

# Musical Expression Through Notation: The Formal Constructs of Klaus K. Hübler

Michael Baldwin

Starting in the 1980s, Klaus K. Hübler began to write some of the most complex and unique music in his oeuvre. Works from this period include *Feuerzauber' auch Augenmusik*, *String Quartet no.3*, *CERCAR*, *Sonetto LXXXIII del Michelangelo* and *Opus breve* wherein each of these works, the notation is derived from the unique qualities of the specified instrument in use. These works are written in extended tablature notation.<sup>1</sup> This type of notation takes the various parameters of an instrument and breaks each down into their individual components, often resulting in multiple staves, which indicate the rhythmic identity of each parameter. The specifics of this notational system will be discussed in greater detail in the following pages. All these works demand the very highest of technical ability in order to be executed correctly, leading many performers to dismiss the demands as unrealistic. Moreover, several composers have been diametrically opposed to such a notation system, and insist that such a system becomes musically constraining and unable to be truly expressive. This paper argues that the notational system implemented by Klaus K. Hübler is indeed capable of articulating a musically expressive language and emancipates the instrument from its traditional function. This is illustrated by Hübler's use of formal structures derived from both the physical medium and through several musical contradictions<sup>2</sup> juxtaposed with one another.

Before any formal structures are presented, a brief explanation of Hübler's notational system is in order. In his string music, Hübler separates the instrument into five different

---

<sup>1</sup> A work written in extended tablature notation will consist of several different staves that each indicate a different performative parameter. In the case of Hübler specifically this is usually found in the separation of the right and left hands each notated on an individual staff.

<sup>2</sup> I have purposefully chosen to use the word contradictions here instead of placing direct focus of dialectical thinking. It is understood that dialectical thinking is a critical aspect of German thinking and aesthetics. However, I have chosen not to discuss the dialectical aspects of Hübler's music due to the scope of this paper, and clarity of my own ideas.

systems. Each system is dedicated to a different parameter of sound production. The various parameters are as follows: change of strings, up-bow and down-bow, point of contact of the bow, type of bowing, and left hand position (pitches, harmonics, finger attack, and finger span).<sup>3</sup> As it turns out, this type of extended tablature notation is suited extremely well for string instruments, due to the array of clearly distinguishable parameters, and has been explored most extensively in this medium. However, Hübler has used these same principles with wind instruments as well, but the parameters used are quite different from one instrument to another. When looking at Hübler's notation in respect to the winds it is clear that his use of extended tablature notation has not been followed to the same extreme as it has in his string writing. Even Hübler himself has noted that the greatest potential for expansion with regards to this system of notation lies in the winds.<sup>4</sup> This is not to say that his approach to the winds is elementary by any means. For example, *CERCAR* for solo trombone applies this extended tablature notation in a rather sophisticated way. In *CERCAR*, the trombone part is broken into two distinct systems, with the first being slide movement, and the second being the specific overtone to be played. Within this setup, multiple other systems can be added – some examples are the notation of the trigger, sections to be muted, and sung material.<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that although the notation for both strings and winds is rather comprehensive, recent exploration in this field of notation has managed to clear up some of the ambiguous aspects of Hübler's notation.

With a basic understanding of the notation system in place, the formal conceptions of Hübler can now be taken into account. Hübler's music is deeply concerned with the physical

---

<sup>3</sup> Klaus K. Hübler, "Expanding the String Technique," *New Music and Aesthetics* 1 (2002): 233-244.

<sup>4</sup> James Avery, "Die Musik Klaus K. Hübler," *Music & Ästhetik* 5 (1998): 115.

<sup>5</sup> Klaus K. Hübler, "Die polyphone Posaune. Ein Vorschlag zur Notation," *Brass Bulletin* 45 (1984): 32-33.

properties of both the instrument and performer, and also with the juxtaposition of seemingly disparate musical materials. The two pieces that will be used to illustrate these concerns are *Sonetto LXXXIII del Michelangelo* for solo piano, and the *Third String Quartet*. Although both works have vastly different soundscapes and musical impulses, the way Hübler shapes his formal ideas can be mapped back to performative aspects and contradictions. Each piece will be looked at from a physical perspective, and then revisited again with an eye towards musical contradictions.

