

Nigel Butterley's *Pentad* (1968) A Unique Composition for Woodwind and Brass

> BRYAN GRIFFITHS

Elder Conservatorium of Music / University of Adelaide (Australia)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0880-6116>

> HOW TO CITE:

Griffiths, Brian. 2020. «Nigel Butterley's *Pentad* (1968). A Unique Composition for Woodwind and Brass». *Estudios bandísticos · Wind Band Studies* 4: 73-89.

ABSTRACT

Written for, premiered by and historically anchored to the Sydney Symphony Orchestra, Nigel Butterley's *Pentad* (1968) has, in recent years, become increasingly mobile in its adoption by the Australian wind band movement. A rare and innovative work for twenty-seven woodwind and brass instruments, *Pentad* exemplifies the modernist '60s in Australian music composition, which poses some barriers to immediately recognising its merits. Considering the work in the context of this period, as well as alongside developments in the wind band movement locally and abroad, this article aims to propagate new nodes for its reception with the further presentation of the 2017 critical-performative edition that has aided in its revival.

KEYWORD

Nigel Butterley,
Australian Wind Bband Movement,
Australian Modernism,
Orchestral Wind Section,
Australian Commission.

Acknowledgments

My thanks John Lynch and Alan Maddox and Terry Hughes for their generous feedback during the drafting process.

Among the most fascinating twentieth-century works for winds to have emerged from the pen of an Australian composer is surely Nigel Butterley's *Pentad*. Commissioned by the University of Sydney to occasion the twenty-first anniversary of its music department's founding (Jones 2005, 402), the Sydney Symphony Orchestra (SSO) premiered the work in 1969, within a program of contemporary Asian, Australian and European compositions. Butterley wrote *Pentad* to accommodate the specific variety of instruments that comprised the then woodwind and brass sections of the SSO (Jones 2005, 402), which would remain the primary site of its performance over the ensuing two decades. Recent years, however, are exciting in the work's ongoing history, as we see it less glued to its place of origin and potentially entering wider circulation via the Australian wind band movement.

Except for a single 1977 performance by Chicagoland's Northwestern University Symphonic Wind Ensemble (which Butterley conducted himself), *Pentad* has otherwise only received Australian orchestral treatments, with the SSO's last in 1989. Thereafter, *Pentad* remained silent until its 2016 'resurrection' for a concert featuring all-Australian wind band repertoire with the Adelaide Wind Orchestra. Part of what facilitated its revival is the research presented here on its conception and compositional background, which includes surprising details revealed in the course of an interview with Butterley. This research culminated in the preparation of a new 2017 critical-performative edition, which prompted the work's most recent and highest-profile performance yet: in 2019, conductor John Lynch and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music's Wind Symphony took the work with them to Buñol, Spain, to showcase at the eighteenth conference of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE).

Butterley and *Pentad*: Australian Modernism

The Sydney-based Butterley (b. 1935) would –alongside his most noted contemporaries Peter Sculthorpe and Richard Meale –establish himself as a leading voice in Australian music in the 1960s. This was a decade of significant transformation in Australian composition, characterised by an ardent embrace of the modernist aesthetic. While composers such as John Antill and Raymond Hanson of the preceding generation had sampled the modernist idiom,¹ by the 1960s the establishment would deem their efforts, modernist or otherwise, 'derivative and old-fashioned' (McNeil 2010, 153); as a result, they would have little, if any, of the influence one might expect upon the generation succeeding them. Indeed, such was general regard for contemporary Australian composition at the time that Donald Pert, the then head of the University of

¹ Most notably Antill in his 1946 ballet, *Corroboree*, and Hanson in his Piano Sonata (1938-40, rev. 1963) and Trumpet Concerto (1947)

Sydney's music department, retrospectively remarked that 'in 1956, there was really almost nothing worth performing in the way of strictly contemporary music in Australia' (Pert 1969).

So it was largely without direction from domestic precursors that the modernism of Butterley and others emerged. Instead, it was their overseas counterparts that would serve as their point of reference –but decidedly not for exercises in mimicry. Butterley and his generation sought to self-fashion their own techniques and practices, which yielded highly original modernist works (Covell 1967, 269). Wrestling Australian composition from the stiflingly conventional musical tradition largely inherited from the British Empire, these works inaugurated a new level of sophistication and maturity of writing aligned with the contemporaneous developments of greater Europe (O'Connell 2000, 25).

