

Subsequent versions contain only minor alterations and additions. In the complete score (variant 2), dynamic, articulation and expression marks are added along with a faintly sketched extension of the final L.H. figure, which appears to consist of a sustained minor third (Ebil/Gb ). This last addition, in a smaller and fainter hand than the remainder of the passage, is not retained in later variants. On S60, the entire recapitulation is rewritten at its final pitch, a tone higher than previously (variant 3).

Having examined the sketch pages for Study I and traced Banks' development of his motivic elements, we may now look at the frequency with which those motives are used so that we may appreciate their significance within the piece. Motive 1 appears complete (including its repeated-note element) in eleven of the fifty-three bars and motive 2 in thirty-one, with at least one of the two motives appearing in thirty-nine bars (three-quarters of the score, as illustrated in Figure 5.1).
Figure 5.1 Appearances of the two motives in *Study I*
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**Key**
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It seems likely that Banks abandoned *Variations* because the combination of a row with severe intervallic limitations and an approach in which some sections were set out in restrictive detail while others were described by only a single word or phrase, proved to be an impractical compositional starting point. For *Three Studies*, he altered his row so as to increase intervallic diversity but retained important elements (as shown in Example 4.2) which subsequently achieved motivic significance in *Study I* (see Examples 5.2 and 5.3 and Figure 5.1). His compositional method also changed; the broad parameters he set himself early in the process by simply planning a ternary form in which the middle section would contain canonic movement, was a
far cry from the detailed overview of the earlier work in which precise component lists for the Theme sections were drawn up.

Most of the sketches for Study I are substantial, up to a page in length, and although on occasion the fragments are abandoned before completion of the planned bars, Banks' change of approach appears to be central to the successful completion of the piece. In fact, his method may be characterised as one of expansion, as opposed to the paring back of material in subsequent variants in many of the Variations sketch series. In the opening and canonic sections here in particular, passages are broadened throughout the series by the insertion of new or related material (see Examples 5.4, 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7), with phrase lengths and relationships to surrounding phrases continually fine-tuned.

The different style of canonic writing is of particular interest; while the vast majority of the Variations canonic sketches contain virtually no continuation of the voices beyond their statement of the mostly row-length subject, short-phrased, rhythmically interesting subjects designed to bring out the elements of syncopation and stretto comprise half of the central section here. Banks' use of short units from hexachordally combinatorial rows exclusively for the third canon subject shows an awareness of these relationships, although at this stage he does not take the next step of combining two such hexachords.
The sketches for *Study II*

As was the case for the previous movement, an exact compositional period for *Study II* is impossible to pinpoint. One clue to the chronological order of the first two pieces does exist, however. The presence on S37 of a canonic fragment for *Study I*, probably dating from the middle stages of composition of that movement, which is followed by several sketches for *Study II*, indicates that the bulk of the former predates the present piece. While it is possible that the sketch periods for the two movements overlapped, the fact that there is no evidence of cello or piano parts neatly copied in ink, as exist for *Study I*, suggests that *Study II* dates largely from after Banks’ meeting with Nelson Cooke, at which a preliminary version of the earlier piece was apparently played. Had *Study II* been worked on to any great extent before that point, it seems likely that Banks would have prepared some of the material for that meeting.

Among the thirteen pages of sketches for *Study II* (shown in Table 6.1) are two scores, each comprised of three pages (S35, S39, S36 and S26–S28). Four of the remaining pages contain material for the opening passage (S68, S42, S38, S41), two contain mainly harmonic outlines for the middle section (S5, S40) and one contains several fragments for cello and piano both together and separately (S37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>top: “II”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>system 1</em>: outline for piano of harmonic progression in middle section (autograph bars 10–17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>system 2</em>: continuation of outline above, for piano and cello — material for final section (autograph bars 17–19) — which “Leads back to opening sounds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>top: “II”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>systems 1–4</em>: first page of second score — material for bars 1–10 of autograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td><em>systems 1–4</em>: continuation of S26 — material for bars 11–18 of autograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td><em>systems 1–2</em>: continuation of S27 — material for bars 19–23 of autograph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like the preceding movement, Study II is in ternary form. It consists of only twenty-three bars: an opening section of ten bars comprised of an expansive, texturally varied cello line punctuated by occasional, brief, rhythmic piano figures; a middle section of seven bars in which the previous piano material is developed in the build-up to the $ff$ climax of the movement; and a recapitulation which is a greatly abbreviated version of the first section, as in Study I. The bulk of the sketches preceding the first score are concerned principally with the development of an opening cello subject and a harmonic outline for the middle section. Much material is written directly into the first score, which thus serves as both an assembly point for sketches already written and as a preliminary sketch in its own right.

Probably the earliest sketch page is S5, on which the heading "II" appears above an outline for piano of the harmonic material for bars 10–17 (see Example 6.1, variant 1). Had any of the sketches for the opening section been written at this stage, it seems unlikely that Banks would have labelled the fragment simply as "II", if indeed at all; it is possible, therefore, that this material was itself originally intended as the basis for an opening section.

The fragment begins with three four-semiquaver groups, each consisting of two alternating notes that outline a minor third, and the six different notes of which are those of P-0 (H1). Each new group seems to commence immediately the preceding one has concluded, with both the register and dynamic within this opening passage
rising throughout, the former from the lowest pitch written in any of the sketches for the work, C♯1. All the groups appear at least twice, and concurrently with the repetition of the third group the first returns three octaves above its original pitch, thus continuing the pattern of rising registers with successive entries. The final material here is an accented tetrachord consisting of two major third dyads that together comprise four consecutive notes of a whole-tone scale (Eb, F♯, G♯, A♯); only the lowest of these notes (Eb2, which is also played twice during the crescendo to the chord) is an element of P-0 (H1). This tetrachord, which of course does not appear in the Studies row that contains no major thirds and only one major second, is repeated as the outline concludes with a molto crescendo to fff.

The next appearance of this material is on S40, where barlines and a cello part comprised mostly of a rhythm with approximate pitches are introduced (variant 2). This five-bar fragment begins with the first two groups positioned as before but now comprising twice as many notes, while arrows from both groups suggest that Banks subsequently decided either to reverse their positions or that they should begin simultaneously. In the second bar, the groups become tremolo pairs and the progression as sketched on S5 begins, with each entry two beats after the last and marked (perhaps unnecessarily) with both an accent and ff. The use of precise rhythmic ideas for cello from this point thus coincides with the replacement of the variant I semiquaver figure by a much slower and texturally based minim pulse in the piano part. The final tetrachord appears as two separate dyads; the second (in the R.H.) enters a quaver before the fifth bar, telescoping the two-beat pulse and combining with the fourth-bar crescendo to increase the momentum of the passage.

The cello part, which contains numerous alterations and is non-existent in the fifth bar, was probably the last written here. Its only precise pitches, the two minims at the opening, provide the pulse that is taken up by the piano in the following bar. The second of these minims was originally Db4, an enharmonic major seventh below the initial Db3, before being changed to either B♯3 or B♭3 — it is unclear which, although the latter seems more likely as that would produce a compound minor third between the two notes and thus be more in keeping with the concurrent piano material. The striking resemblance of the cello material in the first three bars here to the opening
cello phrase of the movement (bars 1–3) may be noted at this point. Although it is impossible to be certain which was sketched first, the opening phrase certainly preceded the following variant in the present series, which appears in the first score. The similarities and probable chronology of the passages will be discussed in detail later in this chapter (in association with Example 6.3).

The presence at the top of the page of annotations relating to the duration of the movement not only suggests that this sketch, like the previous variant, may have been intended as the opening passage, but also shows that even at this early stage the scale of the piece is one of Banks' chief concerns. The last of the annotations is the timing "21 [bars =] 2.20 sec.;" a comparison of this calculation with the timing "2.30" that appears at the conclusion of the twenty-three bar first performance piano part reveals that his plan for the duration of the piece remained fundamentally unchanged throughout the compositional process.

This passage first appears within the framework of the movement in the first score (variant 3), where it comprises the middle section (bars 10–17). The opening material is further expanded here, with at least a bar between each of the initial dyad entries. The dyads of the final tetrachord, on the other hand, are originally only one beat apart (bar 15) before the R.H. pair is restored to its variant 2 position, almost two beats after the L.H. A significant alteration to the tetrachord occurs in the L.H., where the upper note is lowered a semitone from Gb2 to Gt>2, the major third becoming a minor third and thus extending the sole use of that interval in the piano part beyond this point. The L.H. dyad is restated three beats after its initial appearance, followed now only one beat later by the R.H. pair, and the tetrachord appears complete throughout bar 16 on all offbeats except the first. This further telescoping of the dyad entries which culminates in their simultaneous, syncopated restatements during the molto crescendo seems designed both to provide momentum and to enhance the dynamic drive to the climax of the section at the beginning of the following bar.

The piano part at the climax (bar 17) consists of two chords. The first is a quaver-length eight-note chord spread over almost two and a half octaves (D<sup>b</sup>2–G<sup>b</sup>4) which encompasses virtually the same range as the preceding piano material. The second is
a sustained four-note chord in the L.H. that restates the two lowest notes of the previous chord and introduces notes a semitone below each. In both the first and second scores (variants 3 and 4) and first performance piano part, the eight-note chord contains seven pitch-classes, with C4 appearing in two registers; in the autograph (variant 5) and edition published by Schott & Co. in 1954, however, the R.H. C4 is amended to Cb4, thus giving the chord eight different pitch-classes. Although we can only speculate as to the reason for this amendment, made presumably when Banks was writing out the autograph some time after the first performance, it is possible that he realised only then that by making that single alteration to the first chord, its combination with the two new notes in the following chord (C#2 and Eb2) and the two simultaneous cello notes (F#5 and A#5) would produce an aggregate, thereby constituting a more complete climax. The other most likely explanation is that the change is unintended. In subsequent versions, the lengths of the tetrachord components of the first chord are varied, with the L.H. shortened and the R.H. lengthened; not until the autograph (variant 5) are their durations finalised, the R.H. now sustained long enough to overlap with the second chord.

The annotations “Write out for sub p and accent” and “(Write out)” above the piano part in bars 12 and 14 of the first score are reminders by Banks to himself to give individual note values to the tremolo figures in subsequent versions, apparently in order to clarify the precise placements of dynamics and accents in the former case, and the number of notes to be played per beat in the latter. His intended note values are indicated only in bar 14, where “12” is written above the first L.H. crotchet figure and “32” above the R.H. minim figure. This apparent variation of note durations is confirmed in the second score (variant 4), in which twelve demisemiquavers are marked per crotchet beat throughout with the exception of the R.H. figure in bars 14–15 which, with sixteen hemidemisemiquavers per beat indicated, now also marks the exact point of the beginning of the crescendo. This further development of the textural material continues here for only six beats, with the same R.H. dyad reverting to twelve notes per beat, and thus matching the L.H. once again, at the beginning of
bar 16. In later variants, however, the cross-rhythmically derived tension extends until the climax (see variant 5).

Once again the cello part appears to have been the last sketched in the first score (variant 3). While most of the rhythmic ideas from variant 2 are retained, numerous crossings out and alterations of pitch make the part almost illegible in places. As mentioned earlier, there is a strong similarity between the first three bars of this section and the opening cello phrase of the piece; although pitches are now added throughout the passage, this relationship remains based principally on the rhythmic elements, as outlined previously (and shown in Example 6.3). Banks writes RO above bar 12 and initially sketches the first hexachord of that row before crossing out notes 4–6 (annotated in brackets). The I-8 row is used in full from the second half of bar 13, with notes 1–9 played on the cello and 10–12 appearing in the L.H. Two interpretations of the cello material completing bar 14 are possible: either RI-3 (notes 1–4), which overlaps with the final note of I-8; or I-9 (notes 1–3). RI-9 (notes 7–9) follows twice in bars 15–16, after which three versions of bar 16 are sketched, the second and third on the piano staves of the system above. The chronology of these later versions is unclear; elements of both may be recognised in the following variant, and although much of the bar is extremely difficult to decipher, perhaps the best explanation is that in the complete middle version, I-11 (notes 1–3) is followed by P-3 (notes 1–7) which is divided between the L.H. (notes 1–2, E♭–G♭) and cello (notes 3–7, G♮–B♭), the latter overlapping with I-5 (notes 6–8).

In the second score (variant 4), the piano part contains not only clear instructions regarding the number of notes per beat throughout, but also detailed dynamic and articulation markings; the vast dynamic range of the passage, from its pp demisemiquaver beginnings in bar 10 to the sustained fff tetrachord in bar 17, is shown for the first time. With the clarity of this version, it may be more easily appreciated that the tetrachord is comprised of the initial demisemiquavers — which are played in five of the preceding six bars — and their upper neighbours, and that the entire section is thus imbued with an underlying continuity of pitch. Apart from the addition of dynamic and expression marks and alteration of clefs, the cello part is virtually unchanged from the first score until bar 16. The uppermost and middle
versions of this bar in the previous variant provide much of the material here; the major third from $E^b$–$C^h$ which begins the last-beat semiquavers is, for example, derived from the former. This interval, which of course is not present in the Studies row, does not appear in subsequent scores (see variant 5), where the $C^h$ is removed and an $A^h$ inserted as the third note of the group, thus returning the figure to the I-5 set used in the two lower versions of variant 3.

In the autograph (variant 5), where the dual speeds of the notes originally written simply as tremolo in the two hands of the piano continue from bar 14 until the climax of the section, Banks stresses the importance of precise note values with the annotation “in notazione essattissima” at the introduction of both the L.H. demisemiquavers in bar 11 and R.H. hemidemisemiquavers in bar 14. There is a significant alteration to the L.H. in bar 12 here; Banks initially writes $G^h$ instead of $E^h$, although the latter had appeared in all preceding versions and in the present variant for more than a bar. While the $G^h$ is crossed out and replaced by $E^h$, it seems likely that this correction was made only after the autograph had been sent to Schott and Co. to provide the basis for the printed edition. Certainly, on the evidence of the sketch series, the appearance of this $G^h$ in bar 12 of the Schott edition (variant 6) is as the result of an error made by Banks when copying the autograph.

The most extensive sketch series of the movement involves Banks’ development of the opening cello subject (see Example 6.2). He begins six times on four separate pages before continuing in the first score. The earliest version, on S68, is a nine-note fragment for cello alone which consists of $R$–$O$ (H1) in low register followed by an I-9 trichord (notes 7–9) comprised of ascending sevenths (variant 1). It may be noted at this point that the hexachords $R$–$O$ (H1) and I-9 (H2) are combinatorial, of which fact Banks would almost certainly have been aware although no connection between these two particular rows is made on his matrix (S72). The similarity of this fragment to much of the cello writing in the Variations sketches is unmistakable; not only is the register of all but the final note here similar to that of the earlier material, but the presence of crotchet triplets in the second bar is particularly reminiscent of the initial canonic subject of Variations (see Examples 3.8 and 3.10).
The opening passage on S42 is probably the next in the series (variant 2). Although twelve bars are ruled here, only the first nine are used. The opening cello material, which now extends into a fourth bar, retains the variant 1 material with slight rhythmic alterations, and with the addition of RI-9 (notes 1–3) — which may also be interpreted as R-0 (notes 10–12) — an aggregate is formed. As I-9 (7–9) and RI-9 (1–3) are, of course, two halves of the same hexachord, this aggregate is a combination of two hexachords, one of which is itself a combination of two trichords.

The hexachords seem designed to overlap here on open G and D strings, with the former (note 6) intended to ring on under the second hexachord. This apparent use of one of the fundamental tonal possibilities of the cello is among the earliest signs (apart from pizzicato) of Banks’ interest in the textural capabilities of the instrument. The metronome marking “\( \text{\textit{J}} = 60\)”, annotation “sempre legatiss” and use of dynamics in the first bar only, all indicate an initial intention that this page be the first of a score. Another annotation, “(about 24 bars)”, which appears at the top of the page, shows again that the duration of the piece was uppermost in Banks’ mind during the early stages of composition. And, like the timing that appears on S40 (as discussed earlier; see Example 6.1, variant 2), this reference to the scale of the piece (remembering that the final version comprises twenty-three bars) reminds us that his scheme for the duration of the movement remained virtually unchanged.

Sketch page S38, which probably follows, was also initially intended as the first page of a score (variants 3a and b). Again, twelve bars are mapped out, but this time only the first five are used. The metronome marking and annotation above bar 1 are retained, and dynamics are written for the entire three-bar cello subject. The opening hexachord returns to its original note lengths in variant 3a, occupying exactly two bars, and the major seventh double-stop which had appeared in variant 2 at the beginning of the second hexachord is also retained; importantly though, these two notes (D\(_3^b\) and C\(_4^#\)) are now played simultaneously and, as a result, the six cello notes in bar 3 may be interpreted as R-0 (H2), thus completing an R-0 subject.

On the R.H. staff below, Banks sketches another version of the subject beginning on the sixth note which, as in variant 2, he places on the fourth beat of the second bar.
This version of the second hexachord, more rapid than those preceding it, is completed midway through bar 3. The ambiguity surrounding notes 7–9 in variant 3a is resolved by the unequivocal use of the I-9 trichord, while a major seventh double-stop at the beginning of the third bar is retained. But this dyad, appearing now on the second quaver (rather than the first) and notated as a diminished octave, is comprised of notes 10 and 11 (E♭₃/E♭⁵); it can also be traced back to variant 2 where, with the notes entering and quitting independently, the double-stop has a duration of only a quaver triplet. The second hexachord is repeated here in the latter half of bar 3, and this time diminished octave dyads based on both notes 7–8 and 10–11 appear.

Four versions of the opening cello subject follow on S41 (variant 4 and variants 5a–c), the first two of which occupy two systems each and were again intended to be opening passages of a score. The fact that Banks ruled up bars for both instruments throughout but sketched only two short fragments for the piano on this page (and none at all for variant 5) indicates the extent of his preoccupation with finding satisfactory opening material for the cello.

Above the first bar of variant 4 the annotation "Lento Espr." appears, along with tempo and expression marks virtually identical to those on the two preceding sketch pages (S42 and S38). This annotation is retained in all subsequent scores. Elements of variants 2 and 3b are combined here; both the placement of notes 8 and 9 (C⁴ and B⁴) in the first half of the third bar and use of quaver triplets in the following material are reminiscent of variant 2, while the note order of the initial row and second bar quaver triplets are retained from variant 3b (although with the first of the triplets tied from the third beat in the present variant). The notes following the opening row are labelled R2 but in fact comprise the first tetrachord of RI-2. Two characteristics of this variant are particularly interesting: the first is that the first note in all three triplet figures within the opening twelve-tone row is tied from the previous note — this increased fluidity in the rhythm whereby half the notes have a purely cross-rhythmic function coincides with the introduction of the "Espr." marking, and this combination gives the phrase a more rhapsodic feel; and secondly, the final note
of the opening row appears as an open C string, thus giving the subject a range of over two octaves for the first time.

Banks begins again on system 3, setting out seven bars over two systems. But he writes for cello only, making three attempts to begin the piece and using both piano staves in the process (variants 5a–c). The note order in the second hexachord of variant 5a is altered, the use of RI-3 (H2) here completing for the first time an aggregate comprised of two full hexachords. Perhaps the reason for this change of note order is that Banks planned to continue with R-10, and by finishing the initial row on Eb he would be able to use that common tone to overlap RI-3 (H1) with R-10. This theory does not seem so far-fetched if we recall first that the first tetrachord of R-10 is intervallically identical to the second of the bracketed figures on the Variations matrix (see Appendix A, S71), a figure of motivic importance in the sketches for the abandoned work (as shown in Example 3.5). And more specifically, the fact that precisely the same tetrachord as appears in the present fragment may also be found in the cello part of the expanded Theme (Example 3.5, variant 1) suggests that this set had assumed a particular significance.

Another version of the initial twelve-tone row is sketched on the R.H. staff of system 3 (variant 5b). Notes 6 and 7 (G♭2 and D♭3) appear in quaver rhythm on the fourth beat of the second bar for the first time since variant 2, a position they retain in later versions. The second hexachord note order here is originally that of the variant directly above, but by crossing out note 9 (Eb4) and moving it to the end of the hexachord, Banks replaces RI-3 (H2) with I-9 (H2), completing another aggregate. This row, consisting of the combined hexachords R-0 (H1) and I-9 (H2), and with all notes in the same registers and rhythm virtually unaltered, is used as the opening subject in subsequent scores. On the L.H. staff of bar 3, notes 8–11 of the row are sketched in a fragment apparently designed to examine the possibility of employing quaver triplets on the second beat (variant 5c). We may remember that triplets had been used on both the third and fourth beats earlier in the series.

The opening subject attains its final form in the first score (variant 6). The hexachordal combinatoriality of variant 5b is confirmed, while dynamics in the narrow
range of pp–p are also finalised. The principal alteration here is to the metronome marking. The "\( j = 60 \)" of previous variants seems to have been changed initially to the considerably faster "\( j = 100 \text{ ca} \); but this marking, crossed out and difficult to decipher is, in turn, replaced by the much slower "\( j = 88–92 \)" which is retained subsequently.

Although Banks had listed a number of "interchangeable ½ rows" while working on Variations and drawn arrows connecting hexachords of identical pitch-class content on his matrices for both Variations and Three Studies, this series contains the only examples of hexachordal combinatoriality among the sketches for either work. Interestingly, despite trying several different combinations in the course of the series, it is to the hexachords based on his original idea, a nine-note fragment comprised of R-0 (H1) and I-9 (notes 7–9), to which he eventually returns.

The resemblance between the opening three bars of the movement and the first three bars of the middle section (bars 11–13) is so striking that the latter may perhaps be described as a development or variation of the former (see Example 6.3). The chronology of these passages is not clear. While it is probable that the initial sketches of a piano part for the middle section on S5 were the first of the piece (as discussed earlier; see Example 6.1, variant 1), it is also possible that the bulk of the opening cello subject series (Example 6.2) preceded the earliest version of the cello rhythm in the middle section, which appears on S40 (Example 6.1, variant 2). Perhaps the most likely scenario for Banks' compositional process, therefore, is that the piano part in the middle section and the cello part at the opening contained the earliest ideas for those sections. The subsequent use of elements of these parts in the other section enabled Banks to achieve a greater continuity within the movement.

The rhythms of the cello parts in the two passages are almost identical (Example 6.3, variants 1 and 2). The only significant difference between the two is the use of triplets in place of duplets at the end of the second bar in the middle section (variant 2, bar 12), the very rhythm with which Banks had experimented in three consecutive sketches of the opening subject series (Example 6.2, variants 3b, 4 and 5a). The use of identical pitch-classes extends for three notes only; although R0 appears above
bar 12 (the same row as at the beginning), notes 4–6 of that row are altered. While the first three notes in variant 2 are pitched two octaves above their variant 1 counterparts, by the middle of the third bar the two passages are in the same low register.

The similarity of the piano parts in the two sections is also unmistakable. The only material for piano during the opening subject occurs under the sustained first note and is comprised of simultaneous four-demisemiquaver groups in both hands, each consisting of alternating notes outlining a minor third (variant 1). These groups contain the same pitch-classes in essentially the same format (the only difference being the reversed note-order in the L.H.) as the first two groups on probably the earliest sketch page for the piece, S5 (Example 6.1, variant 1). The latter are, of course, the same two groups which by bar 12 of the first score have been transformed into sustained tremolo dyads (variant 2).

A figure for cello based on the second hexachord of the row and used in the outer sections may be traced from the earliest period of composition (see Example 6.4). The version of the figure that initially appears on S5 is of largely textural significance (variant 1); consisting of P-0 (notes 7–11) in low register (playable in its entirety only on the C string) and with all notes written as quavers, it is accompanied by the annotations "sul ponti" and "trem" and detailed dynamics ranging from the extremes of \( pp \) to \( molto f \) and back, the swell coinciding with the rise and fall of pitch in this arch-shaped phrase. While a slightly shorter, though not entirely conjunct, arched phrase is also present in the second hexachord of the Variations row (notes 8–12; see Example 4.2), it was not employed as a separate cell.

The S5 figure therefore represents the first appearance among the sketches of the arch-shaped material as a complete unit. This cello figure, written above a L.H. tetrachord that seems to be a prototype for the chord at the climax of the middle section and followed by the annotation "Leads back to opening sounds", is almost certainly the earliest sketch material for the recapitulation. The L.H. chord, consisting of two adjacent minor third dyads, is identical to the sustained L.H. chord.
at bar 17 of the first score (Example 6.1, variant 3) but pitched a semitone lower. Significantly, even at this initial stage the entire bar is repeated.

The next appearance of the figure is probably on S42, where it follows material for the opening subject rather than for the middle section (variant 2). The first note is written at the same pitch as variant 1 before being crossed out, with the whole figure then sketched one octave higher. While these five notes are again of equal duration (this time semiquavers), they are not notated as tremolo, appearing instead as a legato cell probably intended to be played in a single bow. However, the presence of a "tremolo" annotation above the crossed-out G₂ not only indicates that Banks changed his mind about both register and texture after beginning work on the fragment, but also confirms that he now had an alternative textural idea for the figure.

Both of these alternatives are sketched on S37. On system 2, a combination of the two appears in a version of the figure transposed up a minor third from the original and labelled "End" (variant 3). This fragment, presumably intended for the final section is, like the preceding variants, intended to be played "Sul P" and the first three of its five notes tremolo (notated literally as pairs of demisemiquavers, but conventionally equated with tremolo in performance). The remaining two notes are written as semiquavers which, unlike those in variant 2, are not slurred. The annotations "ORD" and "Sui tast[io]" follow, although no other notes appear in this bar. As in variant 1, a sustained L.H. tetrachord is written below; while the notes in this chord are not clear, it seems most likely that they comprise an identical chord to that in variant 1 but pitched a semitone lower (and therefore a tone below the final pitch of the sustained L.H. tetrachord at the climax of the middle section; Example 6.1, variant 3).

The figure is written again directly below in bars labelled "7" and "8", and this time the ORD material signalled but not notated on system 2 does appear (variant 4). This fragment thus contains both textural ideas in complete phrases, the mostly tremolo figure derived from variant 1 followed by a legato version based on the variant 2 model. The former, sketched in outline only, seems to be a rapidly drawn version of the variant 3 fragment above, while the legato figure comprises the original set of
pitches (beginning on G~2) extended for the first time to the full hexachord P-0 (H2). This hexachord was apparently altered so many times during composition that Banks resorted to annotating some of the letter names below the staff. While these notes (apart from the first) are again of equal duration, they are now written as quaver triplets and the fragment continues into a second bar, where two more sets of quaver triplets are outlined, before it is abandoned. The use of the figure twice in succession here may be seen as a fulfillment of the original plan (see variant 1). And given the labels and positions on the page of variants 3 and 4, it seems likely that Banks was working on the appearances of the figure in both outer sections more or less simultaneously.

In the first score (variant 5), the first bar of the variant 4 fragment is fundamentally unchanged, appearing again as bar 7. The piano is again tacet throughout, and both versions of the figure are now written at the same pitch, beginning on D~3 and based on P-7 (H2). This use of identical pitches is almost certainly designed to further emphasise their textural differences. The first figure is entirely tremolo and accompanied by detailed dynamics for the first time since variant 1, while the second seems once again intended to be played in a single bow, as marked in variant 2. The material is extended here by a third appearance of the figure on beats 1 and 2 of bar 8. This hexachord, which uses the rhythm outlined in variant 4 bar 8, consists of the figure in retrograde inversion (RI-3 (H1)) and marked in the same legato manner as the preceding hexachord.