Before delving too deeply into the physical nature of Hübler's music it will be helpful to first make clear Hübler's views on the performer and the various physical demands asked of him or her. Hübler has made it clear in his writing that the role of the interpreter is something to be considered very critically. His approach to music is grounded in tradition and he sees himself as advancing music along an established path. This approach gives the performer greater capacity to create meaningful interpretations because they have something on which to fall back. Room for interpretation is reduced dramatically when music leaves the performer to his or her own devices and forces independent creation of form. This happens when, instead of having a rich collection of musical ideas that relate to a piece, performers are forced to decipher various symbols and improvise from a limited set of musical ideas. Another problem that arises from this model of composition is that the composer, in most cases, does have a desired sound-world in mind. It is now the responsibility of the performer to achieve this sound world with only a basic framework provided. When all this is taken into consideration, the performer is placed in a rather confined musical world with an elementary language; in the end producing a music that, many times, sounds arbitrary and is musically prohibitive.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Klaus K. Hübler, "Die Freiheit des Interpreten vor der Partitur," *Das Orchester* 4 (1987): 383.

Despite the fact that these various factors play an important role in the construction of Hübler's music, and help to inform his compositional approach, the all-too-frequent question still arises: how realistic is it to ask of the performer the technical demands placed upon him or her? Hübler has confronted this question in multiple instances. It is certain that Hübler has critically examined the practicality of his notation by taking time to make sure all of the actions required are physically possible. When listening to a performance of Hübler's music, and armed with a score, it is possible to register what is being executed correctly and what is not. This means that, although a perfect performance may not be possible, there are certainly different levels of accuracy, which can be clearly quantified.<sup>7</sup> Both the fact that Hübler critically examines his notation, and that different, quantifiable, evaluations can be made in regards to accuracy are important to take into consideration because they show how important each detail in the notation is. When various parameters have been broken down and laid out in such a way, it is crucial for them to be reconstructed carefully, making sure that the resultant sound is what the composer intends. Tied up with this idea is the fact that the physical demands placed on the performer are just as important as the sonic result. If one attempts to simplify the notation, then the physical aspect built into it is diminished drastically.

There are instances, however, where the resultant aural effect and the notation used seem to be disconnected from one another. Such is the case in *CERCAR* for solo trombone. One of the fundamental problems with this piece is that the performer can work all of the pitch material out. This makes Hübler's notation of the overtones useless since actual pitches can be used instead and still achieve the same aural result. However, this problem is not prevalent in other

---

<sup>7</sup> Max Nyffeler, "Bis das Instrument seinen Geist offenbart. Klaus K. Hübler im Gespräch," *MusikTexte* 20 (1987): 4-7.

pieces like the *Third String Quartet* because several of the resultant pitches become very different from the pitches prescribed in the left hand. The use of specific left hand positions (spans) is one example where the resultant pitch material differs from the notated pitches. Using different left hand positions creates various micro-intervals, which would otherwise be impossible to notate in a traditional manner.<sup>8</sup> Although the pitch material can be worked out in *CERCAR*, one should not lose sight of the fact that the physical demands asked of the performer are still activated, and in a more engaging way than if the music had been notated with actual pitches throughout. Another aspect to take into consideration is that Hübler is still very much concerned with pitch and the way that he constructs his interval relationships.<sup>9</sup> This is especially apparent in his *Third String Quartet* where the left hand is given specific pitches to finger, rather than a completely position-based form of notation. For other composers, most notably Aaron Cassidy, the use of pitches has been completely abandoned and physical aspects have taken over. However, this has not always been the case. There has been a transformation in Cassidy's way of working with pitches. This can most clearly be seen when comparing Cassidy's *String Quartet* and *Second String Quartet*.<sup>10</sup>

