Morton Feldman: The Johannesburg Masterclasses, July 1983
Session 6: Works by Dirk de Klerk & Matteo Fargion

Transcribed by Dirk de Klerk

Voices heard:
Morton Feldman (MF)
Matteo Fargion (Matteo)
Barry Jordan (BJ)
Dirk de Klerk (DdK)
David Kosviner (DK)
Peter Klatzow (PK)
Jacques de Vos Malan (JdVM)
Mary Rörich (MR)
Kevin Volans (KV)
Unidentified Voices (UV)

MF: Your scores on Kinder paper. You don't hand this in for a kind of session like this. You make a nice copy. [...].

DdK: Yes I'm sorry, it's the only copy that was available.

MF: I like the fact that it's not *stencilled* and all the kind of affectations of the West. I mean, I like that, you know, but at the same time I think it's a little too relaxed, it should look good.

DdK: Yes it's very old, I wrote that many years ago.

MF: And actually what I would like to do on Thursday afternoon, is take some of the younger composers and just criticise how you make your G clef. What's needed, what's not needed, and just what it looks like.

You put a copyright on the *right* side of a page. It's on the *left* side of the page. [...] The thing needs to be covered, so someone can't psychoanalyse you by way of your score, you know what I mean? Just keep it neat and nice.

OK, why don't we go on right to the song?

Peter, before we begin, to what degree are you critical of what a page looks like?

DdK: My pages don't look like that anymore.

MF: This has nothing to do with you, I'm just using you as a fall-guy as we would say.

PK: Well, I would assume that a student never handed in work like this. I don't mind looking at a rough score, I don't mind how rough it is in the initial stages. I don't want to see a neat score in every session that we have.

MF: Naturally.

PK: But when it comes to the end, and it's handed in, then it has to be a lot neater than this. But your work *is* neater than this.

DdK: Yes.

PK: He's actually got a beautiful calligraphy. Why have we got this copy?

DdK: I never envisaged that we were going to do this, so I didn't bring any other scores. And Jacques suggested that we do this because they have a recording of this.

PK: You're off the hook!

DdK: *Grense* I wrote in 1980, I think, and the other one in 1981.

MF: One of my devil advocate thoughts about the whole concept of beginning, middle and end: if it's still viable.

Again, back to self expression. Why would you need all those dynamics?

It's like years ago I was at a party with Zero Mostel. I'm sure Zero Mostel was known here. And there was a great Yiddish comedienne, and she was going through her famous routines, and it was her party. And a lot of people were sitting on chairs and on the floor, and there was a whole group of non-Jews sitting there. And Zero Mostel said to them, would you want me to translate for you? And he said, "Oh, that would be very kind of you, Mr Mostel." So Molly Picon would say something in Yiddish, Zero Mostel turns to the

gentile people and repeats exactly in Yiddish what Molly Picon just said! So this whole business of having all these dynamics, rather than to help even *the word painting.* What's this thing about polyphony and too much polyphony?

DK The muchphony.

MF: Muchphony, yes. I could apply it here. Feel secure, like Schubert... [Sings expressively] But actually with no […] There's nothing there! It's in the line and everything. So when you write a song, do away with all of that padding, it's not necessary.

The only thing - and I like the piece very much - the only thing that really disturbs me about the piece is again the whole business of accompaniment and melody, accompaniment and melody. I would have liked that piano part really to become a composition, and have it *work*, you know. And at times, the best times of the piece is when the piano starts off and you think it's going to go, but immediately stops. And that's the best parts, when you actually see it. That's all I got to say about your piece. I don't particularly like beginning, middle and end.

PK: There's one thing that worries me in it, and I think we've discussed this before, and that is, there's a kind of reflex action. That the activity in the piano parts takes place at the voice cadences. In other words, as the voice reaches the end of a phrase, then the piano starts turning into a little commotion. And then, the minute the voice comes again, the piano recedes into the background. And I think that, actually, some very interesting textures could have been built up if you had combined activity in both parts at the same time. Not always, of course. But it's too much like a reflex action, that everything happens pianistically at the end of the vocal phrase.