At the top of S37 are two fragments employing the five-note figure at its original pitch (variants 6a and b). Sketched on system 1 after a canonic fragment from Study I, they are impossible to place in the sketch series with any degree of certainty and contain no indication of a proposed position in either of the outer sections. Their common feature is the rapid repetition of the figure: in the first fragment (variant 6a), it appears three times within groups of five or six notes; in the second (variant 6b; written on the R.H. staff below but shown here alongside), where only sextuplets are written, three and a half groups (four complete cycles of the figure) are sketched before Banks runs out of space. The annotation "pp sempre — senza accents" and slurs over each of the completed groups in variant 6b confirm a legato intention here.
Two fragments derived from these sketches appear in the first score as versions of the legato component of this passage in the final section (variants 7a and b). As in the opening section, both the tremolo and legato figures are now at the same pitch, in this case the pitch used in variant 3, P-3 (H2). Banks makes two attempts to sketch the legato material, initially using the complete hexachord to coincide with the sextuplet group (variant 7a, bar 20, beat 1), but then reverting to the previous format in which the five-note set was used (throughout variant 7b). The latter version, which is retained in subsequent scores, comprises six groups over one and a half bars; the first and last groups are thus identical in note order and the legato material ends as it began. It is perhaps paradoxical that while the final section is a considerably abbreviated version of the first (seven bars as opposed to ten), the only substantial material for cello common to both is expanded here, with a duration of eight beats as opposed to six in the earlier section.

The similarities of structure and compositional process between Studies I and II are so significant that it seems likely that Banks, satisfied with his opening movement, made a conscious decision to repeat various facets of both design and procedure when beginning work on the second. Both pieces are in ternary form, with final sections which are considerably abbreviated versions of their opening sections. The most extensive sketch series in each case is for the opening passage (see Examples 5.1, 5.2 and 6.2), while both also contain substantial series for the most important elements of their middle sections: in Study I, the canonic material (Examples 5.5–5.7); and in Study II, the development of the piano part initially into a texturally interesting and subsequently into a rhythmically complex unit (Example 6.1).

While these similarities are perhaps unremarkable on one level, the fact that Banks may have consciously retained some elements of a successful compositional formula immediately after his false start with Variations in this, his first attempt at a chamber work following the completion of his studies with Seiber, Babbitt and Dallapiccola, could be seen as revealing a systematic approach to his composition. His burgeoning confidence is reflected by his preparedness to compose directly into the first score,
perhaps the clearest example of which is in his multiple attempts at the cello part in bar 16 (Example 6.1, variant 3). Of course, the ternary form in the present piece is of a far more straightforward design than that of its predecessor, with the cello having melodic material virtually throughout while the piano part remains almost entirely accompanimental. And while the cello line moves mostly in broad arcs, its long phrases complete with extremes of dynamic, articulation and textural nuance, the piano part is mostly of a sparse, rhythmic nature in the outer sections. Its sparsity may be gauged by the fact that eleven of the seventeen bars comprising these sections contain a single, short figure or less in each hand.

Another aspect of the simplicity of design here is the use of closely related material throughout. The piano material for the middle section sketched on S5, possibly the earliest for the entire piece, also provides the basis for the short alternating or repeated-note figures used sporadically in the outer sections (Example 6.2), while the rhythm of the cello subject at the opening of the middle section is derived from the opening subject (Example 6.3).

The principal feature of this movement is the textural writing for both instruments, the cello in the outer sections and the piano in the middle section. The cello writing initially combines ponticello and tremolo bowings with a huge dynamic swell in a short arched figure (Example 6.4, variants 1 and 2), and in later versions, contrasts that figure to the following one in which the same notes appear sul tasto and legato (variants 3, 4, 5 and 7). Banks also writes a stopped harmonic for the cello throughout bar 10 (F₄) which anticipates the first note of the middle section, thus serving as a pivot note between the first two sections (see Appendix A, S26–S27). In the first and second scores, he sketches this note simply as a harmonic (Example 6.1, variants 3 and 4), but in the later scores (possibly after discussions with Cooke) notates it as an artificial harmonic, annotating the pitch intended above the staff (variants 5 and 6).

The textural writing for piano evolves from the initial sketch on S5, on which much of the accompanimental material for the whole movement is based (Example 6.1, variant 1), into a tremolo passage lasting four bars on S40 (variant 2). In the first score, this
passage consists of alternating hemidemisemiquavers, introducing a rapid pulse in place of the tremolo effect (variant 3). Subsequent scores contain the simultaneous use of hemidemisemiquavers and demisemiquavers (sixteen notes against twelve per beat), which by the autograph (variant 5) are notated precisely and seem designed to increase the tension in the crescendo to the climax of the movement.

The other significant feature of Study II is the use for the only time in the work of hexachordal combinatoriality (Example 6.2, variant 6). Although Banks had experimented with "Interchangeable ½ rows" in the Variations sketches and connected hexachords containing identical pitch-classes with arrows on the matrices for both works, the opening of this movement is the only point at which he employs this technique.
The sketches for Study III

It seems likely that Study III was the last of the set to be composed. As with the preceding movements, no dates exist on any sketch pages, but unlike those pieces, a date — "Feb. 20th, '54" — appears at the end of the piano part for the first performance of the present piece. With the pages for all movements of this piano part numbered from one, indicating that each was written out separately upon completion (probably so that they would be available for rehearsal as early as possible), the presence of a date here suggests that Study III was the last to be written, and thus that composition of the work was finished on, or shortly before, that date.

Among the fifteen pages of sketches for Study III (shown in Table 7.1) are two scores, each comprised of five pages (S3, S24, S25, S2, S4 and S61–S65). Five of the remaining pages contain sketches for an opening passage (S29, S4, S8, S6, S9) and four contain fragments that are written and developed independently before being fitted into the first score (S6, S9, S10, S2).

Table 7.1 The Sketch Pages for Study III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S2   | system 1: material for final six bars (autograph bars 43–48), labelled “Coda”  
    | systems 2–4: continuation of S25 — material for bars 34–42 of autograph, labelled “Recap” |
| S3   | top: “III”  
    | systems 1–4: first page of first score — material for bars 1–11 of autograph |
| S4   | top: “III”  
    | systems 1–2: fragment for cello and piano — projected opening passage (six bars) using a rhythmic pedal note for cello and rising figure for piano  
    | systems 3–4: continuation of S2, system 4 (development and clarification of the fragment on S2, system 1) — material for final six bars (autograph bars 43–48) |
| S6   | top: “III”  
    | systems 1–2: first five bars of a projected score  
    | system 3: fragment for cello (six notes outlined)  
    | system 4: fragment for cello and piano (one bar) containing material for bar 13 of autograph |
While *Study III*, like the previous pieces, is in ternary form, structurally it is significantly different from those movements in that its recapitulation is not a greatly abbreviated version of the opening section, but rather the last of three sections of virtually equal length. In its finalised form (not achieved until after completion of an initial version of the second score), the first section contains sixteen bars and both the middle section and recapitulation, seventeen. Sketches for the opening passage and various other fragments contain material for about half of the forty-seven bars that comprise the first score (all or part of twenty-five bars, as shown in Figure 7.1). The remaining bars contain material which appears to have been written directly into the score and may be identified by the numerous rubbings and crossings out, row references and other annotations made by Banks during the initial stages of composition. This score thus acts as both an assembly point for existing ideas and as a preliminary sketch in its own right.
It is perhaps not surprising that Banks should have the confidence to compose approximately half of the final Study directly into the score, as he had used the same technique, albeit on a smaller scale, in writing Study II (as described in Chapter 6). In the present case, having already settled on a jazz-influenced style, established his motivic elements, and sketched opening and closing passages along with a variety of other fragments (such as the canonic outline in bars 16–19 and the moving R.H. line in bars 13–14 which is repeated in bars 40–41), he uses the first score principally to connect these previously written ideas. His priority here seems to be to determine a precise structure and duration for the piece, leaving some of the detail of the new material until the second score.
The earliest sketches for an opening section, although vastly different in content, have much in common (see Example 7.1, variants 1 and 2). Apart from the obvious similarities that both are written over two systems, labelled "III" and also marked "Allegro Moderato", we may note that not only does Banks, in writing the pitches for only a single hexachord in each of the piano parts, use the same pitches — P-0 (H2) on S4 and its retrograde form R-0 (H1) on S29 (where the final L.H. note is probably written erroneously as Gb instead of Ab) — but also that after beginning both sketches with precise pitches he reverts almost entirely to outlines, apparently concentrating on rhythm and overall shape rather than undertaking a time-consuming search for specific notes.

The diversity of material within the two sketches reflects a great breadth of ideas for the movement, even at this early stage. The S29 fragment (variant 1) is in 6/8, its two principal features a tremolo opening for both instruments followed by a two-part canonic opening in outline that becomes fainter as it progresses, petering out after eleven notes of the first voice. The calligraphy here seems more and more hurried, with Banks not even taking the time to notate the rhythm accurately in the third bar. It appears likely, given the rhythm of the imitative material that appears later in the movement (see Example 7.4), that he intended to write \( \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \end{array} \) in this bar (my interpretation, based also on the positions of the stems both in relation to each other and to the following barline, is shown above the sketch bar itself). That this fragment is comprised of the principal elements in the middle sections of the two preceding movements (textural and canonic ideas), while bearing no particular resemblance to the subsequent sketches, suggests that it may date from an earlier period than the bulk of the preliminary material for Study III.

Similarly, the S4 opening (variant 2) contains no material of particular similarity to any of the later sketches. In 3/4, it begins with a rhythmic pedal note for cello that continues throughout and also features a figure for piano, based entirely on a crotchet pulse, which rises almost five octaves within five beats. This figure, which provides a basis for sequential development (as Banks outlines in bars 4–6), is constructed mostly of (enharmonic) major seventh dyads.
While these preliminary openings do not contain any specific fragments which are subsequently developed, much of the material that follows may nevertheless be traced back to them: their 6/8 and 3/4 metres are used separately and in combination, with the resultant cross-rhythms giving the movement its ‘jazz’ feel; the repeated quavers of the S4 cello opening are the precursor to the principal motive (stated by both piano and cello as they enter); and the canonic outline on S29 is the forerunner of two similar phrases within the movement. We may trace Banks’ compositional process from this point by examining his next sketch page, S8 (variant 3), in its contexts as both a melting pot of ideas from these preliminary passages and as a starting point for the motivic, structural and textural evolution of an opening section (to which end the first seven bars of this fragment also appear as Example 7.3, variant 1).

Banks maps out twelve bars for both instruments on S8 (three bars in each of four systems) although he actually writes for cello only (variant 3). Leaving the first two bars empty, perhaps for a piano introduction, he writes one bar of pitches which he follows with nine bars in outline. Like the preceding openings, this sketch seems to have been written rapidly, Banks not pausing long enough even to note the apparent time changes in bars 5, 6, 8 and 9 (which I have shown above the staff). As he works his way down the page the sketch appears increasingly uncertain and experimental (even allowing for the fact that from the second system he is writing in outline only). The precise notation in the first system (bar 3) is followed by detailed phrase shaping that includes dynamic and tenuto markings in the second (bars 4–6), and numerous crossings out and corrections of rhythmic markings in the third (bars 7–9). By the time he reaches the fourth system, he simply writes “this type of thing” below alternating pizz and arco figures.

The use of outline in each of the first three opening sketches can be attributed to a combination of a sense of urgency associated with getting ideas down before they are forgotten, and a desire to design a section as a whole before spending time on the detail of exact pitches. While the former factor appears to be the primary consideration in both the S29 and S8 sketches (as discussed above), it is the latter that is most significant on S4. Here, in plotting the contour of a second piano phrase before ending it with Db⁶–Bb⁵ (bars 4–6), Banks indicates that he has a particular
hexachord in mind (presumably R-10 (H2), as that is the only hexachord which concludes with those notes), but is more concerned at this stage with the shape of the phrase than with the precise placement of the notes within it.

The single bar of pitches on S8 is based on the same hexachord as S29 (and thus the retrograde of S4) and contains elements derived from both the earlier sketches. The influence of the S4 cello ostinato on the initial repeated-note figure is obvious. This figure now takes on motivic significance, appearing in full three times on S8 (in outline in bars 7 and 10) and in variation on other occasions (the descending \( \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \) figure in bars 7 and 9 and the \( \uparrow \uparrow \) pattern in bar 11). For the final two notes of bar 3, Banks writes the \( J, J_1 \) figure he had used in the third bar of S29. In the context of the 4/4 time-signature, this three-quaver figure appears as a cross-rhythmic unit, but in the 6/8 bars that follow (5 and 8) he uses it as a half-bar cell as he had on S29, thereby establishing its status as an important and ambiguous rhythmic unit that transcends the changes of meter with which he is experimenting.

In studying the sketch pages for the opening passage (see Example 7.3) it becomes apparent that, with the pitched bar on S8, Banks has designed an almost ideal subject. Throughout the series this bar remains virtually unchanged (apart from transposition), the only alteration a shortening of the final note of the initial repeated-note motive from dotted quaver to staccato quaver. The revised length of this motive emphasises the importance of figures of three quavers' duration as motivic, rhythmic and cross-rhythmic elements within the Study — the subject now begins and ends with such figures, one inspired by each of the preliminary openings.

Before examining the opening passage series, it will be useful to look briefly at two bars (34 and 42) that show the use of these elements of three quavers' length on both instruments, as subject and accompaniment, and in a variety of forms (Example 7.2a and b). Both bars are among those that appear to have been written directly into the first score of the Study (as shown in Figure 7.1), but as my purpose at this point is purely to illustrate the fundamental role of the motivic and rhythmic elements, I have taken my examples from the second score, using the revised and clarified versions of the bars, rather than their faint, and at times barely legible predecessors.
In bar 34 (Example 7.2a), the inverted subject is stated in full on the cello, its three-quaver-long elements at beginning and end giving an overall 3–2–3 quaver-beat pattern. The accompaniment, meanwhile, consisting of rests and short chords, is notated in two three-quaver groups followed by a two-quaver group, or 3–3–2 pattern. This bar, in other words, contains two separate syncopated rhythms, with accents occurring on the first (cello), fourth (piano), sixth (cello) and seventh (piano) quaver beats. We may note at this point the similarity in design between the subject here, which marks the beginning of the recapitulation (and is labelled as such in the first score; see Appendix A, S8, system 2), and the opening of the recapitulation in Study I, where the subject also appears in inversion on the cello (see Example 5.7, variants 4 and 5).

In bar 42 (Example 7.2b), both instruments have the 3–3–2 pattern, the cello playing a variation of the repeated-note motive three times (the same as that used in bars 10–12 of the initial opening passage on S8) while the piano has sustained, accented chords. It is no coincidence that this 3–3–2 pattern, with its obvious jazz influence, should appear in both examples, as Banks uses it on numerous occasions (in 14 of the second score's 42 4/4 bars) throughout the piece.

After sketching the opening cello line on S8 (Example 7.3, variant 1), Banks begins again on S6 with a passage intended as the first page of a score, but which peters out after only five bars (variant 2). His need to start afresh may be explained by the fact that three of the five bars here are taken up by a piano introduction, for which he had not allowed in his earlier vision of the passage. He writes R8 above the beginning, but actually bases the introduction on R-6, using the first hexachord in bars 1–2 and the second in bar 3. The former is comprised entirely of major seventh dyads employing two versions of the repeated-note motive, while the latter contains the hexachord in single crotchets and quavers over the narrowest possible range and so is reminiscent of much of the use of the second hexachord in the Variations row (see Examples 3.8 and 3.13). The fact that the third bar contains nine quavers may be attributed to the rapidity of writing; the evidence of subsequent versions suggests that a 4/4 time-signature was intended in the bar preceding the cello entry. Given the notation here, it seems likely that the third note in the bar, F₂, was meant to be a
quaver, thus dividing the bar into a 3–3–2 quaver rhythm which is continued in the following bar under the cello subject.

The second bar of the introduction also makes use of two variants of the repeated-note motive, initially in a quaver triplet figure that appears twice in the R.H. and then in an alternative incomplete fragment written on the cello staff above and connected by an arrow. Neither of the tetrachords sketched for this bar, which seems to have been changed to 5/4 in the piano part some time after commencement of the earlier version, is derived from a single row. Banks was apparently unable to decide with which version to continue; both units are used in later variants, the original on the following page in the series (variant 3) and the second (rhythmically altered) in subsequent scores.

The cello subject in bars 4–5, based on the complete R-0 row over two bars, retains the first bar material of variant 1 and broadly follows the rhythm and shape outlined in that variant for bar 2. The piano accompaniment is comprised of tetrachords increasing in duration as the phrase builds to a climax and contains no simultaneous attack with the cello until that point. The row here was almost certainly intended to be P-0, with the L.H. A₄¹ written erroneously in place of G₄.

The next version of the opening passage, on S₉, retains the three-bar introduction and continues with material almost entirely for cello alone for another four bars (variant 3). The first bar of the introduction, while based on the previous major seventh dyads, is now derived from P-8 although the note order is not precise (notes 7, 8 and 9 all precede note 6). The repeated-note motive is retained only by the higher note of the opening pair, while the second dyad is lowered one octave and sustained under a new four-note figure. This new unit, consisting of alternating notes that outline a minor third and the first three of which are semiquaver triplets, is used throughout the piece, and so may be regarded as of motivic significance. The second and third bar phrases were apparently originally given to the cello before Banks changed his mind, writing “Intro PIANO” over the first bar. The second bar is initially retained as a 5/4 bar before its first beat is removed, while the third, again syncopated, is now comprised of P-0 (H2). Not only is this an identical pitch-class set to R-6 (H2) which
was used at this point in the preceding variant, but it also employs the same six pitches.

The cello subject follows the variant 1 outline closely, its initial hexachord now at final pitch a minor third below the initial version. Banks' calligraphy seems more and more hurried; by bar 6 (the bulk of which is based on an incomplete and slightly altered R-5), much of the detail of the material is almost illegible. And in bar 7 (written on the R.H. staff as he is running out of room), the notes appear in outline only.

In the first score (variant 4), the introduction is returned in full to the piano and the second bar is based on the second version in variant 2 (which was written on the cello staff). Another alternating semiquaver triplet figure is added in the opening bar and the note-order of the P-8 row thus changed, with note 8 now the last to be played. The final bar of the introduction is given here to the L.H., where it remains throughout the series. Appearing for the first time without syncopation, this phrase consists of seven quavers (the same hexachord used in variant 3 with B♭3 added at the end) which, annotated "Accent", propel the phrase to the subject (now marked at the same tempo as the opening).

The unclear and incomplete third bar of the subject in the previous variant (which was marked "12/8") is divided into two bars here, with a change of beat between the two from dotted crotchet to crotchet. Banks then continues with RI-2 which, overlapping with the final three notes of R-5, allows him to complete the latter row. We may note that these first five bars of the subject return almost exactly to the structure outlined in the earliest version on S8. Annotations including metronome markings and broad tempo guides for each of the first four bars are introduced here. The most significant addition is, of course, the earliest appearance of a piano accompaniment under the subject. Comprised initially of trichords in a 3–3–2 quaver rhythm and varied slightly in the following bars, it is based largely on substantial row segments and incorporates two variants of the repeated-note motive in bar 8.

The piano first performance part (variant 5) is of particular interest because it appears that in bar 2 Banks wrote repeated D♭3's (actually Ds with no accidental) in the L.H.
in place of the D♯3s in both the first (variant 4) and second (Appendix A, S61) scores. Very small, faint writing in this score, which appears to add a ♯ before the three notes, matches annotations and fingerings elsewhere in the part and so is presumably that of Colin Kingsley, pianist in the premiere. This accidental was presumably inserted on the instruction of Banks, and so it is perhaps surprising that neither the autograph (variant 6) nor Schott edition contain a ♯. We may assume that Banks simply changed his mind about the note, possibly after hearing the piece in performance.

Apart from the opening and closing passages, only two preliminary sketch series predate the first score (as shown in Figure 7.1). These series, containing material for bars 13–15 and 16–22, the final bars of the opening section and the first passage of the middle section respectively, will be examined in Examples 7.4 and 7.5.

At the bottom of S6, a fragment of less than a bar contains the earliest version of the bar 13 material (Example 7.4, variant 1). The passage here consists of continuous semiquavers in the R.H., a single crotchet trichord on the first beat in the L.H. and a simultaneous accented note for cello which is restated on the sixth semiquaver. The R.H. is comprised of 1-0 (H1) — another three-quaver set — which is repeated and then extended by notes 7–9 of that row. It may be noted that the second cello note coincides with the same pitch in the R.H. and so emphasises the final note of the initial hexachord. The L.H. is unclear, but possibly consists of G♯3, D♯4, F♯4, which together with the cello B♯4 would produce a major-minor seventh, a chord not found elsewhere among the sketches.

This fragment next appears on S9 at the beginning of a three-bar sketch containing the material for bars 13–15 of the autograph (variant 2). The cello part for the first two bars is sketched below the piano here, as if added later (although for reasons of continuity it is shown above in this sketch series). The most significant alteration to the R.H. is that the sixth note of the variant 1 hexachord, B♯4, is replaced by the note a minor third higher, D♯4. This new six-note set is played three times before the final D♯ is replaced by a D♭ which becomes the first note of a complete P-1 row (indicated by Banks). The last three notes of this row overlap in turn with I-10 (H1) which
completes the second bar (and is not indicated by Banks). The accompanying tetrachords in the L.H. and cello parts are based on the 3–3–2 quaver pattern in the first bar, and this rhythm is taken up in all three parts in the third bar. The outer notes of the repeated L.H. trichord comprise a major seventh in place of the minor seventh in variant 1, and the chord as a whole consists of notes 5–7 of RI-O. The cello, meanwhile, has notes 1–4 of the same row (motive 2), and thus the L.H. change to notes 1–3 of RI-O at the beginning of the second bar completes the first tetrachord of the row with the cello at that point.

In the third bar, where both instruments have the 3–3–2 quaver pattern, the cello part (consisting entirely of repeated Db³'s) contains three consecutive variations of the repeated-note element and the instruments combine with notes 2–5 of RI-O within the range of little more than an octave (Eb⁴–Eb³). This bar follows the semiquaver descent over more than three octaves with a driving cello rhythm that culminates in accented quaver triplets and two three-quaver units for piano which each crescendo. In other words, the passage appears to be intended to provide the build-up to a climax, and its insertion as the concluding material of the opening section in the first score suggests that Banks may have decided at the outset to sketch only a few key points in the piece before writing the bulk directly into the score.

This passage is virtually finalised by the second score with two significant textural changes to the cello part (variant 3). Bar 13 is now marked tremolo and the second set of repeated Db³'s in bar 15 is enhanced both texturally and dynamically by double-stopping on the G and D strings. Other alterations here are minor only, involving the regrouping of semiquavers to clarify the six-note sets and the addition of accents, detailed phrasing and dynamic marks. It may be noted that precisely the same material as in bars 13–14 (but raised one octave) is played again in bars 40–41 at the conclusion of the final section, where it is followed by a seven-bar coda (see Appendix A, S64, systems 3–4).

The material that follows this passage in the first score, comprising the opening bars of the middle section, was apparently conceived separately. First sketched on S10, it begins with an outline for what may originally have been intended as a two-part canon
and continues with three more bars also written mostly in outline (Example 7.5, variant 1). The entire fragment seems to have been written at pace; Banks does not even take the time to write out the second voice, indicating his plan instead with an arrow. Strictly speaking, the contrapuntal writing here may perhaps more accurately be described as imitative rather than canonic, as there is no evidence of an intention to overlap common material (a distinction verified in variant 2, where more details of both rhythm and pitch are set out). It may be noted that while this imitative phrase follows the same format as the three canons written in Study I, with the cello and R.H. taking one voice each (see Examples 5.5–5.7), the present example is the only one in which the R.H. is allotted the first voice. The 2–3–3 quaver-beat pattern employed in the first bar of the subject not only incorporates the crotchet-quaver figure sketched on S29 in one of the earliest fragments for the piece (see Example 7.1), but may also be considered a variation of the 3–3–2 quaver cross-rhythm on which the first bar of the opening subject is based (see Examples 7.1 and 7.3).

The final three bars of this sketch contain two cello parts. The first, along with the bulk of the piano part, appears in outline only. The later line, written above the system, begins with RI-1, notes 1–4 (motive 2) and continues with RI-7, notes 1–3. The following bar, initially based on quaver motion, is revised first by the inclusion of a variation of the repeated-note motive suggesting *ricochet* bowing (a *spiccato* technique usually indicated by the combination of *staccato* and phrasing marks employed by Banks, consisting here of two $E_b^3$ semiquavers moving to a $D_{4}^4$ quaver) and then by a quaver triplet pulse outlined above the additional staff.

The concurrent piano accompaniment uses the 3–3–2 quaver pattern, apparently restating a pentachord (either R-7, notes 5–9 or RI-7, notes 4–8) played at the beginning of the first bar. While all the sets used in this bar are components of hexachordally combinatorial rows (probably intentionally), no attempt is made to construct an aggregate. Banks' original idea for the phrase was for the cello to provide a largely quaver-derived pulse which would emphasise the syncopated nature of the piano part. His later idea, whereby the cello has quaver triplets throughout the second bar, considerably complicates this notion, with two different pulses and the instruments having only one simultaneous attack (on the fourth beat) in that bar.
This passage next appears as bars 16–22 in the first score (variant 2). The first note of the subject in the R.H. is B♭₂ here, leaping an enharmonic major seventh to B♭₃, the same interval as in the second voice two bars later. But in all subsequent scores, the B♭ becomes a D♭₃ (see variant 3). This is precisely the same alteration of pitch-class as occurred in the preceding sketch series (see Example 7.4, variants 1 and 2), although whether by coincidence or design it is impossible to say. Whether the present change was as the result of a misprint in the second score overlooked during subsequent copying, or because Banks simply preferred the sound, is unclear; if the latter, the question of why he did not also change the first note of the second voice (from A♭₂ to C♭₃), arises.

A further resemblance to the second canon of Study I (see Example 5.6) may be noted in the use of quaver movement by major sevenths in the piano part at the conclusion of the subject and between the ascending major sevenths of the cello subject. The result is almost continuous motion by major sevenths over seven beats, which thus provides a marked contrast to the preceding legato and following repeated-note figures. While the quaver triplets are retained in bar 21 here, combined with the original pitches and employing another variation of the repeated-note motive, in later versions the first half of that bar returns to a quaver pulse. The original bar 22, based on the final bar of the previous variant, contains a tremolo figure for cello over a short, accented piano hexachord which does not belong to a single row. The tremolo is crossed out and in the following version the next cello phrase is simply brought forward over the same piano chord. Tremolo texture is reintroduced to the cello part four bars later and will be discussed in Example 7.6.

The use of tremolo on the cello in bars 25–26 is, in fact, the other particularly interesting feature of the middle section (see Example 7.6). The employment of this technique recalls the sustained tremolo passage written initially for the piano in the middle section of Study II (see Example 6.1). Indeed, it is possible that in the present section Banks is consciously using variations of the central elements in the middle sections of both preceding movements, the imitative phrase discussed above which is clearly related in both design and structure to the Study I canons, followed by this textural phrase.
In bar 25 of the first score (variant 1), the cello begins a hexachord, P-5 (H2), which appears to be comprised of tremolo crotchets off the beat, although the ambiguously placed annotation(s) "trem \( \# \) \( \# \) \( \# \) " above the cello staff may indicate a later plan to incorporate that effect as well as revealing a fundamental indecision regarding the syncopated nature of the phrase. The simultaneous piano material, which together with the preceding two cello notes is based on P-5 (H1), contains a variation in the R.H. of the three-quaver repeated-note unit played on the cello four bars earlier (shown in Example 7.5), and both hands move together throughout the phrase in three-quaver cells; in effect, therefore, either cello option will be syncopated in relation purely to the piano part. In subsequent scores the cello notes change on the beat, although the annotation "or \( \times \) sim." above the system in the second score (variant 2) shows that Banks remained undecided at that point.

As mentioned previously, the coda of the movement follows the second appearance of the material inserted into the first score as bars 13–14 and 40–41 (shown in Example 7.4). But the earliest version of the final passage offers no hint of such a connection (Example 7.7, variant 1). This five-bar fragment, sketched at the top of S2 and labelled "Coda", contains three principal components: a two-voice canonic passage for cello and R.H. (as used in the Study I canons); a phrase for piano consisting mostly of rising (enharmonic) major sevenths (similar in intervallic content therefore to the earlier contrapuntal subject; see Example 7.5), and a descending passage for cello based on a variation of the repeated-note motive (first used in one of the earliest sketches for an opening passage; see Example 7.1, variant 3).