In Hübler's *Third String Quartet*, the physical component is a primary formal device. Understanding the subtitle of the work, "*Dialektische Fantasie*" (Dialectical Imagination)<sup>11</sup> is of prime importance when analyzing this work. Throughout the piece, there are several sections

---

<sup>8</sup> Wieland Hoban, "Instrumentengeister in Zwangsjacken. Klaus K. Hübler's Drittes Streichquartett," *Musik & Ästhetik* 15 (200): 32.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, 32

<sup>10</sup> Aaron Cassidy. *Second String Quartet* (2009 - 10). <http://www.aaroncassidy.com/music/secondquartet.htm#note> (accessed November 28, 2010)

<sup>11</sup> All translations, unless otherwise noted, are the author's own.

that are notated in a smaller script. The unusual notation requires the performer to play the part without producing any resultant sound (there are a few exceptions to this in which the finger action in the left hand does produce audible sound).<sup>12</sup> This adds a visual layer to the piece and helps to articulate different formal ideas. Defined as silent music, this notation is used extensively throughout the piece. At most sections marked by a letter there is a transition from silent music to sounding music. It is also noted in the preface to the score that the silent music must be executed in the most serious of fashions as to make sure not to dramatize the effect.<sup>13</sup> By imposing this stipulation the performer is required to stay in a heightened physical state, adding to the overall continuity of the work. If instead, the performer were given the freedom to simply act out the silent music there would be a visual disconnect between the sounding music and silent music. Keeping both silent and sounding music in the same physical realm helps bind them together and create more meaningful relationships between both states.

There are other formal devices used throughout the string quartet that at first seem completely unrelated to any physical aspect. One such device is form defined by pitch temperament. To clarify, Hübler's *Third String Quartet* uses three different types of micro intervals. The first type involves specific hand positions by which unpredictable micro intervals arise. The other two types are more defined and clearly outlined in the preface of the score. They are quarter-tone divisions of the octave and third-tone divisions of the octave. Noting when specific types of micro intervals occur dictates formal sections. As a whole, the piece is divided into two large sections, and throughout the first section of the piece quarter- and third-tones are not used. Instead, only the left-hand position is utilized. At the beginning of the second

---

<sup>12</sup> Klaus K. Hübler, *3. Streichquartett*, (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1982.84), PB 5155.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.*

section, at page twenty-seven, the third-tone is used for the first time.<sup>14</sup> Halfway through the second section, just before page thirty-eight, the use of quarter-tones are introduced, marking a new section. For the remainder of the piece, different combinations of these temperaments are used to articulate the form.<sup>15</sup>

Perception becomes a hazy subject within this piece. Both of the use of silence versus sounding music, and different micro intervals as a way of articulating form, are hard to latch onto, and for different reasons in each case. In the case of silent music being a visual component, the effect is possible to discern when watched live. However, when a piece such as this is recorded, the visual function served by silent music deteriorates into simple silence. This is not to say that such a formal construction should be avoided, but instead, that in order to fully comprehend the piece and its discourse, a recording will not alone suffice. While there is no good solution for such a problem, one must critically take into consideration its ramifications. In the case of Hübler's music, it is expected that the listener be fully engaged in the material without wavering their attention.<sup>16</sup> It is uncompromising music that demands not only to be heard, but in the case of the *Third String Quartet*, seen as well. In the case of multiple temperaments, the distinction between each state is much harder to make.

The main problem in defining a distinction between the three different temperaments lies mostly in the first section. It is possible that, had the piece begun with only equal-tempered intervals and proceeded to quarter- and third-tones, a clear distinction might be made. However,

---

<sup>14</sup> It is important to note that the score is laid out in such a way that there are no measure numbers. Instead there are just page numbers, which is how different areas of the score will be specified.

<sup>15</sup> A complete formal analysis is beyond the scope of this paper. For a complete formal analysis please see Hoban, *Instrumentengeister in Zwangsjacken*, 27-43.