MF: But what I do like about it is that at least you're trying to break up some kind of… Say, there's a mixture of both the motif of the lyricism of it and then a little drama. And I don't feel that the dramatic parts are notated right. I don't feel that the pauses in between are right.

They are *never* right, so use fermatas, you know, like Boulez. You have a little pause, don't even measure, put a fermata. Especially in something like a song. A chamber piece is another thing, but in a song, use fermatas and it looks very good. [Laughs]

But learn how to make a fermata. Most people can't make a fermata. I always have trouble. […] I never liked the way the curve looks: it's going this way, that way. Some people said, "Oh, John Cage likes a square fermata." But he does it with a certain type of pen, and if you do it with your pen it wouldn't look as good. What kind of fermatas do *you* like?

PK: *Very* elegant. I've got the right pen to do it, but I haven't got it on me now.

MF: Do you use a compass for it?

PK: No.

DK: French curve?

PK: No, it's too small [to use a French curve].

MF: Because, essentially, it is a kind of theatre. So the pacing is very important. [...]

Oh, am I glad Jeanne's not here! I've got to tell you a story about a singer.

On Saturday afternoon years ago in America was the opera, Metropolitan Opera [on the radio]. And I used to listen, lying down on the couch you know just listening to this opera. So I put on the opera one day. And I think it was Richard Strauss. And my grandmother comes in at me, and she says, "Please, Morton, no ladies, no ladies!" [Laughter]

There's something not really that attractive about a female voice. And it would seem questionable to what degree a voice is really that attractive. It's very subjective. But I have very varied problems. For example, say, like a young voice. I always can tell the age of a voice. I don't like young voices and I don't like old voices. If only Lolita could sing! [Laughter]

PK: That's strange from somebody who wrote *Rothko Chapel*!

MF: Well, I never liked any singer that ever sang it. I shudder when they open their mouth. [...] There's a girl by the name of [Phyllis Bryn-]Julson. She sings a lot in London – Boulez. It's the *only* voice that's absolutely got it right.

Voices are a very, very personal thing. I don't think there's such a thing just as a woman's voice when you write a song. I wonder. Because it never really sounds like it. There's always something in the tone or something that is just not right. Which you could compromise, say, with a clarinet or an oboe.

I think also the counterpoint is a little too exposed, a little bit too exposed.

DdK: What bothers me very much about the piece is the fact that it seems to be stuttering. When I wrote it I imagined a much greater continuity than what it ever sounds like. So as far as that's concerned I don't think it's…

MF: What do you mean by "stutter"?

DdK: It sort of doesn't seem to flow.

UV: Yes, Professor, of course you don't know the language, but this is a very simple sort of flowing I think. I think it is too complicated given, if you think of the words... Don't you think so?

DdK: What do you mean?

UV: Well you said you wanted it more flowing because the poem is like that, that's a very straightforward, well not straightforward…..

JdVM: But there are some places where what Dirk calls "stuttering" is called for. There are words like *verlatenheid*.

PK: I know what you mean, but I think it's because you keep on stopping the piano part.

DdK: Yes, that's right. But in any case, I think that, if you start discussing sort of individual words it's a slightly dangerous area.

It is an over-composed piece in a sense that I worked too slowly on it to really. I mean every little bit became very important to me and it's not good you know. I don't think one should put poetry to music like that. Schubert never did it and he has this melody that sort of attacks the whole vibe.

BJ: I find that in relation to the text that the song is kind of filled with a kind of super-Bergian angst that maybe is not quite what is exactly called for.