The canonic subject, comprised of I-0, notes 1–5 and written as quavers in the narrowest possible range, is followed by a quaver rest before beginning again. On this rest the second enters with the subject a tritone above the first, and with the restatement of the subject in the first voice only one quaver after the entry of the second voice, the contrapuntal form may perhaps best be described as stretto. Immediately after three appearances of the subject in the first voice and two in the second, another phrase also based entirely on a quaver pulse, but very different in character (marked sff initially and with the first notes in each hand accented), rises through more than four octaves within three beats on the piano and leads in turn to a
passage originally intended for cello alone. This material, based on a cell consisting of a repeated note followed by a rising minor third, is used four times, descending more than three octaves through almost the full range of the instrument and returning almost to where the preceding phrase had begun. It seems that Banks had second thoughts about both the use of cello only here and of the actual notes in the last three cells, with annotations above and below the staff indicating alternatives in these areas.

When this fragment is inserted into the first score at the bottom of the same page (variant 2), its connection to the repeated passage that had marked the end of the recapitulation becomes apparent. Bar 42 performs the same function as bar 15 (see Example 7.4, variant 3), following the repeated bars with the 3–3–2 quaver pattern and the same L.H. accompaniment, and serving as the final bar of an outer section in each case. The cello part in this version is no longer purely of rhythmic and textural importance, however; it is comprised of three of the repeated-note cells used above as the initial concluding phrase of variant 1. Midway through the third bar, the passage is crossed out and rewritten on S4 from the beginning of the stretto (variant 3).

Virtually all of the original material is retained in variant 3 with the single alteration that the entire passage is transposed up one tone. While the reason for this change is unclear, it seems most likely that the fact that in variant 2 the cello had completed bar 42 with A♭2–C♯3 and commenced the stretto in bar 43 with its retrograde C♯3–A♭2 may have constituted for Banks a structural weakness. This would explain the crossing out of the previous version and transposition from the beginning of the stretto phrase. The cello retains the full final phrase here, joined in unison for the last repeated-note cell by the piano; and the first two pairs of alternative notes annotated below the staff in variant 1 are also incorporated into the phrase.

The principal alteration to this concluding material in the second score (variant 4a) is the raising by a semitone of the last two pitches; the final repeated-note cell now begins a major seventh below the preceding note and thus the last three intervals of the work — minor third, major seventh, and its inversion the semitone — are those upon which the bulk of both Variations and Three Studies are based. Below the original ending in the second score is an alternative bar 45 which extends the stretto
by three beats and includes a ritardando at the end of that phrase for the first time (variant 4b). Whether this expansion was written so that the piece would finish on the first beat of a bar rather than the second, is impossible to say. The addition of dynamic marks here shows the broad range Banks had envisaged, from subito pp at the start of the stretto to ff in the penultimate rising phrase. These markings are further expanded in the first performance piano part (variant 5), where a subito sf at the beginning of the rising passage leads to ff Brillante for the descending cello phrase and fff on the unison final cell that concludes the work.

There is no doubting the steepness of Banks' compositional learning curve during the winter of 1953-54. He began the process of writing his first chamber work following the completion of his formal studies (probably in November, 1953) by drawing up an outline for a set of variations, but was unable to make any substantial progress on that piece beyond an opening theme section which in its final form was more than twice the length nominated in the outline. The reasons for his abandonment of the work are unclear, but it seems likely that the restrictive nature of writing within strict serial parameters for the first time was the major factor. Specifically, it appears that the lack of intervallic diversity within the row together with an inability to progress beyond openings in his preliminary canonic sketches contributed to his decision.

His next move was probably to make slight alterations to the row so as to retain several key elements while introducing new intervallic possibilities, and with this revised row he commenced work on a new piece (Study I) for which, instead of devising an overview, he wrote numerous preliminary fragments which could then be assembled as complete components in a score. The biggest difference in his compositional process here was that he worked mostly on substantial sketches, expanding his ideas, where in the sketches for Variations he had more often pared the material back. His canonic writing introduced the element of syncopation and first showed the influence of his jazz background as he used short-phrased subjects and stretto in place of the mostly row-length and rhythmically unvaried
Variations subjects. The writing for the cello is also more assured here, with considerable use of the high register and double-stopping in particular. Nelson Cooke's earliest contact with the work in progress was during the period of composition on Study I (as evidenced both by the sketch pages for this movement in his collection — S75–S77 — and by his recollection of the period), and it seems likely that in his roles as both performer and adviser he alerted Banks to various technical capabilities of the instrument.

At about this time, Banks seems to have conceived a system of developing his opening passage material to a point from which he could continue it as a score while also sketching some preliminary ideas that he could then insert directly into that score. Certainly, the compositional process for each succeeding movement appears more confident, and by the period of composition of Study III, he was assured enough to sketch approximately half of his material directly into the first score. Perhaps in writing all of the Studies in ternary form, he was consciously attempting to create a structural unity that would support the continuity implicit in the use throughout of a single twelve-tone row.

Analysis of the sketch pages has shown that despite Banks' reference almost twenty years later to the Studies as his "first strict twelve-tone pieces", numerous points in the score may not be analysed using his designated row. He employs hexachordal combinatoriality once only (for the opening cello subject of Study II) and the row appears elsewhere both in full and in part, the various motivic elements interspersed with long row segments, and with all movements based principally on semitone/major seventh and minor third intervals.

The central element of both Variations and Three Studies, is, of course, serialism (inspired largely by his meeting and classes with Babbitt in Salzburg). Around this core are fitted all other elements: the jazz influence of his formative years in Melbourne; a deep interest in counterpoint and texture (perhaps due principally to, and certainly honed during, his studies in composition and orchestration with

---

1 From the 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).
Dallapiccola in Florence); and most importantly, the general influence of Seiber, whose insistence at their first meeting that Banks always search for the best solution to any compositional problem was a lesson in thoroughness that remained with Banks throughout his life.

These diverse influences are evident in both works, and it is apparent that as early as the point of drawing up his overview for Variations, Banks was planning to use that format in order to showcase them. Each of the Studies makes significant use of a different element: in Study I, the set of three canons in the middle section; in Study II, the long central passage for piano of mainly textural interest; and in Study III, almost continuous jazz cross-rhythms. Apart from the common use of serial motives, perhaps the most notable links between the pieces are that the middle section of Study III includes both contrapuntal material reminiscent of Study I and textural material reminiscent of Study II (in other words, the principal ideas of those movements' middle sections), and the fact that all three movements employ repeated-note elements.
After the premiere of *Three Studies*, Banks continued to earn his living principally as a copyist. As well as working for Seiber in this capacity, he was employed by several other composers including Peter Racine Fricker and Humphrey Searle, and was given work by his publishers Schott & Co. (notably works by Michael Tippett) which enabled him to "get to know a range of music". He also continued writing and arranging music for Australian friends (of the six original chamber works and arrangements written in the decade between *Three Studies* and *Three Episodes*, four were for compatriot musicians), and when his "old mates from Melbourne, Ailsa and Douglas Gamley [asked for some songs, he] did some more north country folk songs ... for them for a BBC broadcast."2

In early 1956, the pianist Margaret Kitchin, who with Maria Lidker had given the first performance of Banks' *Violin Sonata* in February, 1953, asked him for a piece for solo piano. He wrote another twelve-tone piece, *Pezzo Dramatico*, and she premiered the work later that year in Berne and "subsequently played it around London quite a bit and broadcast it."3 It is a short work, only 106 bars in length, lasting about six minutes and containing, as we might expect from the title, "marked contrasts".4 Banks decided when writing *Pezzo Dramatico* to restrict himself to two

---

1 From the 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).
2 Ibid. These were the *Three North Country Folk Songs* for voice and piano which Banks arranged during 1954 and which were published in 1955. The earlier set of *Five North Country Folk Songs* for voice and piano had been written the previous year, on Banks' return from Florence, for the soprano Sophie Wyss. The other three works for Australians in the decade between *Three Studies* and *Three Episodes* were: *Horn Trio* (1962) for Barry Tuckwell, Brenton Langbein and Maureen Jones; *Elizabethan Miniatures* (1962) for Douglas Gamley; and *Equation I* (1963) for Keith Humble.
3 Ibid.
4 In a detailed analysis of the work and brief discussion of serial composition (held with the sketch pages in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA) which Banks probably prepared while teaching at a National Young Composers' Seminar (1970–73), the Canberra School of Music (1973–76) or the Sydney Conservatorium (1978–80), he used the phrase "violent contrasts" before crossing out "violent" and replacing it with "marked".
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forms of the row: prime and retrograde (and their transpositions), which "meant that I had to extend the rhythmic development of my motives, as the more you restrict the material you have to draw upon, the more you have to call upon the other resources of composition to obtain variety in your writing." The principal structural element of the work is a chromatic tetrachord or, as he puts it, "an intervallic complex of four adjacent semitones [which] occurs repeatedly in the part-writing and is deliberately drawn out from the various forms of the row as part of the structural unity of the piece".

A few months after its premiere, Pezzo Dramatico was published by Schott & Co. in a volume entitled Contemporary British Piano Music which also contained new works by Fricker, Searle and Iain Hamilton. Banks acknowledged that "this was a rather important" publication for three reasons: first, it made the work available soon after it was first performed and broadcast; second, its inclusion in such a collection guaranteed a wider public awareness; and third, following hard on the heels of Three Studies for Cello and Piano and Three North Country Folk Songs which had both been published the previous year, it further raised his profile as a composer of considerable diversity.

In the summer of 1956, Banks was selected to attend a summer school directed by Luigi Nono in Switzerland where several weeks were spent studying, for the most part, two pieces: the Schoenberg and Webern sets of Variations for Orchestra. He described Nono as a "wonderful teacher in that his analysis was so detailed ... we took days and days and days to go through two or three pages of music, and we were very stimulated and excited by this." Several lectures on the new area of electronic music were also given at the summer school. Unfortunately for Banks, they were in German, so that although he "got a smattering; I didn't really get very much ... I was

---

5 Ibid. Banks' analysis, with its emphasis on the extended rhythmic development of limited material, indicates the continuing influence of Seiber some four years after their lessons had finished.
6 Ibid. The chromatic tetrachord is also one of the principal structural elements in Three Episodes for Flute and Piano (1964).
7 de Berg interview.
8 Ibid. Banks' analyses of large sections of the two works (contained in scores held in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA) are detailed and colourful. Using four colours (one for each form of the row) he traces twelve-note series and smaller units both in the scores and on separate pages, and also notes rhythmic patterns and alterations.
not as interested in this area; I was still much more interested in orchestral and chamber music, but I expect a few seeds were probably planted there, in 1956.”

By the second half of 1956, Banks was finding copying an onerous and time-consuming business that didn’t allow him enough time for his own projects, and so when a fellow student of Seiber’s, Wally Stott (who had since achieved considerable success as musical director, composer and arranger for the Goon Show) asked him to write some music for a recording session, he jumped at the chance. According to Banks, the scores “seemed to work quite satisfactorily and I realised that the money I’d earned … would have taken me seven times longer as a copyist [so] I began to do arrangements for all kinds of combinations, from trios to orchestral work, which was all very valuable experience [because] as a younger composer [you need] the experience of hearing [your music] pretty directly, otherwise you don’t know whether you’re on the right track or not, so starting to work commercially … was an important experience for me.”

The recording sessions were obviously successful, because Stott called again soon afterwards to offer Banks the chance to write the music for a BBC radio adaptation of one of the H.G. Wells stories, featuring Tony Hancock. Banks jumped at the chance; again the sessions went very well and he “started to be used more and more.” Hancock must have been impressed by the score, because when he needed music for several episodes of his regular radio show shortly after, he employed Banks.

Early the following year, Banks got his first chance to write film music for a documentary on Switzerland. He recalled that “this was a whole new technique to learn … the art of synchronisation with film.” And he began to receive other offers of work, notably “with the animation for Halas & Batchelor, who were making some

---

9 Ibid. By the mid-sixties, Banks was interested enough in electronic music to begin researching the area, and later in the decade became a Founder Member of the British Society for Electronic Music, broadcasting for the BBC on the subjects ‘Electronic Instruments’ and ‘The New Music’. He first used the medium in his own work in Intersections for Electronic Sounds and Orchestra (1969).
10 Ibid.
12 de Berg interview.
13 Hancock’s Half Hour.
14 Alpine Roundabout, 1957.
15 de Berg interview.
wonderful cartoons, [and] this meant learning another technique of working to click-tracks in [another] kind of synchronisation.”

By the end of the decade, with Banks now very much in demand as a screen composer, his “serious music was suffering. Why it suffered was very simple in a way, in that once having made an initial break into such a highly competitive field as this composing of film music, for a while you cannot afford to say no. I confess that I was doing too much [although] I don’t really regret this because I was working with the best orchestras [and hearing my scores] played back by the best musicians in London. It was a craft [and] a technique [that] I had to learn. I gained a great deal from it, an appreciation of scale, timing, space in music, how to move along with visual images, the creation of mood and atmosphere.”

Banks didn’t totally neglect his ‘serious music’ in this period. In 1958 he wrote an Episode for chamber orchestra (which remains unpublished), and at various times began sketching solo and chamber works including a string quartet, a piece for string orchestra and solo pieces for violin and piano, none of which he was able to complete owing to his “energies being sapped by writing music ten, twelve or more hours a day”. And in 1960 he began taking students (mainly at postgraduate level) in composition, analysis and orchestration, continuing to teach privately until his return to Australia more than a decade later.

In early 1961, Banks was commissioned by the BBC to compose a chamber work for the Cheltenham Festival. He decided to write a piece in memory of Seiber, who had been killed in a car accident the previous year. Taking a title used by Seiber for one of his earliest works, Sonata da camera, and the instrumental combination in his Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, Banks wrote “quite a highly organised twelve-tone piece which has many references to Seiber in a way which is probably

---

16 Ibid. Banks wrote the scores for numerous Halas & Batchelor projects including cartoons, documentaries, television series and cinema advertisements between 1957 and 1965.
17 Ibid. In 1960, probably Banks’ most prolific year during this period, his output included the scores for one full-length film, five documentaries, and five projects for Halas & Batchelor.
18 Ibid. Numerous pages containing unidentified rows, matrices and sketches possibly dating from this period are held in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA.
19 Seiber’s Sonata da camera for violin and cello was written in 1925, the year after he completed his studies with Kodaly at the Budapest Academy of Music.
20 The instrumentation is: violin, viola, cello, flute, clarinet, bass clarinet, piano and percussion. Seiber’s work, written in 1957, had used these instruments to accompany a chamber choir.
not well known, [with] the last movement more or less a solo for cello, which was Seiber’s instrument, [and] the second movement a kind of Scherzo [containing] a reference to the kind of light music which Seiber could do so well.” 21 When analysing the piece years later, Banks found that he had “used precisely the same twelve-tone series as Seiber had used in one of his last pieces, the Concert Music for Violin and Piano [sic] … that was an unconscious tribute to my teacher.” 22 He also began writing music for Hammer Film Productions in the same year, and recalled the scores for these horror movies as “beautiful to do because nobody wants a pretty tune, all … they want are exciting, dramatic sounds. I used to experiment [and] I don’t think that Hammer even knew that … half the scores [I wrote were] twelve-tone music.” 23

The following year, Banks was invited by the Edinburgh Festival Society to write a piece for the Australian performers Barry Tuckwell, Brenton Langbein and Maureen Jones. He responded with his Horn Trio, which was not a twelve-tone piece, but “happened to be based on a kind of eight-note configuration.” 24 And later in 1962, at the request of Douglas Gamley, he arranged a suite of anonymous Elizabethan pieces which he called Elizabethan Miniatures. 25 Gamley conducted the suite in performance and recording with the Sinfonia of London, and both works were published by the end of the year.

In 1963, Banks was commissioned by the Centre de la Musique in Paris to write a chamber work. The contemporary ensemble based at the Centre, which specialised in new European repertoire and was also renowned for its collaborations on experimental theatre works, had been formed and was directed by another old friend, Keith Humble, whose only stipulation was that the piece should be “something different”. 26 Taking this opportunity to make his first excursion into ‘third stream’ music, Banks wrote Equation I for an ensemble comprised of a jazz septet and a

21 de Berg interview.
22 Ibid. The analysis was prepared for the first National Young Composers’ Seminar in 1970. In the interview with de Berg (two years after the Seminar), Banks confused the Concert Piece for violin and piano (1954) with the Violin Sonata (1960), Seiber’s final chamber work.
23 Ibid. Banks was to write scores for eight Hammer films between 1961 and 1966, the best known of which are probably The Evil of Frankenstein (1963) and The Mummy’s Shroud (1966).
24 Ibid.
25 The instrumentation for these is: lute, viola da gamba and strings.
26 de Berg interview.
chamber quintet. He later described it as both “a twelve-tone piece and … a reference back to my old love … jazz music, which had not appeared, or certainly not in any overt form, in my music; but here I was interested in combining the two things.”  

That he took many months to compose the work is not surprising given that not only was this his first experiment in a new genre, but also the single most productive year of his screen music career. Although completed early in 1964, Equation I was not performed until nearly two years later, on November 9th, 1965, some two weeks after the premiere of Three Episodes for Flute and Piano.

---

27 Ibid. The work is scored for a jazz group consisting of trumpet, tenor saxophone, piano, guitar, string bass, drum kit and percussion, and a chamber ensemble consisting of violin, viola, cello, harp and percussion.

28 Banks' output in 1963 included five full-length film and two documentary scores, and music for several episodes of the BBC television series Comedy Playhouse.
The flautist Douglas Whittaker, a friend of Banks' from the University of Melbourne, requested a work for flute and piano some time in mid-1964, and together with the composer gave the first performance of *Three Episodes for Flute and Piano* at Wigmore Hall on October 25th, 1965. It is not clear whether it was always Banks' intention to play; that his contemporary notes and correspondence provide no clues to this question does not necessarily indicate that he agreed to perform from the outset. On the contrary, bearing in mind that he had not played in recital since his student days in Melbourne (about fifteen years), and notwithstanding the rather tenuous link offered by his association with Whittaker during that period which may have been sufficient to inspire him to return to the stage, he would surely have been more likely to mention that he was intending to play, given the magnitude of such a decision. Furthermore, Banks' statement in a subsequent interview that Whittaker "asked me for some pieces ... and actually we performed them together",¹ suggests that the performance of the pieces was not part of the original agreement. The most likely scenario, therefore, is that performance was simply not an issue during the initial stages of developing the work (it was, after all, over a year away), and it was probably not until the pair worked through the first sketches for *Episode I* (at the earliest) that a collaboration was considered. What is certain is that his partnership with Whittaker in the premiere of *Three Episodes* was Banks' sole concert performance as a pianist in all his years in London.²

¹ From the 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).

² In the same interview Banks referred to the premiere of *Three Episodes* as his "one and only appearance in public in London", revealing that he "slaved for months to learn the piano part" and subsequently "vowed never to play the piano in public again [because] it took too much time away from composition."
The piano part for the premiere therefore occupies a unique place among Banks’ sketch pages. In its dual roles as integral component of the sketch series and first performance part, it follows often barely legible sketch material with a clarity borne of the composer/performer’s need to read and practise from the score while simultaneously working on the piece with his fellow performer. There is no reason to believe that Banks saw this score (in which each Episode is written out neatly upon completion of a first, ‘draft’ score) as a fair copy or definitive version of the work. On the contrary, its neatness simply reflects his pragmatism; in performing the work himself, he could avoid one copying of the score (and therefore the “time away from composition”) as long as the part remained clear enough for use in performance. That the first performance piano part belongs primarily to the sketch series may be gauged both by the numerous revisions regarding such elements as notes, time-signatures, phrasing, articulation, tempi and notation written in pencil, and black, red and green ink (and so, by implication, at different times within the rehearsal period), and by the fact that it was followed in the sketch series (probably after the first performance, but before the submission of the autographs to Schott & Co. for use as the first edition) by a sketch page (S1) containing experiments concerned with clarifying the piano notation.

Fifty-two pages housed in the Banks Collection at the National Library of Australia contain the only known surviving sketches for the Three Episodes. The bulk of these (forty-nine pages) are contained in a single folder in the Music Section, with the remainder (two pages of preliminary sketches and one for Episode I) located in the Manuscript Section among various lecture notes, correspondence and miscellaneous papers, and most importantly, alongside two pages of analytical notes for the Episodes probably prepared while Banks was teaching at a National Young Composers’ Seminar (1970–73), the Canberra School of Music (1973–1976) or the Sydney Conservatorium (1978–1980). As was the case with the Three Studies, it appears that while preparing notes for the analysis, he removed these pages from their folder and did not return them. The whereabouts of all the sketch pages, numbered in the order in which they were found, are shown in Table 9.1 along with the autograph which served as the Schott edition of the work until a printed version was published in 1967.
Table 9.1 Locations of all known surviving sketch pages, first performance piano part and autograph for *Three Episodes for Flute and Piano* (1964).

**Sketch Pages**
1. Thirty-seven pages (referred to hereafter as S1–S37) located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA
2. Three pages (referred to hereafter as S50–S52) located in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA

**First Performance Part**
Piano part (full score of twelve pages, referred to hereafter as S38–S49) located in the Music Section of the Banks Collection, NLA

**Autograph**
Full score located in the private collection of Valerie Banks

The fifty-two sketch pages may be divided into four groups, one for each of the *Episodes* and one of preliminary and non-specific sketches. Such a breakdown, in which each *Episode* within the first performance piano part represents the culmination of the sketch series that preceded it directly, reveals five pages of preliminary and non-specific sketches, twenty-five for *Episode I*, ten for *Episode II* and thirteen for *Episode III* (as shown in Table 9.2). Not surprisingly, as both the first written and most structurally complex of the three pieces, *Episode I* possesses the most extensive sketches of the set: almost half the total pages (about 48 per cent) and approximately the same number as the other two pieces combined (about 44 per cent).

Table 9.2 Description of sketch pages and first performance piano part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Writing Implements</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Other Markings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>black pencil, with additions in black ink</td>
<td>Episode I</td>
<td>&quot;A.L. No. 43&quot; manuscript brand and format marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Episode III</td>
<td>&quot;Paxton No. 45&quot; manuscript brand and format marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Episode III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>black pencil</td>
<td>Preliminary and non-specific sketches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Whereas for *Three Studies* there had been a separate cello part in the Schott edition, for this work Banks considered it desirable for both players to use a full score; the cover of the 1967 Schott edition bears the direction "2 copies required for performance". Banks' decision was no doubt based on his experience as a performer of the work.

4 A situation which mirrors that of *Three Studies* a decade previously. In that case, the sketch series for the first written *Study I* had consisted of thirty-one of the seventy-seven pages (about 40 per cent), slightly more than the twenty-eight sketch pages (about 36 per cent) for the remaining two pieces.
S5  black pencil, with additions in red ink  Episode I
S6  black pencil, with other unrelated material in black ink  Episode I  two bars of unidentified music in black ink
S7  black pencil, with other unrelated material in black ink  Episode I  seven bars of unidentified music in black ink (first two corresponding to the unidentified bars on S6)
S8  black pencil  Episode II
S9  black pencil  Episode II  "A.L. No. 10" manuscript brand and format marks
S10  black pencil  Episode II
S11  black pencil, with additions in black, red and green ink  Episode II  "Tele", in black ink
S12  black pencil  Episode I
S13  black pencil  Non-specific sketches  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S14  black pencil  Episode I
S15  black pencil  Episode I  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S16  black pencil  Episode I
S17  black pencil  Episode III  "A.L. No. 10" manuscript brand and format marks
S18  black pencil  Episode III
S19  black pencil  Episode III
S20  black pencil  Episode III  "A.L. No. 10" manuscript brand and format marks
S21  black pencil  Episode III
S22  black pencil  Episode III  "A.L. No. 10" manuscript brand and format marks
S23  black pencil  Episode II
S24  black pencil  Episode II  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S25  black pencil  Episode II
S26  black pencil  Non-specific sketch
S27  black pencil  Episode I
S28  black pencil  Episodes I and III
S29  black pencil  Episode I
S30  black pencil  Episode I  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S31  black pencil  Episode I
S32  black pencil  Episode I  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S33  black pencil  Episode I  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S34  black pencil  Episode I  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S35  black pencil  Episode I  "Paxton No. 45" manuscript brand and format marks
S36  black pencil, with additions in black ink  Episode I
S37  black pencil  Episode I
S38  black pencil, with additions in black ink  Episode I
S39  black pencil, with additions in black ink  Episode I  "A.L. No. 41" manuscript brand and format marks
The original versions of all the sketches are in black pencil, with additions and alterations on sixteen pages (covering virtually the entire compositional process) in black, red and green ink. Twenty-four of the pages contain other markings; of these, twenty are manuscript marks which identify two brands employing four different formats: “A.L. No. 41”, a fourteen-staff landscape format used for the first performance piano part (ideal in that role, as it allows Banks to use three systems, each of four staves and retain blank staves between them to avoid crowding); “A.L. No. 43”, a twelve-staff landscape format used only for the last of the sketch series (S1), which was probably written some time after the premiere; “A.L. No. 10”, a sixteen-staff portrait format; and “Paxton No. 45”, a twelve-staff portrait format. Several unidentified brands in twelve- and fourteen-staff portrait formats account for twenty-one of the pages. Once again, it is not surprising that Banks should have so many varieties of manuscript at his disposal; he was, after all, working during this
period on several projects which would have required scores and parts for various combinations, and as a professional copyist for more than a decade, it is likely that he would have accumulated a stockpile of manuscript. Also, as we observed in the sketch series for *Three Studies* (and may also be seen in both the present series and those of other works including the *Horn Trio* and *Equation I*), he was not averse to re-using for sketches pages that had been rendered superfluous in his copying work.

The names and Mayfair address “Jim Connock, c/ Gerard Holdsworth, 3 Deanery St. W.1.” scrawled at the bottom of a page of preliminary sketches (S51) provide a tangible connection to Banks’ screen music work. He was employed by Holdsworth Productions to write the score for a documentary at about this time, and the information here, probably the result of a telephone call while he was in the early stages of work on *Three Episodes*, almost certainly relates to (and may be his first contact with) that project. The unidentified music neatly written in Banks’ hand in black ink on S6 and S7 appears to be discontinued parts for two treble instruments, and had probably been intended originally for use in one of his many projects of the preceding years.

---

5 Banks’ composing work in 1964–65 included three full-length film scores for Hammer Films, two for documentaries, one for Halas & Batchelor and material for a revue at the New Apollo Theatre.

6 *The Prince in the Heather* (1965), which was Banks’ only work for Holdsworth Productions.
There is no way of knowing precisely when Banks began composing the piece he subsequently called *Three Episodes for Flute and Piano*. The only clue among the sketch pages is the incomplete date “9/64” which appears after a fragment on system 4 of S7, one of the earliest of the Episode I sketch pages. It is likely that the preliminary ideas for the work preceded this fragment by a matter of days or weeks only, placing the beginning of the compositional process somewhere between mid-August and mid-September, 1964.

The five pages of preliminary and non-specific sketches for *Three Episodes* (shown in Table 10.1) can be divided into two groups. The first (S4, S52, S51) is concerned initially with the development of sets that may serve as the structural units of the work, and subsequently with the jotting down of various ideas for such elements as flute texture, articulation, notation and motivic material. The second group (S13, S26) contains ideas for further development of the preliminary material, but as these ideas do not appear during the work, the sketches are impossible to place chronologically. While they are most likely to have been written in the early stages of composition, they cannot automatically be placed with the bulk of the preliminary sketches.