Insofar as Butterley contributed to this shift, it began with his incorporation of serialist technique in his 1963 octet *Laudes*. In its expansion on the Pierrot ensemble we can spy an early attraction to the timbral potential of woodwind and brass instruments, with the flute and clarinet respectively doubling alto and bass, and the further addition of trumpet, horn and viola. Following *Laudes*, Butterley embarked, in Elliot Gyger's words, on 'an invigorating exploration of modernist possibilities' (2015, 1), pursuing them both theoretically and conceptually.

Where before he predominantly traded in the composition of choral music, various combinations of wind and percussion instruments would constitute a distinguishing trait of this period. For three amateur instrumental groups consisting of various recorders, woodwinds, brasses, percussion and optional strings, *Canticle of the Sun* (1965) is an example of Butterley narrowing the palette to winds and percussion alone. Though reincorporating choral elements, his radiophonic *In the Head the Fire* (1966) represents a finer tuning of specific ensemble configurations for winds, with an orchestral wind and brass section used as its basis and percussion, recorders, shofar and organ supplementing. Commissioned by what would become the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), *In the Head the Fire* was awarded the prestigious *Prix Italia*, bringing international attention to Butterley for the first time.

Interestingly, the presence of recorders persists in *Music for Sunrise* (1967), which features a minimum of seven, along with flute and percussion. And Butterley's first major orchestral work, *Meditations of Thomas Traherne* (1968), includes twenty-two descant recorders to be played by children. Compositions for the wind quintet with additional instrumentation also appeared, such as Butterley's strictest serialist work (Gyger 2015, 56), *Variations* (1967) and *Carmina* (1968, rev. 1990).

In an oeuvre principally defined by the communication of extra-musical concepts, Butterley's compositions, including *Refractions* (1969) and his *Violin Concerto* (1970), as well as the aforementioned *Variations*, would become noted for their abstract nature. And completed in December of 1968, *Pentad*, retaining Butterley's captivation with

winds, sits among these, but also artistically stands apart, marking with *Explorations* (1970), in Michael Hooper's estimation, the peak of Butterley's modernist powers (2019, 122).

Butterley's music, however, has never truly been regarded as 'aggressively modern' (Ford 1993, 165). In the mid-nineties, he even retrospectively described himself as 'an old-fashioned modernist'² and admitted that he found the strict adherence to serialism arid (Ford 1993, 166-167). Rather, Butterley utilised the principles of dodecaphony as a starting point and the discussed works of his middle period feature polyphonic and heterophonic textures derived from, but not rigidly beholden to, the technique (Gyger 2015, 2–3). In *Pentad*, two motives in particular exemplify this practice: one uses the ordered repetition of an eleven note-row as the basis for alterations such as retrograde, truncation, transposition and resequencing; the other takes a seven-note pitch-set as the basis for creating a rhythmically complex heterophonic texture. Other motives feature dense chordal masses and aleatoric gestures, and another—uniquely, if simply—is but a distant monophonic line.

Deconstructing *Pentad*

Elliot Gyger has provided a robust analysis of *Pentad* amongst a study of Butterley's complete works to date (Gyger 2015, 96-100). For readers already familiar with Gyger's, the following analysis will offer new and slightly revisionary interpretations. These will hopefully intrigue and encourage readers to seek out the work for further study and performance and provide a fresh foundation for approaching it, particularly among prospective conductors.

Pentad is an unusual work in Butterley's corpus in that its title reflects the form of its composition. The five motivic ideas—each distinct in design, assembly, expression, texture, and orchestration—seemingly heighten their contrast between one another through their successive statements, where each motive is stated a total of five times. The motives grow, diminish, or alternate in dynamic; intensify or remain consistent in their texture; expand, recede or maintain a constant length; and vary in their orchestration. Their chronological arrangement, however difficult to formally rationalise, is resultantly musically fulfilling, as their ever interchanging order of presentation, when combined with their ensuing development, provides a sense of pacing, conversation, and even paints larger structures in play. Following Gyger's table of the work's structure (Gyger 2015, 97), I have provided a similar table below (fig. 1, following page) with additional information relevant to our discussion.