PK: "His naked soul," that's the first line: "My naked soul." I don't think that has a super-Bergian agst there. [Laughter]

MF: I don't know… I think this is a kind of a exaggeration of that period. I don't know one song in that particular period that has *this* amount of angst. I can't think of one. Even *Erwartung*. I mean [in *Erwartung*] she's too *busy* to think of angst. [Laughter]

One of the interesting things about Peter's piece when we hear his *Chamber Concerto*, and I think I'll mention it now, is that, notice the different type of rhythmic notation that Peter would use, say, for example, for the guitar, or whatever instrument. And there's this terrific adjustment I found… and I don't know if you were conscious of it when you did it, we'll talk about that tomorrow. And how he adopts the *pacing* of the instrument to both the rhythmic… and how it's notated. And I always wonder when I look at a score when I see that everybody seems to work within a kind of composite type of notation. I think it works *beautifully* with Schoenberg. I think it works beautifully in the classical period in someone like Mozart, where every instrument looks as if it's written the same, you know? But you will notice in a sense that the *pacing* is different.

For example, my favourite example is the pacing for example of [Sings]. Think of a violin playing that [Sings]. Doesn't work! [Laughs] And so *they* found it, in terms of their tempo and everything. Much more concerned about tempo than we are, today. I mean, to us, today, the crotchet is sixty.

Which is the AIDS of modernistic [music]. I'm afraid I'm one of the people that were responsible for it, but still it's disastrous. I think it was *disastrous* to modern music - not aleatory, not this, not that but - crotchet equals sixty.

Ahh, it's too early in the morning to get upset! OK, so I wonder for example if the vocal part should be written in the same way, in the same rhythmic style, as the piano part. And for a marvellous model of the notation of vocal music, an *unsurpassable* model will be Boulez in *Pli selon Pli.* I mean, look at it! Don't become influenced by it, because it will destroy you. But just look at it, in relation to the instrumental parts.

What also bothers me somewhat in the writing of piano parts, is that many times it looks like four-part harmony when it's not four-part harmony. Just [in terms] of what stems go up and what stems go down.

Try an experiment: Do it without dynamics. After all, you know dynamics, in a sense, take care of themselves. Obviously, something low is not going to sound as soft as something high. Do it without dynamics, let it just enunciate the poem without…

When you put in these dynamics, it's like putting hurdles for the singer to jump over or something. They have enough with their voice. Most of them can't sing, you know. Most of them only have about four or five good notes, really, you see. You don't have to worry about expression.

I was once teaching in Siena for a Columbia University Summer Session, and every time, just as we were walking down this little street and turned into this cold loft that they rented, there was someone – it

was a music school – there was someone singing. Soprano, doing only scales. It was... [Sings scales]. As she went up the scale it was... [Sings] because she couldn't get the notes. And we used to stand there until she reached it, because it made our day! It was the comic event of the day. But she put *expression* into the notes, because she couldn't sing. It was too high, you see. So you don't have to worry, you got a high note, it's very expressive.

[...]

[A recording of music by Matteo Fargion is to be played next]

Matteo: Before we play it, I must tell you the story about the cellist.

MF: OK.

Matteo: This was written with certain people in mind and the cellist was Human Coetzee. Some of you probably know him. And about a month before we would have come to Johannesburg, I heard the story that he was going to get married on the 4th of July. So I went to him. Now if there's an absent-minded musician, then it's Human Coetzee. So I told him, "Remember, we're going to Johannesburg." "Yes doctor, yes doctor." "When are we going to Johannesburg?" "On the 2nd to the 9th, is that correct?" "Yes." "Are you getting married?" "Oh, goodness!" he said. [Laughter]

You know what happened? The night of the concert I had to find another cellist. And I couldn't really because they were all in Stellenbosch doing this course. So that's why I had this bad cellist, it just happened. And the night we performed this, who turned up in Johannesburg, but Human Coetzee! He didn't get married, he decided at the last moment, "Ach no, why?" [Laughter]

PK: You trust somebody like that with your music?

Matteo: He plays the cello so well! You know him?

PK: Yeah.

Matteo: So we'll come and do it in the Baxter [Concert Hall] with Human Coetzee.