<sup>16</sup> Nyffeler, *Bis das Instrument*, 5.



this trajectory of temperaments is not found in the *Third String Quartet*. In the first section the performers are given left-hand positions that they must maintain and apply to different regions of the instrument. The resultant effect is a vast variety of micro-intervals that are solely dependent on the hand shape of the player. Because hand positions differ for each player, the resultant pitch material from performance to performance will differ slightly, and even within a quartet, will differ from player to player. This use of left-hand positioning makes it impossible to define a specific temperament in the first section. When the third-tones are used in the second section and the left-hand positions are abandoned, it is hard to hear a clear difference. This has to do with the fact that the left-hand positions have several third- and quarter-tones already active. Adding to this is the very prevalent fact that performance practice had not, and still has not, been developed enough yet for four players to have the same precise intonational inflections of third-tones and quarter-tones. In the realm of aural distinction, the use of varying micro-intervals to delineate form does not work as effectively as intended. However, one way in which these varying temperaments work to help articulate form is by creating different mental and physical regions.<sup>17</sup> Each temperament creates a different physical space for the performer to work within. This can be seen most clearly in the case of the left-hand positions. The third- and quarter-tones are harder to distinguish, but indeed they place the performer in a different state of mind which has a direct result on their physical behavior and sonic end result. When looking at Hübler's use of varying temperaments through this perspective, one can begin to see a valid need for the type of notation being used.

---

<sup>17</sup> In this paper I will be using the phrases “mental regions” and “physical regions”. These are phrases that I have adopted in my own compositional writing and are used to identify various constraints within the performative action, be it either mental or physical.

Hübler's use of the physical medium is found again in *Sonetto LXXXIII del Michelangelo* for solo piano. The piece is based on a sonnet written by Michelangelo.

Even the best artist has no concept at all  
 Unless is it contained in the marble itself,  
 And only the hand of such an artist  
 Can be obedient to his intellect.<sup>18</sup>

Within this sonnet lies a physical implication used in the work, that being, the hand of the artist. There are other implications beyond simply the physicality of the hand, which relate with contradictions and will be looked at more closely later on. Hübler speaks of creating a fixed hand position within which the performer must work, creating a very constrained physical space. Throughout there is an ostinato figure that follows through the piece and acts as a metaphor for the hand chiseling away at the marble block in order to unveil the sculpture within.<sup>19</sup> The form is broken up into three sections in which different physical actions and types of notation used change in order to accent each structural marker. The three sections are laid out clearly, with the second section having the most distinct characteristic sound. The second section uses no sostenuto pedal and makes marked distinctions between different dynamic regions.<sup>20</sup> By establishing a clearly differentiated sonic world in the second section the listener is then able to determine the boundaries of section one and section three. The unique notation used throughout is constructed in such a way that multiple rhythmical figures are overlaid with one another.

---

<sup>18</sup> Klaus K. Hübler, *Arie dissolute / Sonetto LXXXIII del Michelangelo / Reißwerck / 'Feuerzauber' auch Augenmusik / Cercar / Opus breve / Kryptogramm für neun Musiker / Epiphyt*, Jürge Henneberger, Robert H.P. Platz, WER 65242. Translated from Italian by Robert H.P. Platz.

<sup>19</sup> Klaus K. Hübler, "Torso aus einem Marmorblock. Über die Entstehung meines 'Sonetto LXXXIII del Michelangelo'," *MusikTexte* 20 (1987): 9.