**Table 10.1** The Preliminary and Non-Specific Sketch Pages for *Three Episodes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S4   | *top:* three possible titles for the work — “Expression” and “Expositions” crossed out, with “Statements for Flute and Piano” remaining  
*systems 1–3:* three three-note groups  
*systems 3–4:* several fragments for flute and piano, and flute alone, derived mainly from the first and second groups above  
*system 4:* fragment for flute and piano (one bar) |

1 This incomplete date is probably an indication either that Banks was unable to remember the exact date while writing the sketch, or that when returning to the page later, he could remember the month but not the day of composition. In either case, the very presence of the date suggests that the fragment has a particular significance (which will be discussed in Chapter 11).
Group One: Preliminary Sketches  (S4, S52, S51)

S4 is the earliest of the sketch pages. At the top, three possible titles for the work are listed: Expression, Statements for Flute and Piano, and Expositions, with the first and last of these crossed out, indicating that Banks' original choice for a title was Statements. Immediately below, he writes three trichords, each with its list of derived intervals alongside (see Example 10.1). The interval lists for the second and third trichords (which he calls "groups") are incorrect — in both cases minor sevenths and major ninths, though listed, may not be derived, while minor seconds are missing from the second list. The trichords may be seen not only as individual sets, but as groups within a larger set. They share several important characteristics, and their placement vertically rather than horizontally on the page highlights these similarities, suggesting that their relationships to each other and possible roles within a larger unit were uppermost in Banks' mind at the time of writing.

The three trichords all have a second note C and a third note a semitone above the first, with the outer notes rising by a tone in each succeeding group. The overall effect is of a gradual intervallic expansion from their common mid-point, the seconds generated by the first trichord replaced by thirds, which in turn are replaced by fourths. With this set of expanding trichords Banks thus has all intervals
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available to him, which the very presence of the accompanying interval lists suggests is an important point in his planning for the work.

Among the sketches on S4 are two of particular significance. The more substantial of these (and the only fragment written at the beginning of a system, suggesting that it was Banks’ first idea), consists mainly of continuous semiquavers divided between the two instruments over a wide range (nearly four octaves), to which are added phrasing, expression and dynamic marks, and the tempo direction “as fast as possible” (see Example 10.2). Unlike the other fragments on the page, this does not appear to be a hastily written idea, but a considered sketch drawing principally on the second and third groups for its material, and specifically on the major and minor sixths of the second group, and the ubiquitous semitone/major seventh.

Although up to three notes are played simultaneously, at no point do any of the three parts (flute, R.H. and L.H.) play together or have consecutive notes. This approach enables Banks to combine rapid movement throughout the sketch with clarity in each of its components: the progression of (enharmonic) descending sixths in the four semiquavers of the flute part, sixths also in the L.H., the second group complete in the R.H. (the third group having been crossed out), and the major sevenths on both instruments that conclude the fragment.

The other sketch of particular significance on S4 is a fragment for flute that appears in two versions at the end of the third system, and whose small, faint calligraphy belies the importance of its contents (see Example 10.3). The first version (variant 1) is in three parts: a five-note figure more closely related to F minor and Ab major than to any of the trichords, followed by a group of seven demisemiquavers on D4, and finally the words “then Flutter”. The second and third of these elements are precursors to material appearing later in the work, the demisemiquavers the forerunner of repeated-note figures in all the pieces, while flutter-tonguing is used in Episode III.

2 The first version of this sketch shares a staff with the R.H. of a piano chord, although the two do not seem to be related. The piano chord is the second of two, both of which are unclear in details of clef and precise notes intended, and bear no apparent relation either to the trichords or any other material on the page. The placement of the two sketches on the same staff (though by no means overlapping, as the flute is written on the top line and above, and the piano below the bottom line) is more likely the result of the rapid notating of various ideas than an intention to combine the two fragments.
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The second version of the bar contains only the five-note figure, which is expanded by half a beat and is rhythmically more even (variant 2). With its second note raised a semitone (from the repeated F to F#), the figure now begins with a four-note chromatic progression that is an extension of the first trichord material. It is this chromatic tetrachord to which Banks turns next as he searches for structural units on which to base the work. This sketch, therefore, is pivotal not only because it provides the link between initial structural ideas and final choices, but also because it contains, in its first version, other unrelated ideas that appear throughout the Episodes.

On systems 1–4 of the sketch page that follows, Banks writes the 24 possible permutations of a chromatic tetrachord (see Appendix B, S52), taking as his set the first trichord of S4 (C, C#, D) and its adjacent higher semitone (Eb), and beginning with the intervals of the first trichord in positions 2–4 (see Example 10.4, systems 1–2). On system 5 is a twelve-tone row divided into tetrachords, the first two of which are taken from the chromatic series above: the first is the first bar of the page (comprised of a descending semitone between two ascending tones), and the second is the first bar of system 3 (comprised of an ascending tone between semitones in contrary motion) transposed up a diminished fifth (see Example 10.4, systems 2–3). Although all of the tetrachordal permutations containing a minor third (half the total) are specifically marked "(3rd)", neither of those used in the row is among them. Whether this was a conscious decision to identify and avoid those sets, or simply represents a change of mind, is impossible to assess. The minor third is, in any case, a derived interval in both tetrachords, occurring between notes 1 and 4 in the first tetrachord, and notes 2 and 4 in the second. The third tetrachord (comprised of a diminished fifth between semitones in contrary motion) is derived from the third trichord of S4 (see Example 10.4, systems 1–3). Labelled "Harmonic", and with the semitones bracketed, it is identical in structure to the second tetrachord in all respects except its central interval. The only interval that may not be derived from any of the tetrachords, the major third, occurs between the first and second tetrachords in this configuration.

The twelve-tone row, still divided into tetrachords, and now bracketed and labelled "Pno", is written again at the top of the next sketch page, S51 (see Example 10.5).
Over its final tetrachord, another bracket with the label “Fl” indicates the beginning of an overlapping row, and for the first time, the possibility of separate structural material for each of the instruments (see Example 10.5, systems 1–2 and Table 10.2). The flute row peters out after only nine notes, but is rewritten in full immediately below, with the three notes missing from the original (C⁴, Db, G⁴) inserted in positions 7–9. While tetrachords remain the principal structural units in the abandoned first version of the row (apart from the shared “Harmonic” tetrachord, notes 4–7 are bracketed), in the second version the hexachords are bracketed, and indeed are identical in content, the second being an inversion (I-I) of the first. Furthermore, as the first hexachord of the flute row contains the same notes as the second of the piano row (beneath which it is carefully placed on system 2), the two rows are hexachordally combinatory. On the following system, with the rows now aligned and divided hexachordally, aggregates may be formed by combining the hexachords vertically (system 3). Banks writes “(Melodic row)” under the flute row (even though on S52 he had labelled the tetrachord that begins both hexachords “Harmonic”) and identifies three chromatic tetrachords in the piano row, the third (previously unidentified, from notes 7–10) overlapping the second. On system 4 he writes “also this re-grouping” above a new row which, as it comprises the piano row tetrachords in a reordered form, is an example of tetrachordal combinatory.

A comparison of the intervallic contents of the piano and flute rows reveals several similarities and one significant difference (see Table 10.2). Both rows are comprised of only a few intervals; the piano row contains four (intervals shown in Example 10.4, system 3) and the flute row three (intervals shown in Example 10.5, system 2), with semitones accounting for about half the total in each case. While both rows also contain at least one tritone, the remaining intervals are different, major seconds and a major third in the piano row, and minor thirds in the flute row. There are two intervallic elements of particular interest in the flute row: first, the semitone that appears as every second interval, allowing for a subdivision of the row into six pairs of notes outlining semitones; and second, the minor third that exists in the piano row only as a derived interval within the two chromatic tetrachords (as discussed earlier), which is the first interval used in the flute row (enharmonically) after the common tetrachord (from notes 4–5).
Several important ideas emerge in the twelve-tone sketches on S51: first, that the instruments may use different (though not unrelated) structural material; second, that the structural units may vary in length (examples being the tetrachords on which the piano row is based and the identical hexachords of the flute row); and finally, that new rows may be assembled using both hexachordal and tetrachordal combinatoriality.

The remainder of S51 contains ideas related mainly to various textural possibilities on the flute, and in some cases, methods of notating them. These are probably Banks’ first ideas regarding tone-colour, and vary from the purely textual “Change of colour on repetition of phrase” to the use of dynamics and expression marks in “non-vib — vib p < sf >”, and notation in “triple-tongue †” and “Flutter (non-flutter)”. Above a sketch on system 6 of the opening flute motif of Episode II (to be discussed in Chapter 12), the heading “Start of New Section (or piece)” indicates that at this point, the format for the work was not finalised. The use of brackets around “or piece” suggests that the idea for the work to be comprised of separate pieces rather than sections was an afterthought, possibly only conceived at the time of writing the sketch, or even added subsequently.3

---

3 At the top of the earlier page S52, “3 Episodes Fl/Pno” appears in a hand that doesn’t match the calligraphy elsewhere on the preliminary sketch pages. It is most likely that this heading was added (along with the transposition of the system 5 twelve-tone row up one tone on system 6) when Banks was preparing lecture notes years later, probably while teaching at a National Young Composers’ Seminar (1970–73), the Canberra School of Music (1973–77) or the Sydney Conservatorium (1978–80). Supporting this argument is the fact that S51 and S52 were located at the time of this study with other lecture material (including analytical notes for Three Episodes) in the Manuscript Section, and not with the bulk of the sketch pages for Three Episodes in the Music Section of the Banks Collection.
At the bottom of the page, Banks draws up a table in which he divides some of the
textural ideas sketched above into two groups, each containing three opposing
elements (see Table 10.3); “hard” sound (which he labels “AH”), *vibrato* and flutter-
tonguing in the first group are juxtaposed to “soft” sound (labelled “OOH”), *non-
vibrato* and non-flutter-tonguing in the second. While these are only preliminary
categories based on the most fundamental of textural opposites, the very presence on
S51 of broad ideas relating to variations of tone-colour, along with the series of
twelve-tone sketches, indicates that structural and expressive aspects were both
significant areas of interest during the early stages of composition.

**Table 10.3** Banks’ table of textural ideas (S51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. HARD</th>
<th>SOFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate – AH</td>
<td>– OOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. VIB</td>
<td>NON-VIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FLUTTER</td>
<td>(NON-FLUTTER)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Two: Non-Specific Sketches** (S13, S26)

Both S13 and S26 contain ideas for further development of the preliminary material,
but as these ideas do not appear during the work, the sketches are impossible to place
chronologically. While they are most likely to have been written early in the
compositional process, they cannot automatically be placed with the bulk of the
preliminary sketches.

The heading “If Section” and label “Statement” above the first bar both indicate that
S13 belongs with the earliest sketches. The use in the heading of the word “Section”
suggests that this page predates the S51 marking “Start of New Section (or piece)”
(as discussed earlier), while the word “Statement” is a link with the original choice
of title on S4: “Statements for Flute and Piano”. But the most powerful argument
for an early time of composition is that much of the sketch material on S13 is based
on the second and third of the S4 trichords, and not the tetrachords which followed
on S52.
The first system, labelled "Elements", contains sixteen notes for piano in an arch formation, the ten ascending notes in the first bar followed by six descending in the second (see Example 10.6). The ringing, rhythmically free progression in the first bar (marked "Slowly – a piacero" (sic)) rises over a range of almost five octaves. After two initial perfect fourths, this progression consists entirely of minor sixths and thirds (or their enharmonic equivalents), allowing for a series of the second of the S4 trichords (six in all) to overlap throughout the remainder of the first bar and into the second, with each note after the third (B♭) a component in at least two trichords.

A rapid descent in the second bar over more than two octaves (slightly less than half the range of the first bar in a fraction of the time) replaces the gradual build-up of the harmonic layering with a sudden burst of activity. The annotations in this part of the fragment are mostly unclear; the only decipherable one, "8 ↓", is placed vaguely above the latter half of the second bar. The first three notes of the bar (including the tied-over apex of the arch) comprise the third of the S4 trichords, and the remaining notes, all a minor third apart, form a diminished seventh. The flute plays only one note in this sketch, a long B♭⁴, which, entering at the top of the arch (nearly two octaves below the piano) defines the beginning of bar 2 and is related trichordally to both bars.

In writing the second and fifth notes of the first bar as semibreves, Banks appears to be conferring a special significance upon them. As longer notes than the others in the progression, their function seems to be to highlight the identical first and third trichords (notes 3–5 and 6–8) by separating them from the preceding material in each case. This subdivision of the ten notes of the ascending line into three groups containing two, three and five notes respectively (notes 1–2, 3–5 and 6–10) provides the momentum for the first bar to rise to the apex of the arch. The "Elements" to which the first system label refers are the second and third of the S4 trichords. While the second is the principal element, appearing six times in full and providing the minor thirds that comprise the second half of bar 2, the third trichord appears complete in bar 2 and provides the perfect fourths that begin the sketch.

The sketches on systems 2 and 3 of S13 (see Example 10.7) are also based largely on the second of the S4 trichords, with both fragments using two particular trichords.
(shown as \(a\) and \(b\)) for their melodic material. The sets appear in reverse order on system 3, where they are extended by the addition of a fourth note a semitone below the third. This extended version (consisting of two semitone pairs separated by a tone) is also used harmonically in the third bar of system 3, and virtually all of the remaining harmonic material is derived from the major sixths and sevenths contained in the second of the S4 trichords. The sole exception is a diminished third which occurs between the two lowest notes of the L.H. figure on system 2.\(^4\)

The melodic use of trichords \(a\) and \(b\) is similar in the two fragments. On system 2, Banks uses imitation, referring in annotations at the end of the system to the figures played by the flute in bar 1 (trichord \(a\)) and R.H. in bar 3 (trichord \(b\)) as “this repeated idea”, while on system 3 the repetition is precise and immediate; here, writing for piano only, he uses the extended trichords sequentially in the R.H. in the first two bars. The faint or ambiguous nature of much of the calligraphy on both systems indicates that Banks was writing rapidly with a view to recording his ideas in outline rather than taking the time to notate the sketches with precision. Not only are such elements as note lengths, pitches and accidentals unclear or erroneous in places, there is also uncertainty regarding time-signatures in both fragments. While the system 2 sketch was probably written without a time-signature initially, the notation of the L.H. rhythm and presence of triplet brackets in the upper parts imply simple quadruple (4/4) time. It appears that Banks, realising that the use of a compound quadruple time-signature would obviate the need for triplet markings, subsequently inserted a 12/8 time-signature at the beginning of the flute staff, returning to 4/4 in bar 3 (written above the staff due to a lack of space), at the conclusion of the triplet passage. The alternative interpretation that the 12/8 marking was an original feature, and that therefore Banks was thinking of two different time-signatures simultaneously from the beginning (but indicating only one), seems

\(^4\) The cross-rhythmic pattern in this L.H. figure is a recurring element in much of Banks’ instrumental and chamber music to this point, appearing in various works including *Pezzo Dramatico* (1956), *Horn Trio* (1962), and both *Variations* and *Study III* (as discussed previously in this study). It also occurs briefly on the piano in *Episode III*, bar 19, which in one sense defines the present fragment as a preliminary sketch. But as the pattern subsequently appears only fleetingly (with altered harmony), and is not of any structural, melodic or motivic importance, it seems most likely that any particular link is subconscious rather than intentional. The significance of this recurring, jazz-influenced cross-rhythm may best be seen across the entire spectrum of the first decade of Banks’ oeuvre, and so will be discussed in Chapter 14.
unlikely. In either case, only the speed at which he was working can account for the absence of a 12/8 time-signature for the imitative R.H. material. On system 3, the initial 3/8 time-signature is crossed out, replaced by 3/4 in the R.H. and 6/8 in the L.H. But the only possible correct time-signature of the three is the original (although 6/16 would be more appropriate given the note groupings within the fragment).

The label “Re-ordered” above a two-bar fragment on S26 (see Example 10.8) refers to the fact that this flute phrase, which appears over a single piano note, is another reordering of the S52 row using tetrachordal combinatoriality. This thirteen-note variant of the row (with its G₅ at the beginning and end of the second tetrachord) is used in a markedly different manner from that suggested by the S51 version of the original (see Example 10.5, system 3). While on that occasion it was marked “Pno”, with the hexachordally combinatorial row below marked “Fl” and “Melodic”, in this sketch the rearranged row becomes a flute melody.

At this point we may compare Banks’ assembled piano and flute rows with the twelve-tone rows used for Variations and Three Studies a decade previously. The similarities between the flute row in particular and the earlier rows are significant (see Example 10.9); the final tetrachords of the three are identical (with the same progression also appearing in inversion from notes 3–6 and 5–8 of the flute row), while the tetrachord common to the flute (notes 1–4) and piano rows (notes 9–12) occurs from notes 5–8 in the Studies row. Semitones and minor thirds predominate in all three, accounting for ten of the intervals in the Variations row, eight in the Studies and nine in the flute row.

The preliminary sketch series for Variations, Studies and Episodes all display Banks’ interest in combinatoriality. In the sketches for both cello/piano works, combinatorial hexachords in the matrices are linked by arrows, and in the case of the Variations, are further identified as “interchangeable” (S75) and combined in “reconstructed rows” (S74). The Episodes series (which does not include a matrix) contains aggregates formed by combining flute and piano row hexachords (S51), and
two different tetrachordal “re-groupings” of the piano row (S51 and S26). There is also a similarity in the methods and materials used in the development of some of the structural units within the Variations and Episodes rows. Although nominally experimenting with hexachords in the former and tetrachords in the latter, Banks lists tetrachordal permutations in both sketch series. In the Variations series, the tetrachord follows two existing notes, with the whole comprising a chromatic hexachord (see Example 3.1), and in Episodes, the tetrachords themselves are chromatic (see Example 10.4).

There is one significant difference between the preliminary sketches for the cello/piano and flute/piano pieces. While the earlier series contains numerous contrapuntal fragments but only a single textural idea (the pizz. markings on S22 and S18), the reverse is the case in the Episodes series. Here, a great number of varied textural ideas are sketched (mostly on the same page as the flute row is first assembled and the two rows appear together: S51), and the only contrapuntal material is an imitative fragment which, in any case, is of uncertain chronology (S13).
The sketches for *Episode I*

The second score of *Episode I*, which also served as the piano part for the first performance, is dated "25/10/64". This date, though by no means marking the culmination of the compositional process, does represent the completion of an initial sketching out of a playable piano part after which Banks and Douglas Whittaker could begin working on the movement together. Viewed in combination with the incomplete date "9/64" on an earlier sketch page (S7), this indicates that work on *Episode I* probably occupied Banks for at least a month, from some time in September until late October, 1964.

Among the twenty-five pages of sketches for *Episode I* (shown in Table 11.1) are seven comprising the first score (S36, S35, S29, S30, S34, S37, S33) and five comprising the second score (S38, S39, S40, S41, S42). Of the remaining thirteen pages, eleven precede the first score (S5, S14, S15, S7, S12, S27, S28, S16, S31, S32, S6), two contain fragments sketched between the two scores (S50, S32), and one dates from after the second score (S1).

### Table 11.1 The Sketch Pages for *Episode I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td><em>system 1</em>: material for piano part in bars 1–2 of autograph (written on two staves)  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 2</em>: material for piano part in bars 1–5 of autograph (written on three staves)  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 3</em>: material for piano part in bars 15–17 of autograph (written on two staves), then bars 16–18 (written on three staves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td><em>system 1</em>: material for opening passage (autograph bars 1–3)  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 2</em>: fragment for flute in red ink (probably a variant of the S4, system 3 repeated-note figure shown in Example 10.3)  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 3</em>: material for bar 5 of autograph  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 4</em>: fragment for flute and piano (three bars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td><em>system 1</em>: fragment for piano (one bar) containing two ideas used in <em>Episode I</em>  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 2</em>: fragment for flute (one bar) similar to material in <em>Episodes I</em> and <em>III</em>, labelled both &quot;I&quot; and &quot;or save for III&quot;  &lt;br&gt; <em>system 3</em>: unrelated material in black ink (two bars)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Coincidentally, this was both Banks’ forty-first birthday and a year to the day before the premiere of the work.
systems 1–2: unrelated material in black ink (seven bars)
systems 3–4: material for bars 14–16 of autograph, with the incomplete date “9/64” and several annotations for flute written on system 4

systems 1, 3 and 5: development of material on S14, systems 1–2 (autograph bar 5)
systems 1, 2, 3 and 5: five versions of a passage for flute (continuations of the first bar on systems 1, 3 and 5)
system 4: material for bars 6–7 of autograph

system 1: development of material on S55, system 3 (three bars, the first of which is autograph bar 5)
system 2: two more versions of the first bar on system 1 (autograph bar 5)
system 3: fragment for flute and piano (unbarred, probably a continuation of the second bar on system 2
system 4: two fragments for piano (each one bar, the second in two versions)
bottom: rhythmic fragments — calculations for various beat subdivisions, probably related to material above

systems 1–3: development of material on S14, system 3
bottom: rhythmic fragments — calculations for various beat subdivisions, probably related to material above

system 1: fragment for flute and piano labelled “Coda” (five bars)
system 2: two three-note fragments, the first labelled “perhaps end 1st section”, and the second both “start of 3rd [section]” and “2nd gr”, the latter probably in reference to the second of the trichords set out on S4 (see Example 10.1)
systems 1–3: first page of a projected score — development of material on S5, system 1 and S12, systems 1–5 (autograph bars 1–7)
systems 1–2: continuation of S27 — material for six bars of a projected score
system 3: fragment for flute in two versions (unbarred), labelled “OR save this for 3rd piece” (this is the material for the opening of Episode III); bar for piano joined by arrow with the final bar of system 2 (possibly an alternative to that bar; also related to a bar sketched on S3, system 1, and similar to material contained in Episode III)
systems 1–4: continuation of S35 — material for bars 22–34 of autograph
systems 1–5: continuation of S29 — material for bars 34–44 of autograph
system 1: material (set out chordally) for bars 55–56 of autograph
system 2: material for flute part in bar 56 of autograph
systems 1–2: material for piano part in bars 17–22 of autograph
system 3: fragment labelled “End Piece by” and “Piano Builds Up” — material for bars 67–70 of autograph
systems 1–4: material for flute part in bars 35–37 of autograph
systems 1–4: continuation of S37 — material for bars 60–70 of autograph
systems 1–4: continuation of S30 — material for bars 34–49 of autograph
systems 1–3: continuation of S36 — material for bars 10–21 of autograph
systems 1–3: first page of first score — material for bars 1–9 of autograph
systems 1–4: continuation of S34 — material for bars 50–64 of autograph

top: “I”
systems 1–3: first page of second score (first performance piano part) — material for bars 1–17 of autograph
systems 1–3: continuation of S38 — material for bars 18–32 of autograph
systems 1–3: continuation of S39 — material for bars 33–47 of autograph
systems 1–3: continuation of S40 — material for bars 48–64 of autograph
system 1: continuation of S41 — material for bars 65–70 of autograph, with “25/10/64” written at the end of the system
systems 1–2: material for bars 50–53 of autograph
Previously written sketches provide the material for slightly less than a third of the seventy bars that comprise the first score (all or part of twenty-two bars, as shown in Figure 11.1). The material within the remaining bars appears to have been written directly into the score, and may be identified by the many rubbings and crossings out, annotations and alterations (including reworkings of entire passages) made during composition. The extent of these reworkings may best be appreciated by an examination of the fourth page of the score; the original version of this page (S30) appears to have become so confused that Banks decided to rewrite it in full (S34), revising the flute part for bars 35–37 between versions (see Figure 11.1 and Example 11.9). As was the case with each of the *Studies*, the first score thus serves both as an assembly point for fragments already written, and as a preliminary sketch in its own right.

It is impossible to say with certainty which is the earliest of the sketch pages for *Episode I*. Both S5 and S16 contain material which suggests they belong at the beginning of the compositional process, with one fragment on each based on an S4 trichord rather than the later tetrachords or twelve-tone rows; on S5, system 1, the first S4 (chromatic) trichord is used for the earliest sketch of the opening bars of the piece, while the second trichord appears on S16, system 2 (below a tetrachord-derived fragment). The fact that these pages contain fragments based on both trichords and tetrachords indicates either that parts of them were written before Banks had finalised his structural units, or that he returned briefly to the trichords after composition of the larger units. Given that virtually all the remaining sketches are derived from the tetrachords, the latter course seems unlikely. The picture of the early period of composition that emerges, therefore, is not one of an organised process in which the assembling of material is followed by sketching of ideas based on that material, but of a process in which musical ideas are central components and may themselves give rise to further structural development. The most significant aspect of the appearance of the second trichord in the S16 sketch is that it is accompanied by the marking “start of 3rd [section]”, which implies that not only was the format for the work not settled at this point, but also that the fragment preceded the pivotal preliminary sketch page, S51, on system 6 of which the heading “Start of New
Figure 11.1 Diagram of the first score of *Episode I*, showing the positions within of the earlier sketches

Bar 1  Bar 2  Bar 3  Bar 4  Bar 5  Bar 6  Bar 7  Bar 8  Bar 9  Bar 10
---
S5 (sys. 1)  

S27 (sys. 1-3)
---
Bar 11  Bar 12  Bar 13  Bar 14  Bar 15  Bar 16  Bar 17  Bar 18  Bar 19  Bar 20
---
S7 (sys. 1-2)
---
S28 (sys. 1-2)
---
Bar 21  Bar 22  Bar 23  Bar 24  Bar 25  Bar 26  Bar 27  Bar 28  Bar 29  Bar 30
---
---
Bar 31  Bar 32  Bar 33  Bar 34  Bar 35  Bar 36  Bar 37  Bar 38  Bar 39  Bar 40
---
S32 (sys. 4)
Sketched between first and second versions
---
Bar 41  Bar 42  Bar 43  Bar 44  Bar 45  Bar 46  Bar 47  Bar 48  Bar 49  Bar 50
---
Bar 51  Bar 52  Bar 53  Bar 54  Bar 55  Bar 56  Bar 57  Bar 58  Bar 59  Bar 60
---
S5 (sys. 2)
S31 (sys. 1-2)
---
Bar 61  Bar 62  Bar 63  Bar 64  Bar 65  Bar 66  Bar 67  Bar 68  Bar 69  Bar 70
---
S16 (sys. 1)
S32 (sys. 3)
Section (or piece)” mentions for the first time the idea of a work in movements rather than sections.

As S5 contains several ideas that in the course of the sketch series are developed into elements of motivic importance, it is appropriate to begin an examination of the sketch pages here. At the top of the page is the four-bar trichord-derived fragment (mentioned above) which was probably intended as an opening section for the piece. Far from being a vague, unstructured idea, this is an organised sketch which changes only cosmetically in subsequent versions (see Example 11.1). While the presence of a Lento marking at the beginning and double-bar at the end suggest only that Banks had a particular position or function in mind for this unit, the evidence of later versions indicates that it was always his intention to use it as his opening material.

The fragment contains two principal ideas, the first of which concerns the textures produced when a single note is played in unison by the two instruments, ‘bent’ by the flute, and finally returned to unison (see Example 11.1, variant 1). The piano holds C# throughout, played p (the loudest dynamic in the sketch) by the R.H. at the beginning and reiterated in the second (L.H.) and third (R.H.) bars. The flute enters with the same note (though written as a Db) marked pp, and thus the first alteration in the sound is timbral rather than dynamic. Above the system, Banks makes various attempts to notate the bending of pitch, experimenting by adding lines and arrows to accidentals, and an arrow on the staff from the flattest point to the point at which the original pitch is resumed. Writing “slightly flatten” above the beginning of the first bar of the flute line and “slightly raise” above the end of the second, his intention is that the flattest point of the note should occur at the beginning of the second bar. He indicates this by using a ⭑ sign at this point of lowest pitch, which while explaining his preference for a Db over a C# in the flute part, doesn’t explain his continued use of a C# for the piano opening (especially as he writes Dbs elsewhere in the sketch).

The second idea in the fragment involves the gradual building-up of a chord for piano based on the chromatic S4 trichord. Apart from the opening C#, seven other notes — three C#s, two Dbs and two Dbs — entering independently over a range of almost
five octaves, with as many as four held simultaneously, are played at an implied dynamic level of \textit{ppp} (written below both the first and penultimate of the seven). This sketch represents probably the earliest appearance of this element which is used on numerous occasions in a variety of ways throughout \textit{Episode I}.