² Strachan, Laurie. 1995. "Beyond 60." *The Weekend Australian*, June 3, 1995.

| Figure | Motive | Duration/phrasing | Dynamics | Tempo |
|--------|--------|-------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | A1 | 5 bars | <i>mp, mf, f, ff</i> | 48 |
| 1 | B1 | 4 bars | <i>f</i> | 108 |
| 2 | C1 | 5 bars | <i>pp</i> | 72 |
| 3 | A2 | 5 bars | <i>mf</i> | 48 |
| 4 | D1 | 7 bars, 4 phrases | <i>mp</i> | 48 |
| 5 | E1 | 4 bars | <i>p</i> | 48 |
| 6 | B2 | 7 bars | <i>f</i> | 108 |
| 7 | E2 | 4 bars | <i>pp</i> | 48 |
| 8 | C2 | 5 bars | <i>mp</i> | 72 |
| 9 | D2 | 6 bars, 3 phrases | <i>mp</i> | 48 |
| 10 | A3 | 5 bars | <i>mp, f</i> | 48 |
| 11 | E3 | 4 bars | <i>f</i> | 48 |
| 12 | A4 | 2 bars | <i>p</i> | 48 |
| 13 | B3 | 10 bars | <i>ff</i> | 108 |
| 14 | B4 | 11 bars | <i>pp</i> | 108 |
| 15 | C3 | 5 bars | <i>mf</i> | 72 |
| 16 | D3 | 5 bars, 3 phrases | <i>mp</i> | 48 |
| 17 | E4 | 4 bars | <i>pp</i> | 48 |
| 18 | D4 | 4 bars, 2 phrases | <i>p</i> | 48 |
| 19 | A5 | 5 bars | <i>pp</i> | 48 |
| 20 | D5 | 3 bars, 2 phrases | <i>pp</i> | 48 |
| 21 | C4 | 5 bars | <i>f</i> | 72 |
| 22 | B5 | 14 bars | <i>ff</i> | 108 |
| 23 | C5 | 5 bars | <i>ff</i> | 72 |
| 24 | E5 | 4 bars | <i>mp, p, mf, pp</i> | 48 |

Figure 1. Structure of *Pentad*

Pentad opens in a dramatic fashion, where the pitches B-flat, C and B-natural are successively layered in octaves upon one another, boldly forming a cluster. Assembling as the first portion of motive A, these three pitches are consistent throughout each reiteration and, with the exception the final statement, are all articulated the same number of times: the B-flat thrice, the C twice and the B-natural once (echoing the *three, two, one!* countdown one might lead before the start of a work). In the final statement, however, they are each articulated only once. Their orchestration and dynamics are

always varied, yet are always sounded in octaves –single or multiple. The total duration of each pitch incrementally decreases across each statement, neatly corresponding to the number of articulations they each receive: the B-flat decreases by three quavers in duration, the C by two and the B-natural by one (see fig. 2, which revises Gyger's analysis of this work).

| Statement | Pitch | Durations of each articulation (in quavers) | | | Total duration |
|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|----------------|
| | | | | | |
| A1 | B-flat | 13 | 6 | 5 | 24 |
| | C | 11 | 3 | - | 14 |
| | B-natural | 6 | - | - | 6 |
| A2 | B-flat | 11 | 6 | 4 | 21 |
| | C | 10 | 2 | - | 12 |
| | B-natural | 5 | - | - | 5 |
| A3 | B-flat | 11 | 4 | 3 | 18 |
| | C | 9 | 1 | - | 10 |
| | B-natural | 4 | - | - | 4 |
| A4 | B-flat | 10 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| | C | 6 | 2 | - | 8 |
| | B-natural | 3 | - | - | 3 |
| A5 | B-flat | 12 | - | - | 12 |
| | C | 6 | - | - | 6 |
| | B-natural | 2 | - | - | 2 |

Figure 2. Motive A, Pitch Durations of Part 1

The second portion of the motive features quasi-aleatoric flourished figures –to be played as quickly as possible– above a homophonic accompaniment. Orchestration and dynamics are again varied throughout each reiteration; however, each statement successively expands in duration, balancing the ever shortening three pitches in the first portion and thus maintaining a total length of exactly five bars per statement.