MF: As we are setting up the tape, I want all the *Kinder* [German: kids] to notice how the piano starts off with that simple tremolo. In other words, it doesn't start off looking like a piano part, necessarily. So that, for me, is important. That the composer that wrote this is not caught in any kind of stylistic attitude about what a piano should be, or what a piano should sound like for the opening of his piece.

Not one of you would have opened up with a non-piano piano part that sounds very, very good on the piano. Do you see what I mean? It's important to notice things like that when you see a score.

In other words, when you look at something, why doesn't it look like *my* music? And then ask the question, *Why?*

Is this in C? Is everything in C?

Matteo: No.

MF: It's already transposed. OK.

How do you feel about scores in C?

Matteo: I would have preferred it but they don't, once they play it.

MF: Do they play this off the score?

Matteo: Yes.

MF: Do you prefer scores to parts in a small piece like this?

Matteo: Yes. That's why I had to transpose it.

I had a very nasty experience with that. With the first piece I was commissioned by the SABC, it was in '72. I wrote in C, and I said so on the score. Some of the copyists didn't notice this, and just wrote it like that just. And the late Anton Hartman came with the orchestra. There was an entry for the horns... [sings]. They played... [Sings, very low]. Disaster!

MF: Also, look at *this* vocal part in relation to *your* vocal part, or the vocal part in relation to the instrumental part, and you will see that the instrumental part is full of all kinds of crescendos, decrescendos or different type of colour modulations. And I also noticed that the young lady here is kind of left alone, just to sing, you see.

PK: I think they're ready with the tape. Shall we hear it?

[A recording of Matteo Fargion's *Six Songs (1983)* with texts by John Lennon is played]

MF: Another thing that I want to point out next [is that] a lot of young composers never notice... because they don't read scores and they don't read the scores listening to things and catch very, very subtle things that makes for magic, and you wonder why. And yet it's all there on the page. So I advise you all to be more *score* oriented, rather than sitting like you were sitting yesterday, grooving to what you *thought* you were hearing.

We find here in the early stages of the piece a *very* subtle distinction between, say, a phrase of three notes, or two notes, and then two notes without the phrase. And you hear it, it's there. And it's very, very important. Because it's the foreplay, technically, of what is to happen compositionally in the piece. It allows the piece, then, to get involved with other musics, very subtly and very elegantly.

Notice the way the composer, when he saw that he didn't have to write a piano part, did very interesting things with, essentially, a non-piano part. Not afraid of anything. I have only one place that I question the orchestration of the piano part. And I bet you might even agree with me. And that is on page 8.

Matteo: The link?

MF: The link.

Matteo: Yes, I agree.

MF: Because I feel the octave link takes away when you hear the octave. It's the only place where I feel you're kind of like, smoking a cigarette and relaxed a little bit.

Matteo: A cup of tea

MF: You had a cup of tea.

Matteo: And too many biscuits.

MF: Here's another thing in the use of counterpoint which is *exquisite* here, absolutely exquisite. We're on page 8, we're going to turn back to page 4 too, but let's stay on page 8. Those two measures where the counterpoint is going up in the same direction.

And then if you turn to page 4, the power of counterpoint there, of also the last system... also the same thing, with a different rhythm. Also, notice that many of the repetitions come back with a different kind of rhythmic pacing, which the composer felt was needed because it's not exactly, even if you wanted a return… he had to make a return in terms of all the information that was happening *before*. So very seldom you find *literal* repetition. Occasionally. But the use of parallel… thing…, which should have been a great lesson from the Beatles and John Lennon. Because that was the beauty of their music. [Laughs]

Also, and this is something that you find in Stravinsky, and it's very, very hard to catch how he's really doing it. And it's difficult here, too. The effectiveness of the freer writing and emerging pattern situations. And the juxtaposing of this more free writing - or looser writing, or more non-patterned writing - into pattern areas in a very, very beautiful, very, very effective way. Also: *is* the tremolo an accompaniment, or is it like an image? It's interesting. That's a very amazing thing, how some composers can take a tremolo and it's a tremolo - like a Saint Vitus school, whatever it is. [Laughter] Other people could take an ostinato and it's an accompaniment. Other people could take an ostinato and it's absolutely magical.