The next appearance of the fragment is on S27, as the opening passage of a proposed score (which was abandoned after fourteen bars). The two central ideas are retained with minor alterations, due in part to Banks' expansion of the tonal base in this version from chromatic trichord to tetrachord (Example 11.1, variant 2). With the introduction of the adjacent higher semitone E♭, the tetrachord used here is the one that appears in its twenty-four permutations on S52, and comprises the first tetrachord of the piano row. This fact supports the theory that just as the first S4 trichord inspired the earliest version of the fragment, the S52 tetrachords sparked the subsequent expansion and development of that fragment.

Banks experiments again with modified accidentals above the system, notating a similar set to that written above the earlier variant. He retains the $\flat$ sign at the point of lowest pitch, adds an arrow descending to that point to match the one rising afterward, and omits the written instructions related to the alteration of pitch. The changes to the flute line involve not only the expansion of its range from two adjacent notes to four, but also its division into two phrases and extension by a third three-note phrase. The first phrase is now more clearly defined by both the introduction of \textit{staccato} notes at its beginning and end, and an exchange of dynamics with the R.H. that leaves the flute one level above the piano. The original effect of the flute sound, altering in pitch as it emerges from within the decaying piano note, is thus replaced by an immediate and rhythmic presence. The three-note phrase for solo flute at the end of the passage begins as a retrograde version of the preceding phrase, and with the addition of the upper note of the tetrachord, comprises a rhythmically free transition to the following section.

The piano material in variant 2 is not as substantial as in the earlier version, lasting for less than three bars rather than three and a half, and containing five sustained notes instead of eight. The opening C♯, which is again present throughout, and the D♭ and
C₆ that follow, all appear in the same registers as previously, the latter two entering one quaver beat earlier. The fourth and fifth notes (Eᵇ⁴ and D₄), which enter on the second and third beats of the second bar, are adjacent pitches to the sustained opening C#; the range of the chord is thus reduced from almost five octaves to one tone in the space of one beat. Together with the C⁶ in the second phrase of the flute part, this chord comprises a tetrachordal cluster that is heard complete for less than one beat before the piano notes begin to drop out. Their independent cut-offs, which reduce the chord gradually to its original C#, introduce an element of symmetry to the piano part. At the beginning of the third bar, a short, accented mf L.H. chord punctuates the two flute phrases. Pitched exactly one octave below the R.H. cluster and marked “Just loud enough to sound harmonics”, this three-note chord provides the earliest textural idea for piano among the Episodes sketches.² Although Banks’ plan is to introduce extra harmonic resonance to the end of the phrase, in this first draft form the L.H. chord, even when played with considerable force (i.e. above mf), produces only a momentary and barely audible increase in resonance.

The neatness of the calligraphy throughout the fourteen bars of this projected score suggests that Banks was preparing a legible version of his ideas for a preliminary meeting with Douglas Whittaker, much as he had done when writing the first of the Three Studies for Nelson Cooke a decade earlier.³ Both the appearance of this score and the changes to the next may be explained by such a meeting. While the presence of the five modified accidentals above the first system here probably indicates that Banks intended to discuss with Whittaker the most appropriate method of notating pitch bending, the following version certainly reflects the expert advice received regarding the register of the material and the notation of flute articulation.

² The writing of harmonics for piano represents the application of a current avant-garde technique by Banks. He would almost certainly have been familiar with such works as Searle’s Suite for Piano (1956) and Stravinsky’s Movements for Piano and Orchestra (1959), both of which employ similar techniques. The former was published in the same volume as Banks’ Pezzo Dramatico, while a score of the latter, currently contained in the Banks Collection, was probably in his possession at the time of writing Three Episodes.

³ As discussed in Chapter 5. Although it is unknown whether a separate flute part was written out for Whittaker, it seems likely this was the case.
The third version of this fragment is the opening passage of the first score (Example 11.1, variant 3). Although the material here remains substantially the same as in the previous variant, three significant differences between the two scores are immediately apparent. The first is that the entire sketch is transposed up one tone, almost certainly as a result of Whittaker’s identification of the most effective note on which to alter pitch while maintaining the necessary dynamic control at the bottom of the flute register. Secondly, there is no attempt at neatness here; that this is a composer’s and not a performer’s score is demonstrated by the fact that every note for piano in the first bar shows signs of having been crossed out, reinstated, repositioned or clarified by a R.H. or L.H. indication. While the material may now be virtually finalised, the condition of the score reflects Banks’ continuing indecision regarding piano notation. The third difference is the presence above the first bar of the markings “TEI1PO I” and “(Static Blocks) [and] Activity”. The first of these provides the earliest indication that the movement may contain multiple tempo areas and the second contains diametrically opposed terms probably intended to describe two of those areas. The former term certainly applies to the opening passage, with its gradual assembly and dispersal of piano sounds combined with a flute line in low register, little rapid movement, and all with a maximum dynamic of $p$. Similarly, the latter term describes passages in the faster “TEMPO II”, the first of which follows this opening section.

Whittaker’s influence may also be detected in the presence above the first two flute notes of “AA” and “OO” markings which indicate the hard and soft sounds conceived by Banks during his sketching of preliminary textural ideas (and originally written as “AH” and “OOH”; see Table 10.3). No annotation explaining the symbols appears on the score, and with the exception of commas inserted to separate the final three notes, the remainder of the flute part is unchanged from the abandoned score.

The third bar $mf$ L.H. chord appears as in the previous score, but is crossed out, as is its successor, an identical cluster pitched two octaves higher (one octave above the sustained R.H. cluster). Repositioned instead to begin on the last semiquaver of the second bar (one semiquaver earlier, now following the first flute phrase immediately), the chord is written in the same register and on the same staff as the existing R.H. cluster, and with no dynamic mark to place it above the $p$ of the preceding material, it
becomes simply a restatement of the notes rather than a significant textural element. The addition of a pedal application and release on the first two quavers of the third bar shows that Banks is still seeking a brief extra resonance at this point, even without an expansion of the dynamic range or register of the material, and the evidence of subsequent scores suggests that the absence of a dynamic or expression mark to accompany the chord is inadvertent rather than deliberate.

The following version, the opening passage of the second score, contains few alterations to the existing material (Example 11.1, variant 4). Apart from the clarity we might expect in a score doubling as a piano performance part, the principal difference here is the addition of tempo, dynamic, articulation and expression marks. The textural writing for flute in particular is more detailed, probably as a result of further work with Whittaker. Symbols for both hard and soft sounds are used twice, the former modified to “A”, and an annotation explaining the symbols appears above the staff. The semiquavers at the end of the first flute phrase are marked up to mp, now the highest dynamic level of the passage as well as the point of highest pitch within the flute part (excluding the final note of the transitional phrase). By also placing an accent on the restated piano cluster that follows, and encompassing all the piano entries to that point under a single phrasing mark, Banks emphasises that this material, coming as it does at about the halfway point, comprises the apex of the passage's arch. Although the symmetry of the independent piano entries and cut-offs was apparent as early as the abandoned score (variant 2), it is only now, with the raised dynamic of the staccato flute semiquavers and accented piano chord at the centre of the section, that Banks' intentions regarding an arch form may be described with any degree of certainty.

There are two other important additions in this variant. The first is the earliest use of a precise tempo indication for this passage: $\text{♩} = 48$, and the second is the annotation “release in tempo” which accompanies and is connected by arrow to the third bar pedal figure (notated here with crosses in place of the variant 3 noteheads). With the release written as a semiquaver and followed by a rest, the presence of both an annotation stressing the importance of a rapid and precise release of the pedal and an arrow from annotation to note (a distance of less than a centimetre) may be
considered thorough to the point of tautological. The possibility that the arrow was either intended as a reminder to Banks himself (it was, after all, his performance part) or was an option under consideration for the final score is supported by the fact that it doesn’t appear in either the S1 revision of the piano part alone (variant 5) or the autograph produced by Banks after the first performance for use as the original Schott & Co. edition (variant 6). The commas separating the three notes of the transitional flute phrase are a significant deletion from this variant, and that phrase is thus restored to its original (variant 2) legato condition.

Some time after completing his performance part, probably while preparing to rewrite the score in a final version for publication, Banks experimented with clarifying the notation of two passages from Episode I (bars 1–3 and 16–18) by writing them on three staves instead of two. These experimental sketches are contained on S1, where both passages appear first exactly as they had in the second score before being rewritten using an extra staff (variant 5). In the case of the opening section, the revised version consists of a single staff containing the notes comprising the central cluster as they had appeared on the upper staff in the second score, with a double staff below separating the two notes of extreme register for the first time, and thus allowing for an unambiguous pedal release at the end of the E₄¹ midway through bar 2 while the D₃⁶ continues. The only other alterations to the material, both retained in the autograph, are intended to heighten the effect of the restated cluster: a mf marking, and a more intense ∧ accent in place of >.

There are two important additions to the flute part for the autograph (Example 11.1, variant 6). The first is the introduction of vibrato (which had been among Banks’ earliest textural ideas, as shown in Table 10.3), with senza vibrato marked for the first phrase and vibrato for the remainder of the section. Secondly, below the arrows indicating pitch bending, the annotations “slightly flatten” and “return to normal pitch” (the latter a clarification of the annotation “slightly raise” that appeared above.

---

As employed and annotated by Boulez in Improvisation sur Mallarmé II (1957), a score of which, currently contained in the Banks Collection, was probably in Banks’ possession at the time of writing the Three Episodes.
the initial version of the passage) explain the graphic notation precisely on the score for the first time.

Immediately below the earliest version of the opening section on S5 is the first sketch of material for bar 5 of the first score which, appearing in eight variants before achieving its final form (see Example 11.2), is the most frequently sketched fragment of the movement (see Figure 11.1). Although we cannot be certain that this fragment was originally intended to follow the opening passage directly, it is likely that the ideas were chronologically consecutive. This assumption is based both on the relative positions of the sketches on S5 and on their contents. The bar 5 fragment here (Example 11.2, variant 1) consists of seven notes for flute followed by seven for piano, with the first three in each case comprising the same chromatic trichord on which the initial opening section sketch above had been based, and perhaps more significantly, the first four notes in each case comprising the same chromatic tetrachord that forms the basis for all subsequent versions of that passage: C♭, D♭, Eb, D♭ (the first tetrachord of the piano row). With a period of composition probably directly after that first variant, it is likely that this fragment played a significant role in the decision to expand the opening section from a trichord to tetrachord base.

The two parts are completed by Eb, F♯ (comprising the major second adjacent to the tetrachord), and one additional note from the tetrachord (Eb for flute and Db for piano), giving them identical hexachordal content (which, interestingly, is not quite the same as the first hexachord of the piano row, in which the same chromatic tetrachord continues with G♭, F♯; see Example 10.4). The parts are similar not only intervallically, with the passage based almost entirely on seconds and sevenths, but also structurally; staccato semiquavers on the flute lead to two more substantial notes, which are in turn followed by a piano part beginning with short single notes over a wide range and continuing with longer dyads marked “dolce”.

Three more versions of the bar 5 fragment appear on S14 (variants 2–4). The most significant development among these variants is the addition of a rapid, chromatically descending tetrachord (from Eb to Db) leading to the first semiquaver of the flute
part. Its appearance here represents probably the earliest use of this figure, which takes on motivic importance as the sketch series develops. In variant 2, the motive is emphasised by an accent on its first note, which is also marked $f$, and is followed by a diminuendo to $p$ by the first semiquaver. The flute phrase is extended by one note, the final $F^\#$ rising to $G^b$, and for the only time in this sketch series the second half of the bar rises both in pitch and dynamic. In a variation of the flute’s rhythm drawn above the staff, crotchet triplets over the third and fourth beats offer a cross-rhythmic alternative to the semiquaver pulse-based interplay between the two instruments below. The piano part contains only minor rhythmic and notational alterations to the S5 prototype, with dynamic and expression marks added to some notes. This variant is the most detailed and carefully sketched of the three on the page; apart from the clarity of its calligraphy, it contains probably the earliest tempo indication anywhere in the work: $\frac{72}{76}$. The circled “5” to the left of the system probably indicates that it was now Banks’ intention that this fragment would commence from bar 5, thus following the opening passage directly, although given that none of the five subsequent variants on this page or the next bears any similar sign of a proposed position within a larger framework, it is also possible that the number was added at a later stage.

Banks continues for two more bars before abandoning the sketch and beginning again below. (His continuations of variants 1–4 on S5, S14 and S15 will be examined as Example 11.3.) On system 2 he writes three beats of a third variant (as far as the first two notes of the piano part) before drawing a double barline (Example 11.2, variant 3). As the only changes here are a $p$ beginning to the chromatic motive and a diminuendo through the first beat, we may assume that either sudden inspiration or disillusionment was responsible for the abandonment of the fragment. The complete reorganisation of the piano part for the fourth variant, which follows immediately, testifies to the former being the case (Example 11.2, variant 4). The piano notes appear now in minor seventh dyads, in the same order, but with all except one (the $Db$ in the second chord) in a different register, and with the $Db^6$ (the one note repeated, and therefore not essential to the hexachord) omitted. The flute part contains a significant rhythmic alteration: the introduction of a triplet pulse to the
second group of semiquavers, but paradoxically, while the time is taken to mark the second half of the phrase “dolce” (the first use of that term since the piano part in variant 1), numerous notational ambiguities such as too many beats in the bar (which is, ironically, marked in “4” for the first time in the series) and altered accidentals that are difficult to read in the material following the triplets suggest that the flute part was last-written and sketched in a hurry, Banks’ mind probably already on the continuing passage.

Another three versions of this fragment appear on S12 (Example 11.2, variants 5–7). The changes to the first of these (variant 5) from the previous page are immense, involving such elements as duration, time signature, dynamic and note content, which in combination give the fragment a totally different character. By turning to a 4/8 time-signature, Banks introduces a quaver beat and halves the duration of each bar, but he does not write two bars in place of the previous one. Instead, he retains only the flute material from the first two beats of variant 4 (the first six notes of the original S5 figure), the precise amount he had used before abandoning the third variant. In place of the original seventh note, F#, the flute now moves to C# which is probably intended to be flutter-tongued (the notation matches the flutter-tongue sketch on S51, shown in Chapter 10). Above the system, the marking “?8va” together with a bracket encompassing the flute hexachord and a second “8va” above the following C# query the register of the entire passage. This query is probably related to the ff markings for both instruments which replace the dynamics specified for individual figures in previous versions, with Banks recognising that the fragment may be more effective in ff if not played at the bottom of the flute register. The chromatic motive appears here as a set of acciaccature leading to the C# rather than as a dynamic high point in its own right (as had been the case in variants 2 and 3), and with the staccato semiquavers all now clearly marked as triplets, thus emphasising the notes of the upper octave (Db and Eb), the momentum of the phrase is greatly increased.

The piano part is radically altered, consisting solely of the sustained chromatic tetrachord F#–A# (the second tetrachord of the piano row), its notes appearing as two accented major seconds an octave and a demisemiquaver apart. The ‘staggered’
entries are reminiscent of the first two piano notes of variants 1–3, the difference being that here the chord is held under a free section for flute which is sketched after all three variants on this page. (These continuations of variants 5–7 on S12 will be examined as Example 11.4.)

The next variant on S12 (variant 6) is in 6/8, with the entire passage (including the flutter-tongued C#) now encapsulated within the bar. By retaining the ff, accenting all the triplets and marking that C# "shrill", Banks further emphasises the change of character on this page from the S14 variants (2–4), and exaggerates the vast dynamic and textural contrasts between this material and the preceding opening section. For variant 7, he returns (nominally) to 4/8, although the 4 is written over a 6, and there are actually five quaver beats in the bar. This discrepancy, together with an apparent notational error on the last note of the flute part (a missing leger line; see Appendix B, S12) and an absence of any indications of tempo, dynamics or rests in the piano part, suggests that like the final fragment on S14 (variant 4), this sketch was written at considerable speed. Notational inaccuracies notwithstanding, there are three changes to the flute part: first, only the accents on the second and third quaver beats are retained, emphasising the notes of the upper octave even more strongly; second, a new chromatic trichord: C#, D♯, E♭ (a subset of the original tetrachord) is sketched in place of (and in the same octave as) the flutter-tongued C#; and finally, there is no 8″ marking here, although whether as a result of urgency in the writing or a decision to return to the low register of the early sketches is impossible to determine.

Banks' projected score (S27–S28), probably prepared in anticipation of a meeting with Whittaker, provides the next sketch of this fragment (variant 8) and the first consecutive appearances of the opening section and bar 5 phrase since their earliest versions on SS. A further link between the two sections here is the marking "Tempo" over bar 5, indicating the intention for this figure to retain the Lento tempo used at the opening. The flute part, excised again after the sixth note of its original figure (as in variant 3), now fills the bar precisely and is shaped by a crescendo to f on the first of the triplets (all of which are once again accented) and diminuendo over the final note. The piano's staggered tetrachord entry imitates the flute phrase for the first time, with the initial R.H. notes written as acciaccature. The most fascinating aspect
of this score is that it contains annotations written by Banks during or shortly after his session with Whittaker. The first of these, the marking "too long" beside an arrow pointing to the flute's acciaccature suggests that in practice, the tetrachord proved overly intrusive or time-consuming, impeding rather than enhancing the flow into the phrase proper.

By the first score, the bar 5 fragment is virtually complete (variant 9), its appearance as a finely honed phrase amid numerous crossed out and reworked versions of the surrounding material probably due both to its extensive sketch series and Banks' work with Whittaker. The influence of the latter is apparent not only in the transposition up one tone of all material surviving from the abandoned score (as discussed earlier), but in particular in the shortening of the flute's descending chromatic tetrachord to two notes, as foreshadowed in the annotation on that earlier score. The most significant alteration here occurs above the system, where the incomplete marking "Tempo II \( \cdot \) = " indicates that contrary to the "Tempo" instruction of the previous variant, which established a connection and indeed emphasised the importance of continuity between the opening section and this passage, the intention is now for bar 5 to introduce a different, presumably faster (given the change from crotchet to quaver pulse), though as yet unspecified, tempo area. There are two other changes in this variant, one for each instrument. The change to the flute part is the notation of the two sets of triplets as a single group of sextuplets, which unifies the first half of the bar and thus provides greater propulsion of the phrase to the \( F_\# \) crotchet. In the piano part, a \( pp \ F_k \) in the same register as that crotchet enters on the last semiquaver of the bar, dovetailing with the fading flute note and serving as the final addition to a gradually assembled chord that may be considered a variant of the piano element in bars 1–2 (see Example 11.1).

The only significant alterations to this fragment in the second score are the addition of articulation and tempo markings that more clearly define the differences between bar 5 and the preceding material (see Appendix B, S38). The symbol "A" above the first flute note indicates a hard sound which contrasts to the soft sound ("OO") of bars 3–4, while a completed tempo marking "Allegro \( \cdot \) = 120" confirms and specifies
Banks' variant 9 intention to contrast the bar 5 phrase to the "Lento \( \frac{1}{4} = 48 \)" opening section.

There are three sets of continuations of the bar 5 sketches, the earliest of which consists of four variants that follow the fragments on S5 and S14 (see Example 11.3). The first of the variants contains only four noteheads added to the flute part of the initial version of bar 5 (variant 1). These noteheads may be divided into two pairs, each comprising a major second (in compound or inverted form) and appearing above a piano dyad consisting of the same interval; the major ninth of the first pair (G\#\#\#\#, F\#\#\#) coincides with the R.H. D\#\#\#/E\#\# dyad, and the second pair minor seventh (C\#\#\#, D\#\#) is positioned directly above the final R.H. F\#\#\#/E\#\# dyad. The writing of simultaneous major seconds and minor sevenths for the two instruments here further emphasises the importance of that interval-class in this fragment; it may be remembered that the two notes added to the chromatic tetrachord to complete identical hexachords in both instrumental parts in the preceding bar 5 sketch, E\# and F\#, comprise a major second.

The next variant, the continuation of the bar 5 fragment on S14, system 1, contains two bars for flute and one for piano (variant 2). Of particular interest in the flute part are three notes of dotted quaver duration on the first, fourth and seventh quaver beats of the first bar which add a syncopated, jazz-influenced element to the passage.\(^5\) The first four flute notes appear as in variant 1 (as shown), but after the major second of the first pair, the remainder of the first bar (beginning with the second pair) is based entirely on the first of the S4 trichords, the chromatic set: C\#, C\#\# (D\#), D\#. The second bar is also based largely on the chromatic trichord, initially transposed up three semitones (D\#, E\#, F\#) and then back at original pitch. A final major seventh (F\#\#\#\#–E\#\#\#) may have been intended to begin a return to the transposed set or, in an alternative analysis, the material in the second bar could be considered as a variation of the bar 5 common hexachord, the only difference being that with an F\# here in place of an F\#, the notes comprise a chromatic hexachord.

---

\(^5\) This cross-rhythmic pattern, which may be found in many of Banks' works to this point, has already been mentioned in Chapters 3, 7 and 10.
The piano part contains a combination of major and minor sevenths; one of the latter, a short $G#^1/F^h_2$ dyad (played just after the same notes in the flute part) is played under the sustained $F#^3/E_k^4$ dyad, thus forming a chromatic tetrachord. A major seventh at the end of the first bar ($Db^5/C#^6$) coincides with the same notes in the flute part, and a minor seventh at the beginning of the second bar which remains unstemmed ($Bb^3/Ab^4$) probably represents the point at which Banks abandoned the sketch. A L.H. minim $G#^4$ in the middle of the first bar marked "ppp delicato" (a dynamic level considerably lower than any other in the fragment) contrasts to the remainder of the material for both instruments; the flute writing throughout may best be described as 'busy', a combination of short, rhythmic components with a variety of articulations probably written in full before the piano part was begun, while the latter, uncluttered and incomplete, consists almost entirely of dyads and short accented notes.

After abandoning the second variant, Banks sketched two more versions of bar 5 (Example 11.2, variants 3 and 4), and, following the second of these, continued below with a further expansion of the flute material based initially on the same four notes: $G^h$, $F^h$, $C^h$, $D^h$ (Example 11.3, variant 3). Again the flute part appears to have been written first; consisting now of eleven mostly crotchet-length groups of notes comprised, as in the previous variant, of combinations of short, rhythmic units, the passage remains unbarred until the end of the system, and with very faint calligraphy in places and numerous alterations throughout, is often difficult to decipher. The four initial notes are unchanged in both register and order, and the remainder of the flute material may once again be divided into three sections, each an expanded or repositioned version of variant 2 material. The first four groups are based on the bar 5 common hexachord rather than the chromatic trichord of variant 2, and the following four groups are based on a transposed chromatic tetrachord, $F^h$–$Ab$, rather than a transposed trichord. The final three groups are based on the same transposed chromatic trichord used for the central section of variant 2 ($D^h$, $E^h$, $F^h$), with the addition of a penultimate note sharpened by a quarter-tone by the use of a modified accidental identical to one sketched above the first version of the opening passage on S5 (see Example 11.1, variant 1).
Much of the piano material from the previous variant is also retained, although altered in position, register and duration. The R.H. Db/C♯ and L.H. F♯/E♯ dyads are both moved forward, the former now sustained and the register of the latter raised by an octave, and a short G♯/A♭ dyad appears in place of the G♯/F♯ dyad, major ninth replacing minor seventh. The paradoxical writing of precise, rhythmic units for flute within the unbarred format of this variant suggests that either Banks was influenced by similarly notated passages in works such as Berio’s Sequenza per Flauto Solo (1958) and Haubenstock-Ramati’s Interpolation, mobile pour flute (1, 2 et 3) (1959), or that his sole concern while sketching the passage in such apparent haste was to record the note groups.

At the top of a new page (S15), is another version of the S14, system 3 material (see Example 11.3, variant 4). Once again the entire passage is unbarred and the flute part comprises eleven note groups, most of which are one crotchet in duration. There is no reason to believe that the two groups consisting of a crotchet and quaver were intended to be crotchet-length; although such a plan would unify group lengths within the passage, the theory that the absence of triplet markings represents an inadvertent omission is not supported by the presence in the flute line at the beginning of the following bar of precisely that marking. The bulk of the previous flute line is retained, sketched here with considerably more clarity and including such expressive details as a “Rit e dim” above the final three groups and a < > swell below the E♭-F♭ trill. The final group is altered; instead of rising one semitone (D♯-E♭) via the quarter-tone D♯, it is now a symmetrical unit (E♭-E♭-E♭) identical in shape and notation to the beginning of the first version of the opening passage (see Example 11.1, variant 1). The central section of the passage displays an intervallic diversity absent in the previous variant; the seventh group (A♭ crotchet or quaver, D♯ quaver) is new, its tritone following the altered fifth and sixth groups which now contain a minor third (F♯-A♭) and a diminished seventh (enharmonic inverted minor third, G♭-A♭), and preceding a minor third (D♯-F♯) in the eighth group.

---

6 Scores for both of which, currently contained in the Banks Collection, were probably in his possession at the time of writing the Three Episodes.
Apparently dissatisfied with the second half of the flute phrase, Banks rewrites and expands it on the L.H. staff, connecting the beginning of the new version (labelled variant 4b) with its equivalent point above. Starting on the last quaver of the seventh group, he sketches five full groups instead of four by expanding a series of three semiquaver triplets in the earlier version to five. The initial interval, a perfect fifth (D♯⁵–A♯⁵), appears here for the first time other than as the central interval of the original tetrachord, while the introduction of a C♯ two notes later creates another tritone. The piano part is little altered from the previous variant; faint and difficult to read throughout, its gradually assembled final tetrachord (probably the almost chromatic set: E♭/D♯(later crossed out)/C♯/D♭) is sustained (at least in part) under the seventh note group of the earlier flute line.

The sketch continues on system 2 with another single bar containing seven crotchet-length groups. There are two significant differences between these groups and the earlier material in this sketch series: first, the piano writing is more substantial, with the instruments now very much equal partners; and second, both parts contain detailed dynamic and expression marks. While most of the piano material consists of major seventh dyads and intervals which in some cases are components of chromatic tetrachords and hexachords, minor and diminished sevenths also appear. The flute part maintains its intervallic diversity; in addition to semitone motion, it contains two tritones, two major sixths and one major second. A broken line inserted between the fifth and sixth groups (probably after the whole bar had been sketched) indicates that Banks considered either adding or moving a barline, or substituting alternative material at that point. The two groups following the broken line are the most densely written of the series, a double-tongued figure over one and a half octaves for flute, and an incomplete figure of considerable rhythmic complexity for piano. After the barline, a chromatic hexachord for flute, and a chromatic tetrachord and pentachord for piano, the latter of which is a gradually assembled chord reminiscent of the opening passage (variant 4c), are followed only by a rhythmic fragment based on three semiquaver triplets that appears above the R.H. staff (and which, if intended for R.H., would be the first use in this series of such a figure for piano). Broken lines
dividing all material on this system into crotchet-length groups are probably the final additions before abandonment of the entire series.

The compositional process throughout this series is characterised by expansion: chromatic trichords that comprise the bulk of the flute part in variant 2 are succeeded largely by tetrachords and hexachords in the later variants; individual groups are expanded both by the development of existing figures and introduction of new material (as shown throughout variant 4); and the faint, sparse piano writing in the early variants becomes more substantial, gaining equality by the second bar of variant 4. Why Banks should abandon the series immediately after reaching a point of considerable complexity and expressive detail for both instruments is unclear; the two subsequent continuations contain vastly different material, suggesting that he may simply have changed his mind.

The second set of continuations consists of six variants that follow the bar 5 fragments on S12 and S27 (see Example 11.4). These variants, written for flute only, are comprised for the most part of a series of notes of unspecified duration which are intended to be played over the sustained chromatic tetrachord F#–A♯ on piano (as discussed earlier). Apart from the annotations “Ad lib” above the second variant and “cresc. e accel.” under the sixth (which is part of the score probably prepared in anticipation of the preliminary meeting with Whittaker), the passages contain no firm indications of Banks’ intentions regarding phrasing or tempo. This rhythmically free notational technique is again similar to passages in Sequenza and Interpolation, and interestingly, the highest note of both the present series and all the sketch material for Three Episodes, C♯⁷, is also the highest note in both those works for flute(s) alone.⁷

The first and third tetrachords of the piano row provide most of the pitches for this sketch series. The former is the chromatic set C♯–E♭ which has been used in all previous series, and the latter is the common tetrachord B♭, B♭, E♭, F♯ labelled “Harmonic” in its earliest appearance as the final group of the piano row on S52 (see Example 10.4) and “Melodic” when used as the first group of the flute row on S51

---

⁷ Interpolation may be performed by one, two or three flutes.
(see Example 10.5). Use of this tetrachord for the first time since the preliminary sketches makes the writing of fourths and fifths possible here.