Motive B is in immediate contrast to motive A, where in its first three occurrences a dense texture of eleven chords is successively cycled through in the woodwinds and horns. The remainder of the brass instruments abruptly punctuate these chords at various points, duplicating the pitches already sounding. On inspection, these chords each consist of four distinct voice-parts, which are collectively assigned to the four voices that each comprise the woodwind and horn sections. In the first and second statements of the motive, the four voices appear in the sequence as outlined in figure

3 (following page); in the second statement, however, their sequence begins three notes later than the first. Each sequence is heard in full before repeating, but the rhythm is always varied. The final cycle of each sequence is often not completed before the statement concludes.

The image shows a musical score for four voices (Voice 1 to Voice 4) in treble clef. Voice 1's first line is bracketed as a "11 note sequence". Voice 2's line starts with a bracket labeled "sequence begins from here in second statement" that starts at the third note of its line. The notes in all voices are quarter notes with various accidentals.

Figure 3. Motive B, Statements 1 and 2

In the third statement of the motive, this cyclic sequence is disrupted. Taking the first voice as an example (fig. 4), the eleven-note sequence is first heard twice in full and, while retaining the fundamental sequence of pitches, appears incomplete in its next three cycles. The remaining three voices follow, in parallel, the same pattern as the first voice: two complete sequences and three differing truncations.

The image shows two lines of musical notation for a single voice. The first line contains two complete "11 note sequence" brackets. The second line contains three truncated sequence brackets: "First 9 notes of sequence", "Last 10 notes of sequence", and "First 6 notes of sequence".

Figure 4. Motive B, Statements 3

By the fourth statement, the construction of the four voices becomes somewhat more developed. Here, the ensemble divides into three rhythmically distinct groups, with the first group being rhythmically similar to the prior statements of the motive, yet now only consisting of three voices. Each voice is doubled by two instruments – assigned to two of the oboes, the cor anglais, and the three trumpets– but unlike the third statement of the motive, the note sequences are again presented as complete before repeating. At first, these three voices' construction and sequence may appear to be new (fig. 5), yet they are actually based upon the voices as heard previously in the second statement: voice 1 is as voice 1 of the second statement; voice 2 is a combination of voices 2 and 3 of the second statement with the exception of a new pitch (marked in red); and voice 3 is a combination of voices 3 and 4 of the second statement, again with the exception of a new pitch (again marked in red).

11 note sequence

Voice 1 (voice one of statement two)

Voice 2 (variation of voices two and three of statement two)

Voice 3 (variation of voices three and four of statement two)

Figure 5. Motive B, Statements 4, Group 1

The specific construction of these voices is illustrated further in figures 6 and 7, where arrows are used to indicate the selection of pitches from the previous voices that now constitute each new voice of this group. It is interesting to note the newly introduced pitch is a B-natural in both cases, although occurring at different points in each voice's sequence.

Figure 6 shows three staves of music. The top staff is labeled "Voice 2 - Statement 2" and contains a sequence of notes: G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, F4, E4, D4. The middle staff is labeled "Voice 2, Group 1 - Statement 4" and contains notes: G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, F4, E4, D4. The bottom staff is labeled "Voice 3 - Statement 2" and contains notes: G3, A3, B3, C4, B3, A3, G3, F3, E3, D3. Downward arrows point from the notes in the top staff to the notes in the middle staff. Upward arrows point from the notes in the bottom staff to the notes in the middle staff.

Figure 6. Motive B, Statements 4, Group 1: Construction of Voice 3

Figure 7 shows three staves of music. The top staff is labeled "Voice 3 - Statement 2" and contains notes: G3, A3, B3, C4, B3, A3, G3, F3, E3, D3. The middle staff is labeled "Voice 3, Group 1 - Statement 4" and contains notes: G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, F4, E4, D4. The bottom staff is labeled "Voice 4 - Statement 2" and contains notes: G3, A3, B3, C4, B3, A3, G3, F3, E3, D3. Downward arrows point from the notes in the top staff to the notes in the middle staff. Upward arrows point from the notes in the bottom staff to the notes in the middle staff.