In fact I think the prototype of all ostinatos in the early twentieth century was the gorgeous way Mahler uses the harp ostinato. Oh, *you'll* like this! The *Kinder*totenlieder! [Laughter] Remember the harp? It turned everybody on. The Webern *Five Pieces* got into the ostinato, and Schoenberg. They discovered the beauty of an ostinato. Many times my students hear an ostinato and they think it's some kind of simplistic accompaniment.

Then, of course, historical memory. It didn't bother me, because it wasn't the same music. But when the song began, I really couldn't help but think of the Villa-Lobos, and how wonderful that sounds. Just *total* success. [Laughs] Total jackpot! But it reminded me, when you take that language and you just let it go, and you have the right curves and the light motion. It's absolutely gorgeous. [...]

I *do* have problems... [...] and I had it with this illustrious composer here on my left [PK]. I have problems with the French horn. But it's my problem.

PK: May I help you? [Laughter]

MF: But you know, people like Freud might have made his problems everybody's problems. And sometimes I feel I don't have a problem, but the composer has a problem. It [the French horn] does evoke something to me. It evokes… There's something about the instrument. I was telling Peter. If you're familiar with Schoenberg's marvellous article on instrumentation in *Style and Idea*, he starts going on a big trip about how fantastic the horn is. The wonders that it could do... He never uses it!

I have problems with the horn. It does evoke a heroic element. I just can't get it out of my head. It does evoke Scandinavia, for some particular reason. I feel I'm in Stockholm. I have problems with the horn even as a kind of contrapuntal texture. And it's very, very difficult: to what degree one is going to work in its kind of polyphonic way, different colours, it's absolutely... it's just difficult. [...]

I had trouble with the horn in this piece, less trouble of course when it's in a solo. And it's a good horn player.

I had trouble with the cello. I had trouble with the cello making it sound more important than maybe the composer really wanted to make it, the way it stands out. Sometimes we accept it, but maybe didn't *want* it that important, or we want it important, but not that *noticeable*. We don't notice a clarinet line when it plays something gorgeous. A *viola*, maybe. There's something… I think that the cello is a very, very difficult instrument to use now, in… I'm just trying to think of Stravinsky in his instrumentation of a piece, if I remember any cello there.

Of course, when you want these lines to come in and out I mean you can't say… I think it's degree. And for me in this piece, which I think is a marvellous piece, I feel that the instrumentation is a little too: *now this, now that*, rather than just listening to it, and then… just hearing the music and not hearing the instrument. To have your cake and eat it too. But not to the degree of the beef stroganoff of *Pierrot Lunaire*. Of that loss of identity at certain places of the instrument. Some place in the middle.

But it's a wonderful piece, and I love the pacing of the patterns. I love the use… notice the way that the wordplay in the foreplay of just the right *consonant*, the right *words*, how he would use it, how he organised his material, that the words and the play on the words and the subtle variation of the pattern and the subtle variation of the word in relation to the pattern is wonderful, absolutely wonderful.

PK: I think you are right.

MF: But at the same time, what I'm really talking about… If the composition doesn't get you the instrumentation does! What I'm really talking about is evidently an instrumental style of the composer. He hears these things coming out, he hears this and that. I mean it's like you asking me why my piece wasn't for three pianos. I feel that me talking about his piece in this way is almost you remark, your know.

Now the reason, the reason I feel that this is a very, very dangerous area, instrumentally is only because of the very exposed writing, that's all. An exposed writing that…At the same time I don't like a uniform instrumentation. That wouldn't have worked here either.

Matteo: No, I think with a better cellist still it would still sound much better actually.