The first variant uses only the chromatic tetrachord in overlapping sets over a range of three octaves (Example 11.4, variant 1). Although it is not clear whether the second bar was intended to be a continuation of the passage or another beginning, it seems more likely that the former is the case, given that Banks has neatly crossed out the last note of the first bar individually rather than simply leaving the abandoned material or crossing out the entire bar. The principal difference between the bars intervallically is that while the first is based entirely on major and minor seconds and their inversions, the second begins with the only other interval which may be derived from the tetrachord, a minor third. Running out of space after the ninth note, he begins the bar again below with a second version identical to the first except for the reversal of the sixth and seventh notes (and register of the latter) which allows tetrachords to begin on almost every note. The passage is extended by five notes, its final set overlapping into the third bar.

The next variant consists of twenty-three unstemmed notes (Example 11.4, variant 2). The opening three notes, retained from bar 2 of the previous variant, are followed by the third and first tetrachords of the piano row which are used in full alternately. The second and third appearances of the common tetrachord introduce a sequential element to the passage, with the rising five-note figure from notes 11–15 (C#₄–B♭₅) echoed by a figure one semitone lower in outline from notes 19–23 (C♭₄–B♭₅).

The third, fourth and fifth variants are all continuations of the final bar 5 fragment on S₁₂, written on the flute, R.H. and L.H. staves respectively (Example 11.4, variants 3–5). Each succeeding version appears to have been sketched with more haste than the last; variant 3 contains nineteen notes stemmed and beamed together, variant 4 begins with fifteen notes stemmed but not beamed, and variant 5 begins with seventeen noteheads only. The two tetrachords are used in full alternately throughout variant 3, where p is written at the beginning and an arrow extending the beam
beyond the notes of the first bar points towards the following bar. With the benefit of the complete sketch series before us, we may speculate that Banks is experimenting here with an alternative, graphic method of notating the phrasing and dynamics of the passage. Although the experiment remains incomplete, the subsequent evidence of variant 6, in which cresc. e accel. is marked, suggests that the latter term describes the intended function of the arrow. The discontinuation of its use in this case is possibly due to the fact that its inclusion would necessitate an annotation, which would be unnecessary given the adequacy of the traditional verbal marking.

In variant 4, the tetrachords appear both in full and in part before a new chromatic tetrachord, pitched one tone higher than the first of the piano row (D♭–F♯), is introduced. Indicating that the new tetrachord should be played four times, Banks extends the beam beyond the first set as he had in the third variant, although on this occasion he doesn’t place an arrowhead at the end of the beam, so it is unclear whether he intends an accelerando as seems likely in the previous variant. In variant 5, the new chromatic tetrachord is expanded into a pentachord (Db–F♯) but is then crossed out and a re-ordered version written in letter names below the staff. This re-arranged set, comprising the notes of the variant 4 tetrachord in identical order and register with the fifth note (now notated as C♯) added at the end, is retained, along with the first fourteen of the unbeamed notes that begin variant 5, for the final variant (Example 11.4, variant 6). Here, for the only time, this passage does not follow bar 5 directly. While the piano’s chromatic tetrachord remains essentially unchanged underneath, three bars of flute material (belonging to the third series of continuations) is inserted before the sixth variant. A fundamental difference between the use of the pentachord in variant 6 and the chromatic material added in the two previous variants is that the present set, marked ff and written as semiquavers following the

8 The use of arrows for a variety of notational purposes was widespread by 1964 (as documented by Erhard Karkoschka in Notation In New Music, Universal, London, 1972). Banks himself had used them recently when experimenting with modified accidentals in some of the earliest sketches for Three Episodes, and in this instance may have been influenced again by Haubenstock-Ramati, who in Interpolation had attached arrows to extended beams at an angle of 90° when indicating the tempos of particular sections.

9 Haubenstock-Ramati’s solution when indicating gradual alterations of tempo in Interpolation is to use both verbal and graphic notation: the terms accel. and ritard. in conjunction with rising or falling lines.
cresc. e accel. marking of the twenty-three note single-beamed progression, serves as the climax of the passage rather than the final stage of an increase in intensity. As part of the score probably prepared for his preliminary meeting with Whittaker, it seems likely that the sixth variant is the only version of this passage that Banks heard on the flute.

The third series consists of three variants, again for flute alone, on S12, S27 and S36 (see Example 11.5). The first appearance of this material is above the last system on S12, which is where variants 3–5 of the second series are sketched. While its position indicates that it was written after those variants, it is impossible to assess at this point whether Banks originally intended to insert the new fragment between bar 5 and the earlier continuations, or to replace them. All the variants are based solely on a chromatic trichord while underneath the piano holds the unrelated chromatic tetrachord F♯–A♮ (as discussed earlier). Initially, the set used for the flute passage is once again the first of the S4 “groups”: C♯, D♭, D♮, which is transposed up one tone for its third appearance, as part of the first score. Each of the three notes is used in only one register; in other words, Banks allows himself only three different pitches throughout.

The passage remains largely unaltered throughout the series. The variants each contain twelve attacks and are comprised entirely of alternating minor ninths and (enharmonic) major sevenths, with many of the notes in all variants marked either soft and staccato or loud and accented. The repeated-note motion to the accented high notes in variant 1 is the earliest use of a figure that subsequently takes on motivic importance; immediately after its second appearance (C♯4–C♭5), an abbreviated version over the last two notes recalls the first use of this figure, and with no rest preceding it, provides the phrase with additional momentum. In the second variant (part of the projected score), Banks doubles all note and rest values, probably in order to make the passage more easily readable; the variant thus lasts for two and a half bars instead of one and a quarter. Again arrows are used, this time to indicate tempo surges at the end of each of the first two bars. In combination with the marking poco accel., these rising arrows provide the most tangible link so far to the notation in
Interpolation, the only difference being that Haubenstock-Ramati does not use arrowheads.

By the first score (variant 3), with its pitch and notation of tempo and dynamic nuances finalised, this material is virtually complete. The surges, together with several articulation marks which are omitted from later scores (hard and soft timbres annotated here as “A” and “O” respectively), are written above the staff, and dynamics below. Banks returns to his original note values with the exception of the first note, which becomes a tenuto quaver, and the $f$ and $ff$ notes which remain semiquaver triplets. All but the first and last notes are now of the same duration, and the more regular pulse within the phrase allows greater accentuation of the tempo alterations.

Although the two abandoned series of continuations of bar 5 are both based to a great extent on chromatic sets (principally tetrachords), they are very different in all other respects. The first series contains complex rhythmic units for both instruments, and detailed expression and dynamic marks in a form that expands throughout its four variants (see Example 11.3). The second series, on the other hand, consists of six variants of approximately equal duration (see Example 11.4). Written for flute only, and with no use of rhythmic or expressive elements except for a plan that links tempo to dynamic, the emphasis here is on note order and register.

The third series (Example 11.5) draws on elements of both preceding series. Again for flute only, its first two variants appear in tandem with second series passages over their common piano accompaniment, and the second variant was probably played in that format (as part of the abandoned score) by Banks and Whittaker. The material is even more restrictive than before, with these variants based on a single chromatic trichord of which each note appears in a single register, the style may perhaps best be described as concise. Considerable detail and variation in expression, dynamic and tempo markings combine with an almost sequential rhythmic movement in this phrase which, by the first score, has replaced the more extensive, unpulsed second series material. And with the figure in which repeated-note motion leads to accented high
notes, Banks has apparently hit upon a particularly effective motive that is subsequently used throughout *Episode I* by both flute and piano.

Another repeated-note figure also forms a basis for motivic development in *Episode I* (see Example 11.6). Its first appearance is probably on S5, squeezed between the earliest sketches for the opening and bar 5 passages (variant 1). The facts that it is written in red ink (the only fragment so notated among the sketches for *Episode I*) and is situated halfway along the system indicate that it was written later than the surrounding material, probably when Banks, in his haste to commit the idea to paper, used the first available space on the nearest page to hand. The prototype for such repeated-note motion may be found among the earliest of the preliminary sketches on S4 (see Example 10.3, variant 1). The repeated-note component of the present fragment consists of five Db₄s, but may initially have contained six; had the tied second and third triplets of the second group been conceived as a single note, it is likely they would have been notated as a crotchet. In their present configuration they comprise a fourth note, twice the duration of the previous three and fractionally shorter than the final note of the set.

A variant of this motive comprising five equal notes (B₄ semiquavers) appears at the centre of an outline of bars 55–56 on S31 (Example 11.6, variant 2), and subsequently, in slightly altered and extended versions at the same pitch, before and after the use of that outline's material (between bars 53 and 57) in the first score (variant 3). Preceding the repeated-note motive in the outline is a bar containing twelve noteheads, one of each pitch-class (in other words, comprising an aggregate), in combinations that form the basis for much of the material in bars 55–56 of the first score. Three of the noteheads, marked “Fl”, are written in the diamond shape of harmonics, probably to allow Banks, who uses only two staves for the sketch, to differentiate between the sets intended for each of the instruments (I have reproduced this fragment on three staves for the purpose of clarity). The R.H. contains seven noteheads, the first four comprising the chromatic first piano tetrachord and the remainder, three of the four notes of the common tetrachord. The L.H. contains a major seventh dyad, and indeed that interval dominates here; the only notes not involved in such a relationship are the R.H. Bb₄ and the flute B₄.
The piano part remains incomplete in the first score (variant 3), with an indefinite number of beats, with stems and ties missing, no dynamics and only two expression marks. But significantly, it contains two examples of the element first used in the earliest sketch of the opening passage, in which chords are assembled gradually (see Example 11.1, variant 1). The first of these (bars 55–56) is derived from the R.H. tetrachord in the S31 outline, and the second (bar 56) from the remaining five piano notes in that bar. The former figure is retained in the second score (variant 4) but the latter is removed, allowing the following material (based on the complete common tetrachord) to be brought forward, which in turn enables the simultaneous flute passage to be heard more easily over a sustained perfect fourth on piano. Once again Banks’ tendency here is to simplify his sketch material in subsequent versions.

The three flute notes sketched as harmonics in the first bar of the outline establish a link in bar 55 of the first score between the variant of the repeated-note motive in bars 53–54 (the B⁴ crotchet extends that figure) and a variant of the earlier motive based on repeated-note motion to an accented high note (A⁴–G⁴). The final material in the outline is an eight-note phrase for flute consisting of a chromatic hexachord (comprised of two separate chromatic trichords and therefore derived directly from the first of the S4 groups) followed by a major seventh. This phrase remains virtually unchanged in the subsequent scores, and with its final two notes a retrograde version of the ascending major seventh that concludes the flute figure in the previous bar, an element of symmetry is present in this passage for flute; the central variant of the repeated-note motive is framed by the ascending and descending A⁴–G⁴ major sevenths which in turn are framed by the repeated-note variants.

Two sketches provide most of the material for bars 12–17 of the first score (see Example 11.7). There is little common ground between the two, one (S7) containing mostly material for the piano and verbal annotations for the flute in bars 15–17 and the other (S28), material for the flute in bars 12–15. The fragment for piano on S7, system 3 (variant 1) combines versions of two of the elements previously discussed, the rapidly descending chromatic figure and the gradually assembled chord. The former appears in contrary motion and is, as Banks notes above the system, “almost a cluster” (five of its eight intervals are semitones and three are tones). With its ten
notes sustained for two quavers, it becomes a gradually assembled chord. In the next appearance of this material in the first score (variant 3), both the ascending and descending lines are completely chromatic and the notes are not sustained, the removal of the gradually assembled chord enabling the flute motive on the last quaver of bar 15 to be heard above two notes rather than ten. Much of the remaining piano material from variant 1 is also retained in the first score; both the sustained R.H. G#⁲ and the tetrachord that follows (C⁴, D⁴, C⁵, G⁵, the first three of which comprise the first S₄ (chromatic) trichord) appear a tone higher, as indeed does virtually all material retained after Banks’ meeting with Whittaker.

Banks’ verbal annotations following the two notes for flute in variant 1 are particularly interesting. Below the incomplete date “9/64”, he writes several textural ideas for the flute part which are subsequently adopted in bars 15–17 of the earliest version of the first score (variant 3). The similarity of calligraphy and close proximity of the date and annotations suggest that they were written at the same time, raising the possibility that while Banks attached sufficient significance to the textural ideas to date them, he was not at that moment aware of the precise date.

Variant 2 contains the final bars of the projected score, a passage for flute over a sustained piano chord comprised of the common tetrachord. The last four flute notes, a repeated descending major seventh, are a tone higher in the first score while the piano tetrachord is transposed down a major third. A preceding repeated-note figure for flute incorporating staccato-tenuto articulation which is used twice in variant 2, first on A⁴ with hard sound (“A”) followed by Ab⁴ with soft sound (“O”), appears only once in the first score on A#⁴, a tone above the latter, and with no annotation regarding tonal specifications.

Bars 15–17 of the first score contain variants of all four of the principal motives of *Episode I*: the gradually assembled chord, rapidly descending chromatic figure, repeated-note motion to accented high notes and repeated-note figure. This passage represents probably the earliest use of the motives in combination, and is one of only two three-bar passages within the movement in which all may be found (along with bars 30–32; see Figure 11.2). The initial flute part in bars 16–17, based largely on the
use of the various textural devices annotated on S7 such as *sforzandi*, accents and flutter-tonguing, is written on a single note, \( A_b^5 \), and may thus be considered a variant of the repeated-note motive. A subsequent version of these two bars written above the staff (and itself later modified) incorporates other notes and elements (such as an ascending enharmonic major seventh, \( A_4 - A_b^5 \), at the beginning of bar 17 which refers back to the motive based on repeated-note motion to accented high notes at the end of bar 15) and omits some of the textural devices, enabling the piano part to be more easily heard. This paring back, together with the removal of the gradually assembled ten-note chord from the material in the preceding bar, again shows Banks' process of simplification of his material in later versions.

Between the first performance and his writing out of an autograph on which Schott & Co. could base their published edition, Banks experimented with notating the piano part of bars 16–17 on three staves (variant 4), a format he retained in the autograph. His intention was presumably to increase the clarity in these bars by first separating the sustained \( B_l^3 \) from the simultaneous repeated-note variant in the same register, and then rewriting the latter in bass clef so as to avoid the use of leger lines.

The final set of sketches that precedes the first score consists of two fragments containing material for the ending of the movement (see Example 11.8). Probably the earlier of the two is a five-bar fragment at the top of S16 which recalls an idea from one of the earliest sketches for *Episode I*, and may date from the same period (variant 1). The similarity here is in the use of piano harmonics produced by depressing keys silently before playing a *staccato* chord, thereby enabling those prepared notes to act as fundamentals for harmonic resonance. This technique is also employed in the opening passage of the abandoned score (see Example 11.1, variant 2); as in that earlier sketch, the chromatic trichord \( C#, D#, E_b \) is held in the R.H. with its notes removed gradually from the top of the cluster, leaving \( C# \) as the final note. The process is greatly expanded here with harmonics throughout, and the pitch-class \( C# \) around which the entire fragment is centred appears first in the trichord as \( C#^5 \) before being re-prepared in bar 3 an octave lower. And as before, the initial flute entry on the same notes as the trichord fundamentals (marked simply "effect", which suggests that it preceded Banks' meeting with Whittaker at which specific tonal
effects were probably discussed) seems designed to emerge from, or at least vary, the timbre of the piano chord.

The opening figures for both instruments in this variant are marked 8th, presumably in order to accommodate the L.H. chord in bar 1 which contains C#⁴ and Eb⁴, both notes which would already be depressed had the R.H. trichord remained in its original register. As a result, the flute part consists of an opening phrase based on a chromatic trichord which is then expanded into a tetrachord in the same register, its final descending major seventh to C#⁵ followed immediately by a L.H. major seventh rising to the same pitch. The conclusion of all parts on C# is significant; in the present fragment and in variants 3 and 4 (the two scores), all parts except one (the R.H. in variant 3) finish on that pitch-class (as indicated by broken lines terminating in arrowheads throughout Example 11.8). Virtually all the material in this fragment is derived from the first (chromatic) tetrachord of the piano row, the only exceptions being the E₄ and G₄ in the L.H. chord.

The second variant is a faint, often unclear and probably hurriedly written fragment appearing on S32 below a neatly printed two-staff version of the piano part of bars 17–22. That the latter closely resembles the second score version of those bars and was certainly written after the equivalent bars in the first score suggests that Banks was writing out his performance part of finished sections before completing a first score of the final bars of the movement. (However, while the alternative possibility that the ending fragment preceded the material carefully written above is highly unlikely, it cannot be discounted entirely.) The principal components of this sketch (Example 11.8, variant 2) are a gradually assembled chromatic tetrachord for piano and an abbreviated version of the motive based on repeated-note motion to high accented notes (four notes only, followed by “etc”). No change of clef is indicated after the first bar, but it is likely that the following material was intended for the flute; the final passage in particular is reminiscent of the flute part in bars 12–13 (see Example 11.7, variant 3).

Both of these motives are expanded in the first score (Example 11.8, variant 3). The gradually assembled chord becomes a pentachord which now begins with the common
tetrachord Db, G♯, C♯, F♯; pitched more than two octaves above the previous version, the pentachord has almost exactly the same range as the flute material here. The repeated-note motive is now sketched in full, appearing much as it had when originally used in bars 6–7 although without the tempo surges (see Example 11.5, variant 3). The material that follows for both instruments may be considered an extension of this motive because, while one of its fundamental elements — the repeated note — is removed, its derivation from the preceding phrase is undeniable. This final phrase, once again constructed from a chromatic tetrachord, is particularly significant because it contains one of the few imitative passages of the movement. It bears a considerable resemblance to an earlier imitative passage sketched initially in the first version of the first score, and may well have evolved from that passage (see Appendix B, S30, systems 2–3). The second voice of the canon, on the flute, appears in three versions (placed above the system here although in the score Banks sketches the second and third versions below the system in the first available space). The canon begins on the piano with sextuplets on the second beat of bar 69, and this voice remains unchanged throughout; the initial answering figure, using the same material a perfect fifth lower, is written in semiquavers beginning on the fourth beat of that bar (variant 3a). The flute reply is next sketched as sextuplets beginning on the third beat, therefore dove-tailing with the piano subject and imitating it precisely in both rhythm and melody (variant 3b). Finally, Banks rewrites the flute line as quaver triplets, and the movement thus ends with the subject in augmentation (variant 3c).

Although the piano harmonics sketched in variant 1 are not retained here, another element of the opening passage returns in the first bar of the present variant. This is the ‘bending’ of a flute note over a piano chord containing the same pitch (see Example 11.1). In this case, the flute note (Db♯) bends upwards only, beginning a quarter-tone below the note already sounding on piano, and moving to that pitch over more than half a bar. The notation of the modified accidental is different from any used previously, and the ›› sign (which is not annotated, and therefore open to various interpretations) does not appear elsewhere among the sketches. The reappearance of both pitch bending and piano harmonics in this sketch series for the
conclusion suggests that Banks is consciously reintroducing material from the opening section in order to bring a degree of symmetry to the structure of the movement.

The second score (Example 11.8, variant 4) confirms this idea. The flute pitch in bar 66 now bends down from and back to its note shared with piano, and the following repeated-note motive is complete with the tempo surges which characterised its earliest use. This recapitulation of material from the first two sections (bars 1–2 followed immediately by bars 6–7) involves a freedom in both pitch and rhythm for the flute which imbues the beginning of the "Coda" (as Banks marks variant 1) with a momentary jazz feel. The imitation that follows retains the format of variant 3, but with the first voice lowered a fifth here the subject is played by both instruments at the same pitch; the piano part now consists largely of the first set of sextuplets originally written for the flute in variant 3b, and thus the final $A_b^5$ that had been held by the R.H. in the previous variant is removed, the movement finishing instead with the voices in unison on $C#^5$. A final mention should be made of the increasingly dominant role of the pitch $C#^5/D#^5$ throughout this sketch series. By variant 4, both instruments not only begin and end at that pitch, but it appears almost continuously throughout, and once again Banks' process of fine-tuning with each new version may be regarded as a simplification of the material.

Having examined the sketch series that precede the earliest version of the first score and traced Banks' development of his motivic elements, we may now look at the extent to which he employed those elements in the bars he composed directly into the score. As discussed previously, the sketches predating the first score account for less than a third of the bars that comprise the movement (twenty-two of the seventy bars; see Figure 11.1), and yet the motives appear in a substantial form in as many as forty-five bars in the case of the gradually assembled chords (nearly two-thirds of the score; see Table 11.2), and in part on numerous other occasions. When these statistics are considered in tandem with the frequency of the use of the motives throughout the piece (at least one of the elements appears in a substantial form in
fifty-eight of the bars; see Figure 11.2), the pre-eminence of these motives for Banks, as he assembled the fragments and wove them into the vast preliminary sketch that was the first score, is confirmed.

**Table 11.2** Number of bars in which the principal motives appear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive</th>
<th>Number of bars in which motive appears</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradually assembled chord</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidly descending chromatic figure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated-note motion to accented high notes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated-note figure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequent substantial appearances of the four principal motives throughout *Episode I* are illustrated in Figure 11.2. Of particular interest here are the motives most often employed, those consisting of the gradually assembled chord and repeated-note motion to accented high notes; one or both of these appear in fifty-four bars (more than three-quarters of the movement). This breakdown of motivic content is necessarily subjective, since virtually all motivic ideas throughout appear to be derived from the four elements; while the many brief appearances of individual components of the motives are not noted here, the extent of Banks' reliance on these elements will be examined at the conclusion of this chapter. On occasion, the motives seem not to function solely as independent units; in such cases, where the suggestion of one element is superimposed on another, only the primary function of the material is noted in Table 11.2 and Figure 11.2. An example of such an overlaying of motivic elements occurs in bars 9–10, where a chord is gradually assembled on both instruments (see Appendix B, S38). The flute note is re-articulated and its tone altered over the duration of the chord, while one piano note is restated twice, thus introducing what may be considered an abbreviated variant of the repeated-note figure. But as the primary function of the material is chordal, it is recorded as such. This technique should not be confused with the simultaneous use of two motives in different parts, as occurs at numerous points of the score and has already been shown in several of the sketches (see Examples 11.6, variant 3, bar 56 and 11.8, variant 3a, bars 68–69).
Figure 11.2  Appearances of substantial forms of the four principal motives in 
*Episode 1*
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<td>Bar 22</td>
<td>Bar 23</td>
<td>Bar 24</td>
<td>Bar 25</td>
<td>Bar 26</td>
<td>Bar 27</td>
<td>Bar 28</td>
<td>Bar 29</td>
<td>Bar 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 31</td>
<td>Bar 32</td>
<td>Bar 33</td>
<td>Bar 34</td>
<td>Bar 35</td>
<td>Bar 36</td>
<td>Bar 37</td>
<td>Bar 38</td>
<td>Bar 39</td>
<td>Bar 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 41</td>
<td>Bar 42</td>
<td>Bar 43</td>
<td>Bar 44</td>
<td>Bar 45</td>
<td>Bar 46</td>
<td>Bar 47</td>
<td>Bar 48</td>
<td>Bar 49</td>
<td>Bar 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 51</td>
<td>Bar 52</td>
<td>Bar 53</td>
<td>Bar 54</td>
<td>Bar 55</td>
<td>Bar 56</td>
<td>Bar 57</td>
<td>Bar 58</td>
<td>Bar 59</td>
<td>Bar 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 61</td>
<td>Bar 62</td>
<td>Bar 63</td>
<td>Bar 64</td>
<td>Bar 65</td>
<td>Bar 66</td>
<td>Bar 67</td>
<td>Bar 68</td>
<td>Bar 69</td>
<td>Bar 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Gradually assembled chord
- Rapidly descending chromatic figure
- Repeated-note motion to accented high notes
- Repeated-note figure
The first score is a combination of previously written fragments which may be recognised by their comparative neatness, and material composed directly into the score which is often crossed out, altered, barely legible or in the case of the fourth page (S30), completely rewritten. Perhaps the most interesting of the fragments written directly into the score is the phrase on S30. Here, Banks apparently takes the time to sketch the flute part (the only part retained) on another page (S32, system 4; see Table 11.1) before beginning a second version of the fourth page of the score (S34; see Example 11.9, variants 1–3). This phrase, a variation of the motive based on repeated-note motion to accented high notes, is marked as bar 36 in the first score, becoming bar 35 in the second score, in which bars 6 and 7 are combined to form a single bar (see Example 11.5, variants 2–3).

The initial version of the phrase contains detailed articulation and dynamic ideas but omits the triplet markings that the groupings imply (Example 11.9, variant 1), while the following version (variant 2) concentrates on expanding the material in three ways: first, by moving the accented B₃'s back to the third beat of the first bar to accommodate repetition of the preceding C₇; thus enabling the motive to be heard in full; second, by extending the central motivic element (F₆) so that it is connected to the final element (Gᵇ₃), therefore emphasising the major seventh between the two notes; and third, by adding a chromatic trichord at the end of the phrase. Banks' erroneous use of a 12/8 time-signature here instead of 12/16 is interesting, as it also appears in the second score (variant 4), remaining uncorrected until the writing of the autograph, some time after the first performance.

Returning to the first score, Banks begins the fourth page afresh. His principal alterations to the phrase here are the expansion of the structural units in the second and third bars from chromatic dyad and trichord respectively to chromatic tetrachords (variant 3). Indeed, expansion of both motivic and structural elements characterises this series, the former principally in the second variant and the latter in the third. There are only minor alterations in the second score (variant 4): omission of the first note of the third bar; an enharmonic change of the final note(s) in the second bar; and
the reinstatement of the crescendo which drives the phrase in bars 1-2 to its Gb⁵/F#⁵ climax, and which had been used previously only in variant 1.

Although he had designed and labelled two twelve-tone rows “Pno” and “Fl” during his preliminary sketching (see Example 10.5), Banks does not use these rows as complete units at any point in Episode I. Instead, he bases virtually the entire movement on two components from the rows: a chromatic cell, principally a tetrachord, of which there are two (notes 1–4 and 5–8) in the piano row; and a tetrachord consisting of two semitones separated by a perfect fourth which is common to both rows, appearing as the final tetrachord in the piano row and the first in the flute row. Thus, the piano row alone provides almost all the structural material for this piece. In rough notes for either a programme note or an introductory talk at a concert,¹⁰ Banks describes the limitations that he deliberately placed on himself by “concentrat[ing] on using a minimum of musical material: a cluster of ½ tones [chromatic cell] ... and another group of two ½ tones separated by an Augmented [sic] 4th [common tetrachord] ... it sounds rather limiting, but I felt a need to cut down to the basic essentials ... a need to refine”.¹¹

Chromatic units of between three and six notes provide the bulk of the structural material in all of the sketch series examined in this chapter. Several of the series are based initially on a chromatic trichord, and one (Example 11.5) uses only those three notes throughout. The most common pattern among the series, however, is one of expansion of the structural base: in Examples 11.1, 11.8, and 11.9, Banks begins with a trichord and uses larger chromatic units in subsequent variants; in Example 11.2, he initially expands the first chromatic tetrachord of the piano row (C⁹–Eb) with an E⁷ and F# in both parts, before introducing in variant 5 the second chromatic tetrachord

¹⁰ From the ‘chatty’ tone of the notes, the latter seems more likely. These notes probably date from after Banks’ permanent return to Australia in 1973, when he introduced his works at numerous concerts in such centres as Sydney, Melbourne, Canberra, Hobart and Adelaide.

¹¹ The notes are written on two small cards contained in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA.
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of that row (F♯–A♭) on the piano only. The expanded version of the first tetrachord used here also appears in Example 11.3, the earliest continuation of these sketches.