Figure 7. Motive B, Statements 4, Group 1: Construction of Voice 3

Group 2 of the fourth statement –assigned to the piccolos, flutes, third oboe, E-flat clarinet and two B-flat clarinets– is a simple reiteration of the four voices that comprise the eleven-note sequence as presented in the first statement (see fig. 3). Group 3, on the other hand, presents this same eleven-note sequence in retrograde, with minor alterations to several pitches in voices 2 and 3. These pitches are marked in red in figure 8. Again, the fourth voice is omitted.

The fifth and final statement of motive B once again splits the ensemble into three rhythmically distinct groups. Group 2 uses the same four voices that appeared in first statement (see fig. 3), here assigned to the bassoons, horns and tuba. Group 3 uses the three voices of the third group from the fourth statement (similar to statement one with minor alternations and in retrograde; see fig. 8), where each voice is doubled in the trumpets and trombones. And beginning two bars later, group 1 –again being the most rhythmically familiar to the first three statements of the motive– returns to the original four voices heard in the first two statements, though just as in the second statement, it begins its sequence three notes later than the first.

11 note sequence

Voice 1 (voice 1 of statement 1)

Voice 2 (variation of voice 2 of statement 1)

Voice 3 (variation of voice 4 of statement 1)

*All voices are in retrograde to how they appear in this example.
 Pitches marked in red are a variation to how each voice appears in statement one

Figure 8. Motive B, Statements 4, Group 3

Despite of their complexity of arrangement –both conceptually and aurally– the fourth and fifth statements of the motive are intriguing and fascinating to hear. The fourth statement, in particular, offers contrast to the third statement heard immediately before, in dynamic, texture and sound-mass, while the fifth statement propels itself energetically into the final statement of motive C (the penultimate section of the work), creating a sense of climax and culmination of both motives’ developmental trajectory, as well as of the composition as a whole. In addition to its development as discussed above, motive B also expands in duration through each successive statement. Opening with a mere four bars in its first occurrence, an additional three bars are added to each reiteration –although with the exception of a single bar in the fourth iteration– so that the final statement lasts for fourteen measures.

Initial transposition

Figure 9. Motive C, Seven Notes Pitch Set

By contrast, motive C instead retains the same length of five bars throughout the work. Furthermore, where motive B is largely based upon the construction of three or four cyclic tone-rows heard in homo-rhythmic groups, motive C (fig. 9) instead

follows a cyclic sequence of a seven note pitch set '0134567i' (Gyger 2015, 99) that is simultaneously presented by rhythmically distinct instruments, forming a heterophonic texture. Across the five appearances of the motive, this pitch set appears in three distinct sequences and three distinct transpositions, although each instrument is assigned only one sequence and one transposition in each statement. Similarly, only two sequences and two transpositions of the pitch set are ever presented in each statement.

Each instrument cycles through its sequence, either forward or in retrograde, and is assigned a specific rhythm (for instance, triplet-quavers, semiquavers, quintuple-quavers etc.). In addition to this layer, a small cluster of either three or four pitches briefly interjects this texture. This layer itself is either sounded as block chords, or ornamented with flutter-tonguing, trills, or rhythmically measured alternations between two of the assigned pitches.

Beginning in the first statement, these two distinct textures are each presented by one group of instruments: the cyclic pitch set material is assigned to the trumpets and first two trombones, while the pitch-clusters are flutter-tongued by the horns, third trombone and tuba. Each successive reiteration until the fifth statement adds a further layer of the cyclic pitch set material, but always orchestrated independently from each other layer. By the final statement an extra pitch-cluster is instead added in the trumpets, but where these chords were ornamented before, this cluster is not. Further to this successive layering, the dynamic level is also increased in each reiteration, starting from pianissimo and concluding at fortissimo. As such, the first statement is quietly sparse and includes moments of silence between the two textures, whereas the fifth statement, consisting of two pitch-cluster layers and four independent layers of the cyclic pitch set material, is an almost overwhelming cacophony of sound.

Out of all of the motives, D is the simplest and most distinct in its design and execution. As a monophonic line, the phrase (fig. 10) is gradually weaved through various instrumental combinations, though prominently in the woodwind instruments. This orchestration technique is not similar, as might seem, to Webern's pointillistic *klangfarbenmelodie*, but rather to what Gyger has described as 'a shifting blend of timbres, evolving as the line itself evolves' (Gyger 2008). The motive is consistent in dynamic, marked as *mezzo-piano* for its first three iterations, before diminishing to *piano* and *pianissimo* for the two final statements respectively. Similarly, where the first statement is comprised of four distinct phrases lasting for a total of seven measures, each reiteration subsequently loses the first bar of the previous statement, so that in its final appearance the motive only consists of two phrases lasting for three bars. This is in contrast to the successive expansion of motive B, creating a sense of balance between the two motive's diverging trajectories.