MF: Probably would with a better cello.

How about the horn? You don't have any problems with the horn?

Matteo: No, not really.

MF: And *you* don't have any problems?

PK: No.

MF: See?

Does anyone here have any problems with the horn?

Raise your left hand. Mary?

MR: Not in this piece I don't.

MF: But in principle you do have problems?

MR: It tends to remind me of the use of the horn in the *Serenade* for tenor, horn and strings of [Benjamin] Britten. Not that that's a bad thing, but I think that it relates to what you were saying about the heroic sort of quality of the whole thing. It's a sort of fairly heroic piece, you know, which exemplifies the Scandinavian quality.

MF: When Boulez' record came out of Harrison Birtwistle's *The Triumph of Time*, I was sitting with Harry listening to the piece and he said, "What do you think?" I said, "The orchestration is tremendous." He said, "What bothers you?" I said, "When those horns came in."

It's like, if you use a horn, it's like a ready-made Henry Moore. [Laughter] Hey! Monumental!

PK: It doesn't always have to be. There's a long passage for example in [Birtwistle's] *The Fields of Sorrow* where he uses horn and vibraphone, and in fact, he uses the vibraphone as a kind of harmonic over the horn, and they balance each other and it's rather an unusual kind of sound.

MF: Well, in his generation there was a great horn player... What the hell's his name?

JdVM: Barry Tuckwell.

MF: Yeah, because in that first early post-student piece of his, the *Sappho Fragments*, the horn is used beautifully. I could never do it and maybe I had trouble with the horns because we could never get a horn player. Though, there was a young fellow... In fact, if you ever get hold of a piece by Christian Wolff with piano and horn, it's sensational. Unfortunately this young man died. He played the horn like a cello. If your back was to him and he played a note you wouldn't know what it was. But he's dead. Tut!

So I had problems. I had… it's a kind of instant. I don't like instruments to become *instant* something. It's like… I don't like instant rice, instant coffee.

PK: You have such bad instant coffee in the States, I'm told? [Laughter]

MF: No, no. We have commercials where you're sitting in this most expensive restaurant in San Francisco. It's a famous commercial. And everybody is saying how good the coffee is. And some woman leans over to the maitre d' and says, "Oh. I loved your coffee! What is it?" And he says, "Maxim." And they do the test, they go around to all the big hotels and restaurants, passing on this instant coffee you see. You get an endorsement. With paid actors and actresses, of course.

Yes, I don't like instruments that have instant success like *a capella chorus*.

You want to get down on your knees and pray the minute they come in. [Laughter] You want to pray like St Augustine: "Save me, save me, but not yet!" [Laughter]

The minute you get diversified instruments, [...] you're not covering yourself. The instrument itself might have a successful element of its timbre, but it's not successful in terms of the instrumentalists. You can give this to a student group and play this, and you'll have a nervous breakdown! So in a sense, there is danger here in your choice of instruments.

So it's a difficult thing, it's a difficult thing and it does become a very personal thing, about what is the element of the success of a combination. Sometimes you know it. The most unlikely things could be fantastic, like the Schoenberg *Serenade*.

I personally have always had problems with Boulez' *Marteau*. I felt that the viola didn't work. And the young lady that I wrote *The Viola in My Life* for, at the time of our romance, was learning that [the *Marteau*] by memory. So when Boulez looked down and she was playing it, she was looking at him right in the eye. And I heard that scratchy part for six months and she was tops. And I've heard her other performance, and then I think he just wanted to get away from the cliché of the violin coming in playing passages. I think that's all he wanted to do. It was a miscalculation. Too noticeable. The viola can't work with that speed. It can't work with that speed.

DK: Pete, I remember you saying many years ago we were talking about the *Marteau* that you felt that it's deficiency was that all instruments were really alto instruments in the middle of the range.

PK: I remember.