The relationship between the principal motives consisting of more than a single pitch and the chromatic structural units is a fundamental one; both the rapidly descending chromatic figure and the repeated-note motion to accented high notes are derived entirely from chromatic cells, as is the gradually assembled chord in the majority of cases (as at the opening of the movement; see Example 11.1). The fact that virtually every motivic idea throughout may be regarded as a component of one of the four principal motives further illustrates the dominance of chromatic units.

The other significant structural unit is the tetrachord common to both rows, which appears on three occasions in the sketch series examined in this chapter. Its earliest use is probably in the rhythmically free set of continuations of bar 5 for solo flute shown in Example 11.4, where its introduction in the second variant allows Banks to vary the passage by including movement by fourths and fifths for the first time. The common tetrachord is also used as a gradually assembled chord on numerous occasions, appearing in that capacity in both Example 11.7, and as the first four notes of a pentachord in Example 11.8, variant 3 where it replaces a chromatic tetrachord used in variant 2.

As textural ideas were among the earliest recorded in the preliminary sketches for the work (see Table 10.3), it is no surprise that they play a central role in the sketches for Episode I. Having made a decision to “refine” his material, Banks planned “a variety of sound and movement [so that] the listener wo[uld]n’t be bored to tears.”¹² Five principal textural ideas are employed in this movement, four of which are for flute: hard and soft timbres (Examples 11.1, 11.5, 11.7 and 11.9); pitch bending, specifically descending approximately a ¼ tone from, and (for the most part) returning to, a pitch held in unison with the piano (Examples 11.1 and 11.8); flutter-tonguing (Example 11.7); and vibrato (Examples 11.1 and 11.8). The fifth is the use of harmonics for piano (Examples 11.1 and 11.8). In order to notate some of these ideas, Banks was obliged to develop several symbols. His experiments with the notation of hard and

---

¹² Ibid.
soft sounds and pitch bending in particular produced various combinations of annotations, modified accidentals and arrows, and were probably also influenced by Whittaker’s input. And the influence on his notational method of such composers as Boulez, Berio, Haubenstock-Ramati, Searle and Stravinsky, whose scores were probably in Banks’ possession at the time of composition (as discussed previously in this chapter), is also likely.
The sketches for *Episode II*

Although the earliest sketches for *Episode II* date from before or during the compositional period for *Episode I*, the bulk of the movement was almost certainly written upon completion of the preceding piece. The second score of *Episode II*, which, as with *Episode I*, served as the piano part for the first performance, is dated “9/11/64”. As the earlier movement is dated “25/10/64”, we may assume that the composition of most of the second movement took place in the intervening two weeks.

Among the ten pages of sketches for *Episode II* (shown in Table 12.1) are four comprising the first score and a flute part of the first twelve bars of that score (S8, S9, S10, S11) and three comprising the second score (S43, S44, S45). All the remaining pages contain the beginnings of projected scores, ranging from S23, which dates from early in the compositional period for *Episode I*, to an abandoned score on S24 and S25 that appears to have immediately preceded the first score.

**Table 12.1 The Sketch Pages for *Episode II***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S8   | top: “II (Canto)”  
|      | systems 1–3: first page of first score — material for bars 1–6 of autograph |
| S9   | systems 1–4: continuation of S8 — material for bars 7–14 of autograph |
| S10  | systems 1–4: continuation of S9 — material for bars 15–25 of autograph, with “9/11/64” written at the end of system 4 |
| S11  | top: “II (Canto)”  
|      | systems 1–6: flute part of a projected score — material for bars 1–12 of autograph, probably written at the same time as the equivalent bars of the first score |
| S23  | top: “SLOW SECTION” and “bîÈD CANTÔ”  
|      | systems 1–3: first page of a projected score — material for bars 1–3 of autograph |
| S24  | top: “II (Canto)”  
|      | systems 1–4: first page of a projected score — material for bars 1–9 of autograph |
| S25  | systems 1–2: continuation of S24 — material for bars 10–12 of autograph |
| S43  | top: “II (CANTÔ)”  
|      | systems 1–2: first page of second score (piano first performance part) — material for bars 1–8 of autograph |
| S44  | systems 1–2: continuation of S43 — material for bars 9–14 of autograph |
| S45  | systems 1–3: continuation of S44 — material for bars 15–25 of autograph, with “9/11/64” written at the end of system 3 |
As Table 12.1 shows, there are no short fragments among the sketch pages for *Episode II*. While it is possible that this is because Banks either did not retain any such sketches or that they became separated from the remaining pages, it is more likely that he simply did not find it necessary to begin the compositional process here with a set of preliminary ideas which he might then develop and incorporate into a score. The facts that all extant pages are components of projected or completed scores, that a smooth, logical progression may be established from each score to the next, and that the first in the series begins with a motive sketched previously, and on which the bulk of the movement is subsequently based, suggest that the sketch page series is complete.

The chronological order of the sketch pages may be easily established. The earliest (S23), headed “SLOW SECTION” and thus dating from the period before the overall structure of the work was decided, predates much of the sketch material for *Episode I*. The following projected score (S24, S25), is headed “II” and, as the planned opening passage of a second movement rather than section, probably dates from the period following completion of the preceding movement. This abandoned score begins with two bars of material taken almost entirely from S23, which are written clearly and with considerable expressive and dynamic detail, before continuing with a further ten bars that appear to have been composed directly into the score. Similarly, the first score (S8, S9, S10) which follows, begins with eleven bars taken virtually intact from the abandoned score; a flute part (S11), also based on the abandoned score, but which from the similarity of its calligraphy and corrections seems to have been written and used at the same time as the equivalent bars in the first score, raises the possibility that the page was neatly written out at this point in preparation for a meeting with Whittaker. Interestingly, Banks uses coloured inks on S11, probably to assist Whittaker in his reading of the part. At three points he indicates a hard sound (“A”) in red ink and soft sound (“O”) in green.

The remainder of the first score, as with the abandoned score, contains numerous alterations, crossings out and annotations, and is often barely legible.
The sole substantial motivic element of this movement is a figure based on repeated-note motion that first appears among Banks' earliest sketches for the work. It is contained in a fragment written on S51, system 6, which is comprised of two distinct figures: eight demisemiquaver B⁴'s, followed by a descending glissando (marked "fall") over the diminished fifth B⁴–E⁴ (see Example 12.1, variant 1). While two repeated-note figures had also been among the principal motivic devices of Episode I, a fundamental role of the notes here appears to be textural; the annotation "pulse beat", which is connected by an arrow to a wavy line below the repeated notes, suggests that rhythmic alteration of timbre is an important component of the motive (although Banks gives no explanation of how this is to be achieved at this stage). Throughout the development of this fragment as the opening phrase of the movement, its three structural notes are unaltered. Both the repeated-note and glissando figures undergo some changes however; the former is expanded by two sets of semiquaver triplets (first signalled above the staff in variant 2), and the latter is expanded by the insertion of semitone steps in place of the glissando (variants 3 and 4), which are subsequently removed in the second score (variant 5). The crossing out of the chromatically descending notes in both the first score and its contemporary flute part (variant 4) may well have been a result of hearing Whittaker's realisation of the passage.

The most important changes to this phrase occur in the annotations regarding the performance of the repeated notes. In variant 2, the marking "pulse sound" instead of "pulse beat" indicates an intention to emphasise a timbral rather than purely rhythmic pulse and implies a breath pulsation rather than a tonguing pulsation, although no further details are provided about the technique by which this should be achieved. The use of the term "sound" is particularly significant; in the following bar, the appearance of hard and soft sounds alternating on a repeated note (F⁴, which together with the three notes of the first bar comprises the common tetrachord) means that Banks is employing two different textural effects consecutively on repeated-note figures for flute.2

2 Both of these textural ideas had initially been sketched on S51, and it may have been Banks' intention from the beginning to base a section of the work on the contrasting tonal possibilities offered by the different treatments of repeated-note figures.
It is not until variant 3, the projected score probably sketched after the completion of *Episode I* and almost certainly after a meeting with Whittaker, that a detailed annotation clarifies Banks’ vision for the phrase. Both note length and the nature of the pulse are addressed here; the former is indicated with “*legatiss*” and the latter described as “controlled vibrato”. In notes probably for an introductory talk at a concert, Banks explained that he “could see no reason why *vibrato* should not be used this way — after all, it *can* be controlled, but I hadn’t seen it done before.”

The full extent of the contrast to the hard and soft sounds in bar 2 is confirmed, with the notes here very full in length, equal in dynamic, and without the sharp edge of attack provided by the tongued notes in the phrase that follows.

The annotation is further refined in subsequent variants. The initials “cv” substitute for “controlled vibrato” and are used in conjunction with a bracket above this and similar repeated-note phrases throughout the movement. In variant 4, the marking that “the notes so enclosed [are] to be played non detached” (rather than “*legatiss*” as in the previous variant) removes the emphasis from playing each note as smoothly, and the entire figure as seamlessly as possible, placing importance instead on “precise rhythm”, while the addition “mainly lip” *vibrato* clearly shows Whittaker’s influence. In the second score (variant 5), the marking of the two crotchets that follow each of the textural figures in bars 1 and 2 “*senza vibrato*” gives the opening section even more variety, with three distinct timbral components. Some time after the score was written out, the pattern of alternating hard and soft sounds in the second bar was apparently extended to include the last of the repeated notes and the first of the crotchets, although the original markings were not erased. Banks’ query here regarding deletion of the words “mainly lip” from the annotation probably indicates an intention to discuss further the precise wording with Whittaker. The annotation remains unaltered in the autograph.

The opening passage material returns in a modified form in bars 18–19 (see Example 12.2). The initial figure combining repeated-note motion and controlled *vibrato* does not appear, the passage commencing with the Ef⁴ (virtually doubled in length) that

---

3 These notes, which probably date from after Banks’ permanent return to Australia in 1973, are written on two small cards contained in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA (as mentioned in Chapter 11).
precedes the use of alternating hard and soft timbres. This textural device is not combined with repeated-note motion here; every second note (employing a soft sound) is instead lowered by a semitone, and thus the entire flute phrase becomes one long, symmetrical unit, its central triplets framed by the minim E♭s. The piano part in this passage remains closer to its predecessor; the bar 18 entry, a six-note figure containing both chromatic and common tetrachords, is identical to the opening (though now written for L.H.), while the repeated-note figure that follows is pitched a semitone lower, the E♭ combining with all other material introduced in the bar to form a chromatic tetrachord in place of the common tetrachord used in bar 3. The absence of the flute’s initial motive removes the element of imitation from this modified version of the opening. Although the piano’s demisemiquavers remain, their function can, of course, no longer be imitative.

At this point, we may examine further the roles of the chromatic cell and common tetrachord in this movement. As in Episode I, Banks bases virtually the entire piece on these two structural units, although he reverses the relative importance of their roles here. The common tetrachord is the predominant unit, used on numerous occasions in both linear and chordal forms, while chromatic cells provide the bulk of the remaining material. The particular set of the common tetrachord comprised of E♭, F♯, B♭, B♮, which appears on the flute at the beginning and the piano in bar 3 (see Example 12.2), becomes a focal point. Indeed, the combination of its extensive use and tendency to emphasise or conclude on E♭, combined with the various repeated-note figures written on E♭ throughout, may be said to give that pitch-class the status of a tonal centre.

The repeated-note motive appears in nearly three-quarters of the bars that comprise the movement (eighteen of the twenty-five bars, as illustrated in Figure 12.1). It is used in combination with textural elements on the flute in two-thirds of its appearances, primarily with controlled vibrato (in nine bars), and also with alternating hard and soft timbres (in three bars, including the variation at the return

4 Other significant appearances by this set include as the sole use within the movement of a gradually assembled chord (bars 8–9), a passage of almost three bars for flute (bars 10–12) and a piano chord (bars 21–22) that gives rise to an E♭ which is sustained until the conclusion of the piece (see Appendix B, S43–S45).

5 Such figures occur in bars 3, 5, 12–13, 18–19 and 21–25 (see Appendix B, S43–S45).
of the opening material; see Example 12.2). The motive appears as a purely rhythmic device on both flute and piano in a further six bars.

**Figure 12.1** Appearances of the principal motive in *Episode II*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar 1</th>
<th>Bar 2</th>
<th>Bar 3</th>
<th>Bar 4</th>
<th>Bar 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 6</td>
<td>Bar 7</td>
<td>Bar 8</td>
<td>Bar 9</td>
<td>Bar 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 11</td>
<td>Bar 12</td>
<td>Bar 13</td>
<td>Bar 14</td>
<td>Bar 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 16</td>
<td>Bar 17</td>
<td>Bar 18</td>
<td>Bar 19</td>
<td>Bar 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 21</td>
<td>Bar 22</td>
<td>Bar 23</td>
<td>Bar 24</td>
<td>Bar 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- Repeated-note motion combined with controlled vibrato
- Repeated-note motion combined with alternating hard and soft sounds (including variation at return of opening)
- Repeated-note figure (flute and piano)

The only passage in *Episode II* that does not feature the repeated-note motive is that immediately preceding the return of the opening material (bars 14–17; see Example 12.3). These bars, written directly into the first score (variant 1), are based almost entirely on the chromatic and common tetrachords (the latter appearing both in full and in part), and contain the most complex writing of the movement. Banks indicates the overall shape of the passage with both his markings above the system and the design of the flute part. An *accelerando* at the beginning of bar 14 leads to a designated “Climax” at the mid-point of bar 15, after which a *ritenuto* returns to the opening tempo in bar 18. The B♭⁶ at the climax is the highest pitch of the piece (repeated on the following beat), and appears as a relatively long, accented note after
a build-up involving a gradual rise of the phrase in pitch (the 8" in bar 15 is written simply as “8”) coupled with a shortening of note values: sextuplet semiquavers at the beginning of bar 14 give way to demisemiquavers which in turn are followed by a trill on the beat preceding the climax. A gradual descent of the phrase in pitch and lengthening of note values after that point bring a symmetrical shape to the entire passage.

The flute line seems to have been written first in variant 1, its detail in such areas as annotation and articulation being in stark contrast to the incomplete piano part. This contrast may perhaps best be appreciated by examination of bar 16, beat 1, where the writing of two different types of accent for flute (as used previously in Episode I; see Example 11.1, variants 4–5) appears simultaneously with R.H. piano chords which are indicated simply by a vertical line and based on a chord with incomplete accidentals (on the evidence of subsequent scores, the F(♯) is intended to be an F♯ as in the preceding chord at the end of bar 15) and a L.H. figure, the beginning of which is crossed out and the remainder unclear, having apparently been sketched hurriedly.

While the initial material for both instruments is comprised of chromatic tetrachords, the bulk of the passage is based on common tetrachords. Above the flute part in bars 14–15, Banks brackets three common tetrachords that combine to form a twelve-tone row, labelling the resultant derived series “Generated row”. This is the only place in the movement and the entire work where structural elements combine to form a larger unit, and the use of a complete row here suggests that it was specifically included as a unifying factor in the lead up to the climax. Interestingly, the sole use of combinatoriality in Three Studies (hexachordal on that occasion) is also in the second piece (see Example 6.2).

In the second score (variant 2), Banks adds detailed dynamic, phrasing and articulation marks for both instruments. A crescendo to ff establishes the third beat of bar 15 as the loudest moment of the piece, and the metronome marking \( \text{♩} = 76 \) confirms that beat as the point of arrival for the accelerando. The clarity is far greater here (as we might expect from a score also serving as a performance part);
not only is the flute part in bar 15 notated at pitch, allowing the overall shape of that line to be more easily appreciated, but the piano part at the same point is written on two staves, the contrapuntal lines now clearly divided between the hands. A comparison with the earlier piano part shows that most of the crossings out were made with the intention of paring back one of the lines to enable the remaining material to be more easily heard, a process not only similar to one used in several of the sketch series for Episode I, but also in some of the sketches for Variations a decade earlier (see Examples 3.7 and 3.9).

The edition of Three Episodes published by Schott & Co. in 1967 contains two apparent misprints which, coincidentally, involve notes in consecutive bars of the flute part in Episode II (see Example 12.4). Both of these notes, one from each of bars 5 and 6, are components of common tetrachords, and are unchanged throughout the compositional process before appearing in the Schott edition a third below their previous pitches. The earliest appearances of the figure containing the contentious note in bar 6 are in the abandoned score and the flute part based on that score (variant !). The third note of this bar, B♭⁴, is a component here of the tetrachord E♭, F♭, B♭, B♭ that is used by Banks at significant points during the movement (as discussed earlier). Similarly, the second note of bar 5, D♭⁵, which is initially sketched in the first score (variant 2), is a component (along with the following note, A♭⁷) of the common tetrachord E♭⁴, A♭⁵, D♭⁵, G♭⁷; this tetrachord is not only sustained simultaneously on the piano, but contains the two flute notes at the same pitches (see Appendix B, S43). The appearances, therefore, of a B♭ in place of the D♭ in bar 5 and a G♭ in place of the B♭ in bar 6 of the printed score are almost certainly due to errors during typesetting.

The use of red ink for the only time on the second score to indicate the two incorrect notes (variant 3) suggests that Banks consulted this score when checking the proofs for the Schott edition (having presumably sent the autograph to the publisher for use as the model for typesetting). Following the standard practice of correcting typesetters' errors in red ink, he may have inadvertently noted the corrections in his
own score at this time rather than in the proofs. This would explain both the markings in the second score and the presence of the apparently wrong notes in the published score.

It is clear that the periods of composition of the first two Episodes overlapped; the initial version of the single substantial motive in Episode II is contained on one of the preliminary sketch pages for the work (S51), and the earliest opening passage derived from that motive is labelled as a section rather than a separate movement (S23), indicating that it was sketched before a final decision was made on an overall structure for the work. The same two structural units are employed in both pieces, with the tetrachord common to both the piano and flute rows the predominant unit here, and chromatic cells providing most of the remaining material. This greater reliance on the common tetrachord enables Banks to make more linear use of intervals not contained in the chromatic tetrachord; whereas the flute part in Episode I had contained very few fourths and fifths, those intervals appear frequently in Episode II (see Examples 12.3 and 12.4).

The major difference between the pieces is that in place of the complexities generated by the use of such elements as four motives, numerous alterations of tempo, and textural devices including pitch bending for flute and harmonics for piano in Episode I, the present movement features a simplicity of design — an opening passage that returns at its original pitch towards the end of the movement (see Example 12.2), and a tendency to revolve around a tonal centre of E♭; furthermore, it is based principally on a repeated-note motive that appears in three-quarters of the bars, most often in combination with a new textural idea which Banks calls "controlled vibrato" (see Figure 12.1). The use of controlled vibrato alongside both senza vibrato phrases and the hard and soft sounds introduced in Episode I gives the flute part here a considerable textural diversity (see Example 12.1).

Perhaps the most striking manifestation of the relative simplicity of Episode II is that, with the exception of a preliminary sketch of the principal motive, the entire movement was composed directly into a score. Of course, the abandoned scores
(S23 and S24) may be described as preliminary, but with each in turn it was no doubt Banks' intention to complete a definitive version. In beginning afresh on each occasion, he retained material from the preceding score up to a certain point, and at no stage did any of the scores function merely as assembly points for previously sketched fragments. A similarity in the compositional methods for the two pieces may also be noted here: the flute part often seems to have been written first, appearing as a complete line including articulation and dynamic markings, while the piano part remains incomplete (see Examples 11.3 and 12.3).
The sketches for *Episode III*

Although the earliest sketches for *Episode III* appear below the final bars of a projected score for *Episode I*, it seems likely that the bulk of the movement was written upon completion of *Episode II*. The second score of *Episode III*, which, as with the preceding pieces, served as the piano part for the first performance, is dated “3/12/64”. As *Episode II* is dated “9/11/64”, we may assume that composition of most of the movement took place in the intervening three and a half weeks.

Among the twelve pages of sketches for *Episode III* (shown in Table 13.1) are five comprising the first score (S18, S17, S19, S20, S21) and four comprising the second score (S46, S47, S48, S49). Two of the remaining pages contain the openings of projected scores (S2, S3) and one contains material for the conclusion of the piece (S22).

**Table 13.1 The Sketch Pages for *Episode III***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td><em>top: &quot;III Ritmico&quot;</em>&lt;br&gt;systems 1–2: opening of a projected score — material for bars 1–3 of autograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td><em>system 1:</em> fragment for piano (one bar, crossed out) containing a cross-rhythmic idea similar to one used in bars 53–54 of autograph&lt;br&gt;<em>systems 2–3:</em> opening of a projected score — material for bars 1–6 of autograph, labelled “III (Ritmico)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td><em>system 1:</em> bars 8–9 of first score — expanded version of those bars on S18, system 3&lt;br&gt;<em>system 2:</em> continuation of S18 — material for bar 14 of autograph followed by two bars comprising a prototype of bars 22–23 of autograph&lt;br&gt;<em>systems 3–4:</em> continuation of system 2, bar 1 — material for bars 15–21 of autograph&lt;br&gt;<em>top: “III”</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td><em>systems 1–4:</em> first page of first score — material for bars 1–13 of autograph (bars 8–9 incomplete and crossed out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td><em>systems 1–4:</em> continuation of S17 — material for bars 22–39 of autograph&lt;br&gt;<em>bottom:</em> rhythmic fragment — calculation for beat subdivision, probably related to material above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td><em>systems 1–4:</em> continuation of S19 — material for bars 40–52 of autograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td><em>systems 1–2:</em> continuation of S20 — material for bars 53–57 of autograph&lt;br&gt;<em>systems 3–4:</em> expanded version of the two bars on system 2 — material for bars 56–57 of autograph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The earliest sketch for Episode III appears on S28 under the final bars of the abandoned score of Episode I (see Example 13.1, variant 2a). That Banks had settled on a three-movement format for the work by this stage, but remained undecided regarding the position of the fragment within that structure, is suggested by the label "OR save this for 3rd piece". This sixteen-note figure is based on a combination of four of the chromatic tetrachords used on S52 to list the twenty-four possible permutations of a four-note set, C♭⁴-E♭⁴, and is specifically comprised of the first four tetrachords on system 3 of that page, all of which begin on C♯/Db (Example 13.1, variant 1), and the first of which (transposed up a tritone) also forms the central tetrachord of the piano row (see Example 10.4). Accents and sforzandi are added on the first, fourth and eighth quaver beats, with hard and soft sounds marked under the first two sforzandi. This essentially rhythmic sketch (as evidenced by the heading "Ritmico"), thus also includes both substantial offbeat emphasis and textural variety. Immediately below this fragment (but shown here alongside) and connected by an arrow, the sixteen notes are sketched again, this time labelled "also open out" and with one or two notes of each tetrachord raised by an octave (variant 2b). Accents are used again, on the first and eighth quaver beats as before, and now also on the third and sixth quavers instead of the fourth.

These fragments next appear as the first and third bars of a projected score on S2 (variant 3), where they are punctuated by a repeated common tetrachord on the piano and a rapid, rising chromatic tetrachord for flute. The latter figure is pitched almost two octaves above the flute's preceding material; its final note is marked with both a
sf and ▲ accent, more intense than the > variety used elsewhere in this sketch series.\(^1\) The bracketed annotation "? to 15\(^{th}\) Jumps" here indicates that Banks is considering following the octave displacement of bar 3 with double-octave leaps.

Another projected score, this time comprised of five complete bars on S3, contains the next version of the opening material for Episode III (variant 4). The flute fragments in bars 1 and 3 are transposed up one tone here, employing the tetrachord \(D#^4-F#^4\), and thus revealing a compositional process identical to that of the opening passage of Episode I. The same transposition of this chromatic unit had also occurred midway through the earlier series, almost certainly after Banks had worked through the projected score of that movement (S27–S28) with Whittaker (see Example 11.1). The present sketch is therefore the first of this series that may be dated from after that initial meeting between composer and performer. The material for both instruments in bar 2 is raised by only a semitone, however; as a result, the piano’s common tetrachord in this bar contains the two pitches on either side of the transposed flute fragments, and it is interesting to note that, had the flute tetrachord in bar 2 remained at its original (variant 3) pitch (G\(^5\)-B\(^5\)), a twelve-tone row would have been formed by the material in bars 1–2.

The new material in this variant (after bar 3) seems to have been hastily written, becoming increasingly unclear, incomplete in the L.H. and without a barline where one might be expected at the end of the fifth bar. It includes in bar 5 the two-octave jumps for flute signalled by the variant 3 annotation, and is comprised entirely of chromatic and common tetrachords; the chromatic set used by the flute in bars 1 and 3 remains a significant unit, appearing in the first half of bar 4 on flute and in the following bar on piano. This variant includes probably the earliest appearances of a repeated-note figure that is subsequently used throughout Episode III and may be accorded motivic status. The three-note figure, comprised in most cases of two short notes of equal duration followed by a longer note, first appears in the R.H. in bar 2,

\(^1\) Banks’ differentiation between ▲ and > accents was probably based on Boulez’ annotations in *Improvisation sur Mallarmé* (1957), as discussed in Chapter 11.
and towards the end of the fragment is also written for flute then repeated immediately in the R.H. a minor third lower.

While changes to the opening passage in the first score (variant 5) are for the most part related to format rather than content, there are two significant alterations: the first is the addition of a piano line in unison with the flute in bar 2, complete with identical dynamic and expression marks, as had been mooted by the annotation "col Fl." in the preceding variant; secondly, two flute parts are sketched for bar 4. Both contain the two chromatic cells used in variant 4 at their original pitches although with slight adjustments to rhythm and note order, and the later version, which is written above the system, is retained almost intact in subsequent scores.

Another fragment sketched on S28 below the concluding bars of the abandoned score of Episode I provides a link between the initial and final compositional periods of the entire work (see Example 13.2, variant 2). This single bar for piano alone displays a haste of execution: a time-signature apparently added belatedly; incomplete note lengths in the L.H.; and ambiguity of pitch in the R.H. On the last of these points, the second note is presumably intended to be either a D♯ or D♭. If the former, the presence of accidentals on the following two notes is puzzling, and if the latter, both the absence of an accidental and the reiteration of the ♯ on the fourth note are inexplicable. In either case, Banks' notation is inconsistent. If the second R.H. note is a D♯, the bar is based on a chromatic trichord, and if a D♭, it is based on a tetrachord. The format here is of a gradually assembled chord which is used in a rhythmic stretto; the R.H. has the 3/8 bar divided into four dotted semiquaver-length beats, the lower part of the L.H. has the same rhythm beginning a demisemiquaver later (although the second note is erroneously written as a quaver instead of a semiquaver), and the upper part of the L.H. begins another demisemiquaver later but remains incomplete.

The fact that the beginning of this bar is connected by an arrow to the new material (after the tied chord) contained in the bar directly above, which is the final bar of the abandoned score of Episode I (Example 13.2, variant 1), suggests that it was
originally intended as an alternative to that material. In the earlier bar, two chromatic tetrachords are assembled gradually, with the resultant eight-note chord complete before the end of the second quaver beat. Banks seems to have changed his mind about the rhythmic cell used in the second beat, apparently beginning with a dotted rhythm before adding a triplet marking above the R.H. — had the opposite scenario been the case, he would probably have crossed out the triplet marking, as he had elsewhere on that system (see Appendix B, S28). The similarities between the two bars (variants 1 and 2) outnumber their differences; while they begin with the same pitch-class (E♭ in variant 1 and D♯ in variant 2) and are based on the same type of gradually assembled structural units (admittedly greatly simplified in variant 2), only the later bar contains the regularity of pulse that together with a return to a dotted rhythm enables a subdivision of the three beats into four equal parts in the R.H., the first voice in the rhythmic stretto.