The final motive, E, consists of two homo-rhythmic layers; the first layer alternates between a pair of dense chords while the second does likewise with a further, different pair. These four chords remain constant throughout the motive's five appearances,



Figure 10. Motive D

which are consistently four bars in length, the final bar always being a 6/4 measure. The interest in this motive's trajectory, however, is in its variation of dynamic, the voicing of the four chords, and their orchestration. With the exception of its fifth reiteration –also the last motive to be stated in the work– the dynamics are always collectively applied and are constant throughout each statement. This motive's orchestrations represent some of the most interesting approaches in the work. For instance, in the fourth statement of the motive, the second layer is assigned to the flutes and piccolos in mid to high register, and the trombones and contrabassoon in mid to low register. By contrast, the second statement assigns the first layer to the mid-range of the horns and first trombone, and the second to the low registers of the double reeds and clarinets.

A Wind Band Work? Evaluating *Pentad* and Its Compositional Background

However complex the construction of *Pentad's* motives and their progressive development are –particularly the motives B and C–the work can simply be appreciated more facilely, perhaps as a varied journey through five motives and their ever-changing organisation. Nonetheless, responses to the work have been mixed. Reviewing a performance by the SSO in 1989 –the last given to date by that orchestra– Roger Covell asserted in *The Sydney Morning Herald* that '*Pentad* wears its 20 years well' and 'was reassuringly alive' (1989). Laurie Strachan reporting in *The Australian*, on the other hand, questioned the work, commenting that 'although there was some interesting music here, it was hard to grasp where it was all going and why' (1989). That the piece is described as 'febrile', 'sour' (Murdoch 1975, 51), 'static and restrained' (Strachan 1989) and, even in the case of Covell (1989), 'gruff', 'dense' and 'stiff', alludes to the challenges posed by its general aesthetic. Butterley himself has noted a comparable reaction from musicians alone to his music from the 1960s: 'I have a feeling that the SSO was largely antagonistic to new works through that period. The musicians were apprehensive and, to composers, not really encouraging. I always felt on the outer. Some player would always look for wrong notes, or would relish finding something you'd written which was not suitable for their instrument' (quoted in Sametz 1992, 281).

Given their level of abstraction and modernism, the difficulty in finding a receptive appreciation of Butterley's works from this period has not gone remarked. In the same

1989 review in *The Australian*, Strachan commented that none of Butterley's music had really engaged with the general public, despite its positive reception from his peers (1989). Yet in spite of such accounts, *Pentad's* instrumentation has permitted it to be performed by orchestras and wind bands alike, and this has seen the work performed by both mediums at the professional, pro-am and educational level. Although *Pentad* was specifically written with the number and variety of the SSO's wind section in mind, a question arises if Butterley had any knowledge of the wind band movement. Did the seriousness of its renewal after 1945 influence his choice of instrumentation? Moreover, was Butterley aware of other notable works from the period for alike orchestration?

To answer the second question first: both Jones (2005, 415) and Gyger (2015, 100) have several parallels between *Pentad* and Igor Stravinsky's *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* specifically (1920, rev. 1947). Indeed, it seems plausible that *Pentad* may have taken some inspiration from Stravinsky's work, since in 1961 while Stravinsky was touring Australia, the ABC, where Butterley was working at the time, presented a high-profile concert performed by the Victorian (now Melbourne) Symphony Orchestra that included *Symphonies* among its program.³ In addition, when Stravinsky also appeared on tour with the SSO that year, Butterley attended a rehearsal with him and the orchestra, although their program excluded *Symphonies* (Buzacott and Australian Broadcasting Corporation 2007, 309).