<sup>20</sup> Robin Freeman, "Contemporary Piano Music: Heilbronn's 'antasten' Festival; Scelsi and Hübler at the BMIC," *Tempo* 187 (1993): 41

These competing rhythms then have to be rendered as one single monophonic line. As a result the note durations indicated in the score are not heard exactly as they visually appear in the score. Instead, they act as attack points in which the next note of an opposing line terminates the currently sounding note. It is interesting to note that this type of notation was also being developed by Brian Ferneyhough; (although the principle was applied to inherently monophonic sounding instruments instead of the piano with its polyphonic capabilities) around the same time without either Ferneyhough or Hübler knowing of the other's notational system.<sup>21</sup>

There are several pieces where Ferneyhough uses this type of notation, in which the notated durations are truncated by the following note value. Some pieces include but are not limited to *Trtticco per G.S.*, *Terrain*, and *Mnemosyne*. The piece *Mnemosyne*<sup>22</sup> will be looked at briefly in order to illuminate another composer's use of this notational system, one that achieved vastly different musical ends. *Mnemosyne* for solo bass flute and eight pre-recorded bass flutes concludes Ferneyhough's *Carceri d'Invenzione* cycle. It is interesting to look at both Ferneyhough's *Mnemosyne*, and Hübler's *Sonetto LXXXIII del Michelangelo* and compare their corresponding notation systems, as both Hübler and Ferneyhough have found ways to take a notation system similar in construction and use it for two very different aims. In the case of Ferneyhough, and more specifically *Mnemosyne*, the notation serves as a vehicle for creating a sense of physical tactility in regards to the flow of time. The use of such a notation places the performer in a rather specific physical region in which they must constantly push up against the constraints placed on them through the notation. This constraint is heightened by the performer

---

<sup>21</sup> It should be noted that Klaus K. Hübler was a student of Brian Ferneyhough for some time, but neither composer was aware of this specific notational development.

<sup>22</sup> Mnemosyne is the Greek goddess of memory.

being instructed to perform with the aid of a click track. In regards to the use of a click track and its effect on the performer, as well as temporal flow, Ferneyhough has commented saying, "it was suggested to me by a number of performers ... to dispense with the click track altogether; I am not in favor of this, though, since the mental interference patterns set up ... contributes a lot, I think, to the moment-to-moment flow of expressive tension."<sup>23</sup> He goes on to say that by removing the click track, the performer will be more inclined to piece together the musical material in a more traditional way, negating the constraints central to the work.

Ferneyhough talks about the mental perception of various note durations and how their visual appearance infer the aural outcome. A rudimentary example of this phenomenon would be to present the performer with a whole note that is then truncated by a quarter note after one half of the whole note had sounded. By presenting the performer with a whole note instead of the more precise half note, the performer will interpret the whole note with a different aural trajectory, also known as the note's envelope. Ferneyhough describes this phenomenon as performative shaping. By looking at Ferneyhough's own writing on his music, and some of the principles outlined here, it is clear that the physical/mental performative state of the performer is absolutely vital to the end sonic result. In that regard, both Ferneyhough and Hübler can be seen as striving for similar aesthetic goals. However, it is in the overall aural quality of the piece and its overarching themes that are projected, that Hübler and Ferneyhough find their difference. Hübler sees Ferneyhough's notation as a type of "self-alienation" of the artist rather than process, and has mentioned in an interview with Max Nyffeler that "... the complexity in me is more of a

---

<sup>23</sup> Brian Ferneyhough, "The Tactility of Time," *Perspectives of New Music* 31 (1993): 25.

necessity to produce a certain sound. This seems to be the main difference between Ferneyhough and me."<sup>24</sup>

The Sonetto can also be looked at differently if one takes into consideration the use of contradictory elements, both musical and non-musical. The idea of contradictory elements lie at the heart of both the sonnet by Michelangelo, and in the formal outline set up by Hübler. Within the sonnet there are two opposing forces. The first is the physically tangible marble and second is the notion that although the sculpture already exists in the marble, the sculptor must call on his intellect to reveal it. This opposition of the literal (marble), and metaphysical (intellect) is labeled as north and south poles respectively in Hübler's formal outline, making it clear that both of these elements are in direct opposition with each other. The literal aspect controls the durations, rhythmic layers, and serial parameters. In many ways it represents formalized music. The metaphysical aspect controls compositional techniques, playing techniques, and the degree of detail. These metaphysical parameters are controlled more intuitively, and act as a reaction/resistance to the literal parameters.<sup>25</sup> They also help to reveal the true inner sculpture that already exists in the block of marble. These powerful contradictions interact and push up against one another constantly throughout the piece creating another type of constraint, this time specific to musical elements and not physical elements. With these contradictions Hübler is able to shape the music in such a way that it is constantly aware of itself and its limitations.