At the top of S3 is another single bar for piano, this time crossed out (variant 3). As in the previous variants, this bar is based on chromatic material, and like variant 2 in particular, is written entirely in bass clef, is incomplete in note durations (specifically in the lower R.H. part, where dotted crotchets are written instead of dotted quavers) and contains no time-signature within the bar (although unlike the earlier bar, a time-signature is not added belatedly). There are also intervallic similarities between these two variants: a major seventh between L.H. notes, and a semitone between the upper L.H. note and (lower) R.H. note. The present variant expands the preceding one in both the number of voices (four instead of three) and beats in the bar (five instead of three), and with the placement of the additional voice as an upper part, the range of the fragment is extended by almost an octave. As the new voice, the only moving line in the bar and indeed the first of the series, is comprised of the notes G♯, A♯, E♯ played twice, the make-up of the actual chromatic cell in use at any given point varies between a tetrachord in which G♯ is the highest pitch-class, a tetrachord in which E♯ is the lowest pitch-class, and a trichord comprised of the three lower voices; the A♯ is, of course, not a component of a chromatic unit in this bar. The most significant difference between the variants is the return here to a triplet pulse throughout, which allows for a regular cross-rhythm
in the bottom line — from the first Gb\(^2\) on the last triplet of the first beat, that note is played on alternate triplet beats for the remainder of the bar.

A version of this cross-rhythmic element is used in bars 53–54 of Episode III (variant 4). Here, with a common tetrachord rather than a chromatic unit providing the structural material, the pulse is emphasised by accents in the R.H. (which contains an extended version of the repeated-note motive played three times) and tenuto marks in the L.H. (which, while now comprising the remaining three notes rather than two as in the preceding two variants, is still written over the range of a major seventh). This sketch series encompasses more of the compositional period of Three Episodes than any other, from an initial fragment appearing at the conclusion of the projected score of Episode I, to a passage composed directly onto the final page of the first score of Episode III. While variants 1 and 4 have little in common, Banks’ process of transferring some material from each variant to the next may be easily traced.

At this point, we may examine further the role of the repeated-note motive in Episode III, which appears in its original three-note version in more than half the movement’s bars (thirty-two of the fifty-seven bars, as illustrated in Figure 13.1). Unlike the repeated-note motive in the previous piece, this element does not have a central textural component, appearing as an essentially rhythmic device often accompanied by articulation marks such as staccato, sec., tenuto, or accents. The final note is longer than the first two in more than three-quarters of cases and the motive occurs mostly in a single part; however, in a number of places it appears as a set of three semiquavers, and on five occasions in this format as a four-note chord (usually a common tetrachord) which is played in two or three parts and then repeated two semiquavers later (bars 11, 15, 18, 46, 50 of the second score). Paradoxically, these points of the motive’s greatest harmonic density are marked with some of the softest dynamics of the movement, never exceeding \(p\). The repeated-note element provides the basis for the bulk of the rhythmic material throughout; it is often extended (see Example 13.2, variant 4), varied by the alteration of the final note (see Example 13.4, variant 4), or expanded by the insertion of identically pitched semiquaver pairs (see Appendix B, S49, bar 48).
Figure 13.1  Appearances of the repeated-note motive in *Episode III*
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Key

- Appearances in the flute part
- Appearances in the R.H.²
- Appearances in the L.H.

Apart from the opening fragments on S2 and S3, the only other sketch for *Episode III* that preceded the writing of the first score consists of eleven bars on S22 containing material for a concluding passage. The annotation “End” is written above the first bar of that page, and on systems 1 and 2 are five bars which may comprise Banks’ initial sketch for an ending. The compositional process here is not clear; at

² These include the two instances in which the middle note of the motive appears in the L.H. (bars 39 and 57; see Example 13.4, variant 4).
the end of system 1, the third bar not only peters out with no barline or L.H. material and an incomplete R.H. part, but the whole bar is also crossed out. While we cannot be certain that these bars and the two that follow on system 2, which are also crossed out and after which there is a double bar, were originally intended to serve as the final passage of the work, both their relative positions and a marked similarity in the apparently hurried style of their calligraphy suggest that this is the most likely scenario. In this study, because of the subsequent separate development of the systems 1 and 2 figures and of spatial constraints, the two components, of three and two bars respectively, appear separately as the first variants of the following two sketch series (Examples 13.3 and 13.4).

The first two bars on S22 are the forerunners of bars 49–50 in the first score and bars 50–51 in the second score (see Example 13.3, variants 1a, 2 and 3; the insertion of an additional bar in the second score is shown in Example 13.5). The numerous similarities between the earliest and subsequent versions of these bars are immediately apparent:

- a sustained flute note in the first half of the first bar (initially with a semitone trill that is not retained in later variants) over the repeated-note motive in both hands of the piano (comprised of two chromatic tetrachords on S22, but only one common tetrachord subsequently) — the removal of the trill and half the piano notes in variant 2 is another example of Banks’ habit of simplifying his material in later versions;
- a semiquaver-based flute passage in bars 1–2 which is comprised of a common tetrachord followed by a chromatic tetrachord and remains virtually unchanged throughout — only the texture of the final note of the phrase (G#5) is altered, with the accent in variant 1a replaced by flutter-tonguing (annotated as “F”) in variant 2, and both accent and flutter written in variant 3;
- the elements sketched for piano in the second bar on S22, a rhythm outlined in the R.H. followed by a five-note chord containing a common tetrachord in both hands, are combined in later variants — the R.H. rhythm is altered in variant 2 to begin with the repeated-note motive, and by variant 3, the fifth note of the original chord (G#5) is omitted;
• another semiquaver-based flute passage in bars 2–3, the first half of which is retained in outline while the second half is retained unchanged throughout the sketch series. This passage is of particular significance as it contains the sole instance among the sketches for the entire work in which a chromatic dyad, the only unit of more than a single note contained in both the common and chromatic tetrachords, may be regarded as a structural cell in its own right, rather than as an isolated unit or component of an incomplete trichord or tetrachord. The passage consists of six chromatic dyads; on S22, four of these employ octave displacement and in the later variants, five. It is perhaps surprising that Banks should incorporate a new structural unit, albeit one derived from both his principle structural units, into the final passage of the final piece. Whether such use of the dyad was spontaneous or had been considered at an earlier stage in the compositional process is impossible to assess.

Eight of the eleven bars on S22 are numbered 1–8; the three that are not numbered are the three that are crossed out — the last bar on system 1 and the first two on system 2 — which probably comprise the final three bars of the initial concluding passage (as discussed earlier). The bar numbering suggests that a second, expanded version of the passage was intended, and the circling of the number 3 above the first bar after the unnumbered bars, possibly to assist Banks with any subsequent identification of the new bar order, reinforces this idea (see Example 13.3, variants 1a and 1b).

In bar 3, the progression of chromatic dyads in the flute part is continued, and the piano part combines the linear use of chromatic tetrachords with the harmonic use of a common tetrachord that appears on both the first and third beats. The only piano note in this bar which may not be incorporated into either of the principal structural units is the L.H. Db on beat 2. In later variants, this note is altered to D#, thus becoming the final component of a chromatic tetrachord (variant 2, bar 3). The bars numbered 4–6, occupying system 3 of S22, are for flute only. While bar 4 is comprised of the same phrase for flute as had been used in the first of the unnumbered bars (shown here directly above), none of the material on this system appears in the subsequent sketches. These bars become progressively less distinct, the pitched phrase in bar 4 giving way to purely rhythmic fragments which by bar 6
are so faint as to be almost impossible to read. Bars 7–8, on system 4, are for piano only; followed by a double bar, their fundamental relationship on this page is with the final two bars of the initial ending (on system 2), and so they appear in this study as variant 2 in Example 13.4.

The earliest version of the final phrase, consisting of the first two bars on system 2 of S22, is based entirely on three intervallically symmetrical common tetrachords that combine to form an aggregate (see Example 13.4, variant 1). The flute part here consists of two identical ascending tetrachords comprised of perfect fourths either side of a semitone. With the first tetrachord rising from C#5 to C#6 and the second from B♭5 to B♭6, the only descending interval in the phrase, a semitone between the sets, completes a progression built on alternating disjunct and conjunct motion throughout. The piano tetrachord also ascends, through the more constant leaps of a perfect fourth between tritones, to D♯7 which, as the highest note written for either instrument in the sketches for any of the pieces, appears as part of the final dyad. It is perhaps surprising that the sketch should end with a major third between the instruments, as this is the only interval which may not be derived from either of the two principal structural units. The detail of the articulation marks in the uncomplicated piano part of this carefully constructed phrase contrasts to the incomplete and approximate nature of the preceding piano material (see Example 13.3, variant 1a), indicating that Banks had, from his earliest sketch for the conclusion, a firm idea of the character of his intended phrase.

Another final phrase appears at the bottom of S22 (Example 13.4, variant 2). This variant, for piano alone, is comprised of two common tetrachords preceding a final chord, and is largely derived from material in the earlier phrase. As with the flute sets above, the tetrachords have a duration of two beats. The first tetrachord combines the intervallic structure of the earlier piano set with the pitches of the second flute set, while the second tetrachord uses the variant 1 piano material in its original register and introduces the repeated-note motive to each of the first three notes, thereby adding an element of rhythmic momentum to that of continually rising pitch in the build-up of the tetrachord (which to this point does not contain any dynamic markings) to its D♯7 final component. The piano part of Episode III thus concludes now as it had begun, with a statement of the repeated-note motive (see
Example 13.1, variant 5). The chord that follows may not be so easily classified; it contains three-quarters of both the common (C₆, D₆, G₇) and chromatic (B♭, C₇, D♭) tetrachords. The evidence of subsequent variants suggests that the doubling of C₇ is erroneous; the substitution of B₇ in the R.H. in variants 3b and 4 allows completion of a chromatic tetrachord.

The following two appearances of this phrase are on the final page of the first score (Example 13.4, variants 3a and b). While the flute tetrachords of variant 1 are retained at the conclusion of variant 3a, which is the initial ending of the score (and where the writing of the first note as D♭ in place of C♯ is almost certainly a misprint that is corrected in variant 3b), their note lengths are halved and they now occupy only the second half of the penultimate bar. The original piano tetrachord is also retained, used in its variant 2 combination with the repeated-note motive; the only alteration to that format is the bringing forward of the final chord to the beginning of the last bar, thus halving the duration of the R.H. D♭ (now rather than 7, in the absence of any 8vo markings) and avoiding the major third that would otherwise have occurred between the D♭ and the flute's B♭ as the two highest notes of the final chord. Here, for the first time, the complete set of components designed, it seems, to propel the movement to a climactic conclusion are assembled: a crescendo from p to ff in the space of one crotchet leading to the final accented, five-note chord; repeated demisemiquavers played simultaneously by both instruments — the first seven of the flute's tetrachord notes (which would now be double-tongued) are repeated (rather than six as in variant 1), while the piano has the repeated-note motive; rising pitches in all tetrachords; and halved flute note lengths, by which the contour of the phrase becomes exaggerated.

The preceding flute material in variant 3a is based entirely on chromatic units, the tetrachord D♭–F♭ and dyad F♯–G♭ which are repeated, and the tetrachord F♯–A♭ which is written in letter names above the staff and notated in later variants, replacing an unclear unit, possibly the chromatic tetrachord E♭–G♭. Two particular elements, one rhythmic and one harmonic, recur throughout this passage. The former, appearing on both instruments, is a variant of the repeated-note motive in which the final note is altered, usually by a major seventh. The latter is a five-note
piano chord which outlines a major seventh in each hand and contains the common
tetrachord C~, D~, G~/F#, G~; with the exception of the G~ (for which a B~
doubling the flute is substituted), this chord is identical to the final chord from which
it was almost certainly derived, as Banks used material from existing cells to
enhance continuity between his most recent sketches and previously written
fragments. The piano part is incomplete and appears hastily sketched, with some
notes left unstemmed while others are indicated only by a stem.

Below the original conclusion of the first score is an expanded version of the final
two bars (variant 3b). While it is clear that these bars were written after those above
and before the equivalent bars of the second score (variant 4), the numbering here
(bars 56–57 rather than 55–56) suggests that they were sketched after the insertion of
an extra bar into the second score (shown in Example 13.5), and not immediately
after the preceding version. The final phrase is retained with only minor alterations:
the first note of the flute’s first tetrachord is restored to D~; 8th indications return in
the piano part; and the introduction of a B~4 instead of C~5 in the R.H. of the final
chord completes a chromatic tetrachord. The principal addition here consists of two
beats of material inserted in the second half of the penultimate bar. This material is
derived from the rising L.H. quavers in variant 2 and is again comprised of tritones
and perfect fourths, which on this occasion form overlapping but incomplete
common tetrachords. It appears that Banks, while satisfied with the momentum
generated by the final two-beat build-up to the climax of the last chord, decided to
develop the initial stage of that build-up by adding the more slowly moving, tenuto
progression at its beginning. The simultaneous flute part contains another repeated
chromatic dyad, and an “F” above the second quaver of bar 56 followed by a
horizontal line extending into bar 57 probably indicates flutter-tonguing for the
duration of the bar.

The changes to the final passage in variant 4 are minor, concerned principally with
details of articulation, register and dynamic: the flutter-tonguing figure in bar 56 is
reduced to three quavers, with normal (“N”) articulation resumed on beat 3; the final
Bb is raised by an octave on both instruments, returning to its original pitch of B~6;
and the L.H. quavers in bar 56 are marked both tenuto and ringing and, with a
crescendo from their mf base, now play a far more substantial role in the build-up to the sff climax.

Episode III is in ternary form, its outer Ritmico sections in 4/4 (bars 1–21 and 39–57) framing a considerably slower and more legato Grazioso section mostly in 6/8 (bars 22–38). The relationship between these tempi is significant; with the Ritmico marked $\text{J} = \text{ca 88}$ and the Grazioso $\text{J} = \text{ca 132}$, the durations of the first section minim and second section dotted crotchet, and therefore the bar lengths of the respective sections, are identical. It appears that this continuity of pulse was conceived some time after work had commenced on the first section of the first score, probably when Banks was considering his tempo for the middle section. The replacement of the original opening crotchet tempo of 100/108 with 88 (shown in Example 13.1, variant 5) may have been made as Banks, in deciding on a tempo for the middle section, established the connection by which three quavers in the new tempo would occur in the time of four in the old tempo.

The closing bars of the central section in the first score contain a series of predominantly legato phrases for flute which, becoming shorter as the passage draws to its conclusion, are the most important means of achieving a smooth transition to the more staccato, accented material of the returning Ritmico section (see Example 13.5, variant 1). These flute phrases are based largely on a single chromatic unit used in only one register: F#4–A♭4. Two groups of notes are sketched here for the last three semiquavers of bar 36. The lower group were probably the first written; comprising part of the adjacent chromatic tetrachord F#4–A♭4, the final note of this group is held over into the following bar, which is completed by rests — had the upper group been written first, bar 37 would originally have been occupied entirely by rests. The upper group, which is retained in the second score (variant 2), completes an F#4–A♭4 chromatic tetrachord, the first note of which is also the last note of the preceding tetrachord. Its use of staccato repeated Ab4's presages both the staccato R.H. quavers in bar 38 and, perhaps more importantly, the repeated-note motive that appears on both instruments at the beginning of the following Tempo I° section.
Both above and below bar 37 in the first score are fragments that suggest an intention to insert two beats at the beginning of that bar. Above the system is a two-beat annotation consisting of the letter names Ab, G, A⁴ beneath three quavers, all following a quaver rest — these are the same three notes that comprise the upper group at the end of the previous bar. Below the system is a single-staff 4/4 bar which contains all the piano material from both piano staves above. The sustained notes here, comprising elements of the common tetrachord which has been played throughout the passage, are simply held for two more beats, while the R.H. quavers are sketched on the third and fourth beats. But rather than expand bar 37 by two beats in the second score, Banks creates a new 2/4 bar. The added flute trichord is notated in the same register as all the other linear material in this passage, repeating the previous trichord precisely and being followed by its retrograde in the R.H., separated from both by a quaver rest. The insertion of this phrase not only extends the duration of the passage’s ritenuto from two to three phrases but, with its pp marking, also provides a destination for the diminuendo. The final accented mf F#⁴ of the piano tetrachord (bar 39, beat 1) serves as a pivot note between both sections and structural units — this last note of the chromatic cell that has dominated linear motion in the concluding bars of the central section is also the note on which the repeated-note motive is taken up by both instruments in bar 39.

The earliest sketch for Episode III dates from midway through the compositional period of Episode I, appearing below the final bars of the abandoned score of that movement (see Example 13.1, variant 2a). Given that the present piece is based almost entirely on the same two structural units — the chromatic cell and common tetrachord — as the preceding movements, it is perhaps not surprising that its initial ideas should have been conceived during the writing of the earlier material. Indeed, Banks’ annotation “OR save this for 3rd piece” suggests that, having sketched the original version of the opening fragment, he had not decided what use to make of it. At this point, we may also review the role of the other unifying factor in the work: motives based on repeated-note motion, four of which appear in Episode I with one in each of the subsequent movements. While these forms of the motive vary widely, the fact that one or more are used in their original or a substantial form in 108 of
the work's 152 bars (71 per cent) confirms the fundamental importance of the repeated-note element throughout.

No new textural devices are introduced here; the only use of such a device is the flutter-tonguing which had previously appeared in *Episode I*. Perhaps the absence of fresh textural ideas for flute is related to the fact that, unlike for the first two pieces, no evidence of a preliminary score exists for *Episode III*. This relationship works as follows: in writing the opening section of *Episode I*, Banks introduced to the flute part the bending of pitch and use of hard and soft sounds, both of which were contained in the projected score almost certainly prepared for a meeting with Whittaker; similarly, controlled *vibrato* was contained in the projected score of *Episode II* also prepared for such a meeting. So, if Banks had no new textural queries, he may have considered a preliminary meeting for the final movement unnecessary. Of course, non-musical reasons, such as Whittaker's absence during the period of composition or conflicting schedules, could also explain the apparent non-existence of a preliminary score.

Banks' growing confidence with this instrumental combination by the third movement is reflected most clearly in his sketching of all but the opening and concluding passages directly into the first score. While this is the same procedure he followed when writing *Episode II*, the scale of the exercise is greatly increased here, with additional complexities raised by sectional contrasts and the variety of rhythmic elements. His subsequent description of the piece as "a simple divertimento ... a rhythmic study [with] all sorts of cross-accents" connects the movement to a sketch for *Episode I*, which contains a similar syncopated, jazz-influenced rhythm (see Example 11.3, variant 2). As in the earlier pieces, the flute part often seems to have been sketched in considerable detail, including elements of articulation and texture, while the piano part is recorded in outline only and contains either the intended notes or rhythm (see Examples 13.3 and 13.4).

When writing *Three Episodes*, Banks made a conscious decision to restrict himself to "a minimum of motivic material [in which each of the] 3 short pieces [would

---

3 This description, contained in rough notes probably for an introductory talk at a concert, is written on two small cards held in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA (as mentioned in Chapters 11 and 12).
provide] some new way of looking at the material”. This restriction of working within the narrow parameters imposed by the use of only two short structural units for virtually the entire work is an example of the kind of intellectual compositional challenge he had set himself, on occasion, since his earliest sessions with Matyas Seiber in the spring of 1950, and which became a central feature of his creative process in the period culminating in the sketching of Three Episodes.

His major compositional project prior to beginning the sketches for Three Episodes was the music for the film Hysteria, for which he was commissioned to write a jazz score. For that work he set himself the intellectual challenge of composing the entire score using the twelve-tone method, later recalling that when writing his film scores during this period he “used to experiment ... I don’t think Hammer knew at this stage that half the scores they were getting was twelve-tone music, but it was possible”.6

Perhaps the origin of the intellectual approach in Banks’ writing may be traced back to a single seminal moment at his first lesson with Seiber. After studying his student’s harmonisations of a number of Bach chorale melodies, Seiber commented, “The trouble is, you’ve harmonised all these once only. Now, what I want you to do is to go away and harmonise one, twenty different times, because until you can see all of the possibilities, all the harmonic possibilities, how can you select the best?”7 Banks’ acknowledgement that “of course, he was right. This was the kind of thing we had to get at and I had to work very seriously at”8 not only indicates his acceptance of both the logic and importance of Seiber’s observation, but also suggests that from that moment he consciously undertook to make the greatest possible use of his material. It may thus be argued that his self-imposed restriction of structural units in the present work, when coupled with the use throughout of a single motive which appears in a variety of forms, represents one of the most significant examples of such a commitment.

4 Ibid.
5 This Hammer Film/MGM co-production was released in 1964.
6 From the 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
The importance of Douglas Whittaker's influence on the compositional process for *Three Episodes* should not be underestimated. It was he who requested a work for flute and piano, and with whom Banks played through preliminary versions of the first two pieces. At these meetings, he presumably demonstrated various techniques relating to texture and articulation, addressed queries regarding nuances of sound production and advised on possible methods of notating those sounds. His role may perhaps be described therefore as fitting somewhere between those of collaborator and fellow performer.

---

9 Other influences may include Berio's *Sequenza* (1958), Haubenstock-Ramati's *Interpolation* (1958), Boulez' *Improvisation sur Mallarmé II* (1957), Searle's *Suite for Piano* (1956) and Stravinsky's *Movements for Piano and Orchestra* (1959), all of which make use of notational techniques similar to those used by Banks here, and the scores of which were probably in his collection at the time of writing *Three Episodes* (as discussed in Chapter 11).
Conclusion

This study has traced the many similarities between the compositional processes for *Three Studies* and *Three Episodes*, similarities extending to both method and materials. If Banks' process in *Three Studies* involved both the devising of a method and his earliest use of a set of pre-determined materials, then the *Three Episodes* may be said to constitute a continuation of this combination.

The fact that the 1953 Banks, a relatively inexperienced composer of chamber music and novice at twelve-tone writing, and the highly accomplished composer of 1964 are worlds apart in terms of both time and achievement begs the question: is he likely to have deliberately returned to the method and materials employed in the earlier work when writing *Three Episodes*, or is it more likely that he subconsciously returned to the successful formula?

His method of developing an opening passage that could be continued as a score, and into which existing fragments could be inserted, appears to have been conceived when he commenced work on *Study I*. Having abandoned his nominated structure and row for *Variations* after failing to make any substantial progress on all except the opening section (which when completed was more than twice the length originally envisaged), he began again with a less intervallically restricted row and apparently no firm plan for a form or duration for the new piece. The ternary form that evolved was repeated in the following movements, with the process seeming to become less arduous; a greater percentage of the material in the succeeding pieces was written directly into the score (about fifty per cent in *Study III*). Even allowing for the fact that the first piece of the set is by far the longest and most complex, a more assured style with each of the subsequent sketch series has been demonstrated.
That this compositional approach was repeated a decade later during the writing of *Three Episodes* has been shown clearly in this analysis of the sketches. In the later work, the percentage of preliminary sketches devoted to the opening movement, once again the first written and most substantial of the set, is even higher. A single sketch of the principal motive appears to be the only material preceding the first score of *Episode II*, and by the time of composing the last piece, Banks was confident enough to sketch all but the opening and closing passages directly into a score.

The similarities in method include Banks' preparation of early, incomplete versions of parts of both works for preliminary meetings with the commissioning performer, and it seems likely that Nelson Cooke and Douglas Whittaker provided valuable insights into the technical and textural possibilities of their instruments at these meetings. Banks' process in each case may therefore be seen as a learning experience in which by collaborating with the performers he was able to realise more fully the potential of the other instrument. It appears both from an examination of surviving sketch pages for other early chamber pieces and Banks' own comments that this collaborative link between *Three Studies* and *Three Episodes* was unique.

The striking resemblance between the materials used in the construction of the works has also been demonstrated. On a general level, both are of course serial, with a single twelve-tone row employed throughout *Three Studies* and two short cells (appearing mostly as tetrachords) providing the basis for virtually the whole of *Three Episodes*. Banks initially designed two related twelve-tone rows for use in the latter, but subsequently pared his structural units back to a "minimum of motivic material [as he] felt a need to cut down to the basic essentials ... a need to refine."\(^1\) His decision to take the process developed ten years previously of unifying the work by basing it on a small amount of common material to a new and more intellectually challenging level, while apparently deliberate, was therefore made some time after he had commenced composition of the *Episodes*.

---

\(^1\) From notes appearing on two cards contained in the Manuscript Section of the Banks Collection, NLA and quoted more fully in Chapter 11.
The specific structural links between the works comprise both rhythmic and serial elements. The unifying rhythmic factor is that all six of the movements comprising both works employ at least one motive based on repeated-note motion. Not only is the final tetrachord of the flute row identical to those of the Variations and Studies rows, but the tetrachord common to the flute and piano rows (upon which much of Three Episodes is based) also occurs in the Studies row. The relationship of the chromatic tetrachord, the other principal structural unit of the Episodes, to the chromatic Studies hexachords, is reflected in Banks’ experiments with combinatoriality during both sketch series; in the earlier case he combines hexachords and in the later one, tetrachords. His unmistakable ‘borrowing’ of some of the Studies building blocks, which are pared back into the sole significant serial units ten years later, is almost certainly an unconscious return to those structural cells.

There is a precedent among Banks’ chamber works for such an unconscious borrowing of material. In 1961, when writing Sonata da Camera, a piece subtitled ‘In Memoriam’ and intended as a tribute to Seiber who had died the previous year, Banks had based parts of the work on a row used by Seiber in his Concert Piece for Violin and Cello (1953). It was only when preparing an analysis of his work some years later that Banks “was surprised to find out and which I didn’t associate at the time … that I’d used precisely the same twelve-tone series … a very unconscious tribute to my teacher.”

Several other relevant points should be raised here. The first is that in the period between the Studies and Episodes, Banks was “beginning works and never really completing them … a string quartet … a solo violin piece … quite a complicated work for string orchestra … an extended piano piece”. The question arising from this fact is: did he experience some kind of writer’s block which led him, consciously or not, to return to a successful formula when composing for a duo combination for the first time in a decade? This question may only be addressed if the works discussed here are not considered in isolation; therefore a brief

---

2 From the 1972 interview with Hazel de Berg (preserved in the Oral History Collection of the National Library of Australia).
3 Ibid.
examination of his other solo and chamber works dating from the intervening years is necessary.

There are three: *Pezzo Dramatico* (1956), *Sonata da Camera* (1961) and *Horn Trio* (1962). All are serial, the first two based on twelve-tone rows and the third on "a kind of eight-note configuration." In his short, solo piano piece *Pezzo Dramatico*, Banks restricted himself to two forms of the row, prime and retrograde, basing much of the work on two of the important structural elements identified in both works examined in the present study: a chromatic cell (here a tetrachord) and a repeated-note figure. Coming only two years after *Three Studies*, this piece thus provides the earliest manifestation of a deliberate intellectual challenge such as he subsequently set himself when writing *Three Episodes* and the *Hysteria* film score combining jazz and twelve-tone elements that preceded it. Examination of the sketch pages for *Pezzo Dramatico* reveals numerous preliminary fragments for, and abandoned versions of, the opening passage which constitute the most extensive sketch series of the work. Together with the fact that several other fragments are slotted into Banks' earliest score, a general similarity in procedure and materials to the two works discussed in this study may be noted.

In the octet *Sonata da Camera*, his initial structural cell was a three-note set comprising perfect fourth, augmented fourth and minor second intervals, the same combination as the third group sketched on the earliest page of *Three Episodes* fragments. This material evolved into three related twelve-tone rows, the second of which to be written was identical to Seiber's. Chromatic units and repeated-note figures again play a significant role in parts of the score, but as little sketch material survives, details of the compositional process are unknown.

The principal serial unit of the *Horn Trio* is comprised largely of perfect fourths and minor seconds, while a secondary element consists of an accented descending semitone. Once again repeated-note figures are used motivically throughout, and the sketch series for the eight-bar introduction in the first movement, on which all subsequent material in that movement is based, is the most extensive of the work.

---

4 Ibid. This eight-note set actually contains only seven different pitch-classes.
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This overview of the various significant similarities of both method and materials in Banks’ completed intervening chamber works suggests a continuity in his compositional process throughout the decade which began with the *Studies*. It supports the theory that he was constantly looking for intellectual challenges, a theory supported by his own words: “The idea of inspiration is a very beautiful one and certainly I believe in the promptings of the subconscious and of musical impulse, but I also have to believe that this won’t operate, it will go to sleep on you, unless you’ve done your intellectual work beforehand.” 5

5 Ibid.
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