But any propulsive energy derivable from an Australian wind band movement remained largely nascent until the founding of the Australian Band and Orchestra Directors Association in 1985. Prior, the movement appears to have existed primarily within the schooling system, the Australian Defence Forces through the establishment of the Australian Army School of Music in 1953 (later the Australian Defence Forces School of Music) and the Australian Army Band Corps in 1968. One wind band to have taken an active role, however, was the Australian Broadcasting Commission National Military Band (ABCNMB), which was formed from 1934. The band seems to have stimulated some interest and promotion of the medium in Australia until its cessation in 1951, although its repertoire appears to have largely consisted of transcriptions (Hardy 1995, 26). Given the infancy of the movement in Australia, we can appreciate that Butterley was not concerned with writing specifically for the wind band itself, and upon enquiry, he had only a passing knowledge of the ABCNMB (Butterley, 2016).

The concurrent developments in the United States were, however, also surprisingly unfamiliar to Butterley (Butterley, 2016).⁴ This was likely, in part, due to the uneasy

³ The concert program in Melbourne included *The Fairy's Kiss Divertimento* (1928, rev. 1950), *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* (1920, rev. 1947) and *Jeu de cartes* (1936) (Buzacott and Australian Broadcasting Corporation 2007, 308).

⁴ The development of the movement at this time was primarily driven by the emergence of

| Woodwinds | Brass | Other instruments |
|------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 6 flutes | 6 horns | 9 percussion |
| 2 piccolos | 6 trumpets | harp |
| 2 oboes | 6 trombones | keyboards |
| 2 cor anglais | 2 tubas | double bass |
| 6 clarinets | | |
| 2 bass clarinets | | |
| 6 bassoons | | |
| 2 contrabassoons | | |

Figure 11. Instrumentation: American Wind Symphony Orchestra

| Woodwinds | Brass |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 2 piccolos | 4 horns |
| 2 flutes | 3 trumpets |
| 3 oboes | 3 trombones |
| cor anglais | tuba |
| E-flat clarinet | |
| 2 clarinets | |
| bass clarinet | |
| 3 bassoons | |
| contrabassoon | |

Figure 12. Instrumentation: Pentad (1968)

divide between the wind band movement and the other more traditionally recognised mediums of western classical music that Butterley associated with and composed for. The geographical distance between the US and Australia would have, no doubt, also played a part, as would have the capacity of the wind band movement in Australia at the time to sincerely import these developments. Nevertheless, Butterley's unawareness of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra (AWSO) is especially interesting, given that the ensemble's distinct instrumentation closely resembles that of Pentad's. Omitting the saxophones and euphoniums that almost are always commonly found in a traditional wind band, the AWSO is instead modelled on the variety of woodwind and brasses found in the modern symphony orchestra. These forces are, for the most part, doubled in number, with percussion, harp, keyboards and a double bass added to complete the ensemble.

Given the uniqueness of the AWSO's instrumentation, Boudreau initiated an ambitious commissioning project, which by 1972, had generated over two hundred compositions for the ensemble. Not only do many of these works use a similar instrumentation to *Pentad*, they are intriguingly also of a similar musical aesthetic; a large number of the composers commissioned by Boudreau were in fact 'purposefully *avant-garde* and from outside the traditional wind band world' (Caines 2012, 76). It is not inconceivable, then, that Butterley as an outsider to the wind band movement could have been one of these composers commissioned by Boudreau and Pentad, an *avant-garde* work for its time in Australian composition, one of the many representative works of this idiom in the ensemble's repertoire. Yet, the resemblance of Pentad's aesthetic to many of the AWSO's works is, of course, purely coincidental, and there is no indication that Butterley's choice of instrumentation for the work was a stipulation of its commission by the University of Sydney (Jones 2005, 402). Enquiring on this point,

Frederick Fennell's wind ensemble concept from 1952 and Robert Boudreau's establishment of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra in 1957.

Butterley stated, 'I wanted to write something different to what I'd done before. I'd written pieces for string orchestra, I've written for full orchestra, and I wanted this piece to be different. And that principle applies to every piece that I've written, I should think' (Butterley, 2016).

Pentad Today

Whereas the vast majority of the wind band works for the AWSO's unique instrumentation were a result of commission by that very ensemble, *Pentad*, for alike instrumentation, was instead composed out of Butterley's own determination to write differently. Consequently, I suggest that the work be considered not as a wind band work per se, but rather as an orchestral work distinctly for wind instruments that the wind band movement may then enthusiastically adopt amongst a larger sphere of repertoire. Beyond Stravinsky's *Symphonies*, there are a number of equivalent works that have been incorporated into the wind band repertoire, such as Michael Tippett's *Mosaic* from his *Concerto for Orchestra* (1962-63), Steven Stucky's *Funeral Music for Queen Mary* (1992) and Magnus Lindberg's *Gran Duo* (1999-2000).