MF: But [...] I *like* that and I like that middle colour. But it's as if he's writing down in a restaurant. Middle... Middle... "Oh of course... viola." [Laughs]. It bothers me. It's purely subjective, but like all things subjective I feel I'm right. Maybe that's a definition of subjective.

Beautiful piece.

We go on to the John Lennon influence...

UV: I'd like to take up a point that you mentioned earlier about sound, grooving on sound. I take your point that one can learn a lot from actually looking through a score by careful attention to various details in it. But at the same time it seems to me that one can, if one goes further than that, one can end up relying too much on one's actual eye.

MF: No, it's not an eye. It's your ear you're relying on. For example, in the bad recording of *Flute and Orchestra*, which I thought the cassette wasn't doing too well. Or Bunita Marcus's piece. If it's obvious on a bad recording that, if you're looking at the music, you *hear* that which you wouldn't necessarily catch.

I don't trust anybody's ears, including my own, and I've got some of the best ears around. I don't trust my ears. But the score tells everything. It tells how to notate phenomena, it tells orchestration, little *points* that you pick up that you didn't even know *existed,* that sparks you onto different ideas.

Let me give you a perfect example. In *Pierrot Lunaire,* crotchet equals - I'm not sure about the numbers - crotchet equals seventy-six dash forty-two. Believe, it or not. No, the other way!

What that taught me was, why is the accelerando starting and then building? Why not start the other way? Of course we call it a ritard. But as an image, and not as a ritard, understand me? But you start the other way see, you start faster going slower. But I didn't really think of it logically as a ritard. I thought of it

you see just getting little faster, but the other way. Not as ritard or even as the image of ritard, if you want to use that.

So there are things that you pick up on scores.

When I was a kid [in] the *Farben* movement of the Schoenberg *Five Pieces for Orchestra* a little notation to the conductor, "Don't try to balance out the instruments," was *terrific*. Like stuffing a mattress. Like stuffing a mattress, that little bit of reality.

I feel one of the dramatic differences between this generation and my generation - and you can see it in a concert hall now - when I went to a concert hall, I would say that a tremendous portion of the audience had scores with them. I never went to a symphonic concert or a piano recital without a score. And I feel that the reason you are in trouble - and you *are* in trouble - is because you no longer score oriented and you don't go to live music enough with the scores.

There's nothing like hearing *Harold in Italy* outdoors, like in Tanglewood, and you'd hear how this music sounds in that particular environment. You hear the orchestration, you hear the articulation with the score. It's just like that, the secret is just like that. I guarantee everyone here - and if I'm still alive in twenty years let me know if I'm right - look at scores, listen to live music with scores and you have a career. How do you like that? I'll put it in writing.

Of course, if you don't have a career it's that you were listening to the wrong live music and the wrong scores! [Laughter]

OK, [Matteo's] *Six Songs*... I'm very friendly to the John Lennon Foundation. A young man called me from Los Angeles and he got a grant from the John Lennon Foundation to come and study piano with me. And he didn't want to let me know, but he just hopes I'll have some time for him. So I said what did you get? He said two thousand dollars. I said, come East! What shall I charge him?

PK: Two thousand dollars an interview.

MF: [Then] I'm only going to see him once!

Well listen, I think you [Matteo] have an affinity for this world that's amounts to a kind of genius.

I suggest that you stop studying, stop coming to places like this. Go to America. Do you know the art songs of Ned Rorem?

Matteo: No.

MF: He'll commit suicide if you don't!

Don't get involved with any… Don't study anymore, you don't need it.

KV: He's my student.

MF: He's your only student!

KV: You can't do that to me! [Laughter]

MF: I think they [Matteo's songs] are wonderful. I mean it's like a duck to water. I mean it's just *marvellous*. Everything about it is marvellous. But I wouldn't advise you to study in case you might go off in another direction.

How you do it in a sense of theatre, everything about it is like, it's faultless, there's nothing to criticise. So what the hell do you have to go to him [KV] for, there's nothing to criticise.

Could you criticise anything?

KV: No.