In the same way that much of the AWSO's repertoire exhibits, these orchestral wind works often typically depart from the more traditional musical idioms associated with wind band music, sometimes quite radically. Incorporating them in the wind band's repertory, then, has not only broadened the depth and scope of our medium's musical aesthetic, but also furthered and incited new and unique compositions written specifically for the wind band. Such works, however, can often make for challenging listening for both performers and audiences, who without guidance or explanation, may be unenthusiastic in their reception. Yet, far from being a 'dry' and 'stiff' example of abstraction, I contend that *Pentad* is a creative, intelligent and even playful rendition of Australian modernism, which with a little introduction can in fact understood and appreciated by all.

Composed at a time when Australian composition was shearing its inherited musical heritage and forging ahead in new directions, *Pentad* singularly captures Butterley's individual approach to, and exploration of the modernist aesthetic. In spite of its composition outside of the sphere and influence of the broader wind band movement, the work has come to be embraced by that movement locally as an example of a respected Australian composer writing for the medium at a time when few others were. For the Australian wind band movement, *Pentad* represents an important contribution to our relatively young repertory and, for the movement internationally, it is a fascinating example of modernist wind writing. Just as Stravinsky's *Symphonies* is now regularly performed by orchestras and wind bands alike, so too deserves *Pentad*. This critical-performative edition of the work is available through the Australian Music Centre (Butterley, 2017).

References

- Antill, John. c1956. *Corroboree*. Sydney: Boosey & Hawkes Australia.
- Butterley, Nigel. (c1969) 2017. *Pentad*. Edited by Bryan Griffiths. Sydney: BWG Publications. <https://australianmusiccentre.com.au/work/butterley-nigel-pentad>.
- Buzacott, Martin, and Australian Broadcasting Corporation. 2007. *The Rite of Spring: 75 Years of ABC Music-Making*. Sydney: ABC Books.
- Caines, Joseph Edward. 2012. "Frederick Fennell and The Eastman Wind Ensemble: The Transformation of American Wind Music Through Instrumentation and Repertoire." MArt Thesis, University of Ottawa.
- Covell, Roger. 1967. *Australia's Music: Themes of a New Society*. Melbourne: Sun Books.
- Festival Concert: Asian, Australian, European Music*. Concert program notes. Sydney Town Hall, Saturday, March 29, 1969, at 8:00pm.
- Ford, Andrew. 1993. *Composer to Composer: Conversations About Contemporary Music*. St Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Gyger, Elliott. 2015. *The Music of Nigel Butterley*. Malaysia: Wildbird Music.
- Hanson, Raymond. 1948. *Concerto for Trumpet & Orchestra*. Fisher Library Rare Books and Special Collections, Sydney: Australia
- . c1976. *Piano Sonata*. Sydney: Albert & Son.
- Hardy, Martin. 1995. "The Development of the Australian Wind Band: An Historical Overview with Review of Selected Works." MMus Thesis, University of New South Wales.
- Hooper, Michael. 2019. *Australian Music and Modernism, 1960-1975*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic & Professional.
- Jones, David Howard. 2005. "The Music of Nigel Butterley," edited by Michael Ewans. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The University of Newcastle.
- McNeill, Rhoderick. 2010. "A Heritage Worthy of Revival – Australia's forgotten music." Symphony Services International. Accessed April 9, 2016. <http://symphonyinternational.net/a-heritage-worthy-of-revival-australia's-forgotten-music/>
- Murdoch, James. 1972. *Australia's Contemporary Composers*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
- O'Connell, Clive. 2000. "Musical Composition in Australia in the Period 1960-1970: Individual Triumph or Historical Inevitability?" MMus thesis, The University of Melbourne.
- Sametz, Phillip. 1992. *Play On!: 60 Years of Music-Making with the Sydney Symphony Orchestra*. Sydney: ABC Enterprises.
- Stravinsky, Igor. 1952. *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*. London: Boosey and Hawkes.