The use of contradictions as a tool for musical expression is an aspect of Hübler's music that reaches all the way back to his earliest works. In regards to his *First String Quartet*, Hübler has said that "it had interested me at that time, to produce a contradiction between the material

---

<sup>24</sup> Nyffeler, *Bis das Instrument*, 6.

<sup>25</sup> Hübler, *Torso aus einem Marmorblock*, 9.

plane and the affective-like area of this contradiction, the result in this piece is an expressive quality."<sup>26</sup> There are other instances where this use of contradictions plays a vital role in the music. *Opus breve* for solo cello shows this in its simplest form. The piece is only one minute and thirty seconds in length and is written in extended tablature notation. Hübler takes two basic ideas, a fixed hand position that produces a static harmony, and a collection of chords that break up the fixed hand position and harmonic stasis. Hübler then clarifies them throughout the piece by starting with both ideas intertwined and eventually separating both ideas completely.<sup>27</sup> The fixed hand position keeps both the left hand and harmony static while the various bowing techniques in the right hand are constantly changing and transforming. When chords are presented this breaks up the harmonic stasis and removes the left hand from its locked position. The right hand is then completely in sync with the left hand creating a type of physical stasis in the right hand. Due to the brevity of the work, the relationship between both ideas is easier to discern than it would be in a longer and more complicated piece such as the *Third String Quartet*.

Even though such a distinction is harder to make out in a large-scale piece such as the *Third String Quartet*, there exist a vast array of musical contradictions. Hübler has talked about his use of contradictions and their function saying,

"I believe that such a piece has two components: There is something to hear, but there is also something to analyze - that is, a sensual and an intellectual component, and thus it

---

<sup>26</sup> Nyffeler, *Bis das Instrument*, 4.

<sup>27</sup> (Franklin Cox, July, 2010, personal conversation with Franklin Cox)

seems to me to justify that things happen beyond the limits of perception... this duality is important for me – there is not only the sonic result."<sup>28</sup>

In the *Third String Quartet* specifically, the contradiction presented is between silent music and sounding music. Both aspects were already covered in regards to the physicality of the piece; however, they also serve as a meaningful contradiction throughout the piece. There is a constant struggle for the instrument in which it begins to unearth its "true spirit".<sup>29</sup> Notice that this is a struggle for the instrument and not the performer of that instrument. Throughout the *Third String Quartet*, sets of contradictions cause each instrument to reflect upon itself and question its very existence. In the moments of silent music the instrument begins to take note of its current state, and the unusual circumstance it has been subjected to. The state of playing silent music then becomes the natural state of performance making the moments of sounding music a foreign state. Before any confusion arises, it must be observed that the instruments have been personified slightly in order to clearly illustrate the fact that the instrument is reflecting upon itself, an inherently human action, not typically applicable to an inanimate object such as a stringed instrument. With this in mind, when the instrument becomes self-aware of its present state, either silent or sounding, it will begin to move to another state. In the case of an instrument playing a moment of silent music, once the instrument becomes aware of its silent state it will transition to sounding music. Hübler is effectively creating different regions and then expanding their boundaries as far as possible. Once these boundaries have been surpassed, the instrument is forced to reckon with its current state, be it silent or sounding, and has only the option to move

---

<sup>28</sup> Nyffeler, *Bis das Instrument*, 5.

<sup>29</sup> Hübler, *Expanding the String Technique*, 233

back into another state.<sup>30</sup> The uses of these boundaries help to dictate the formal outline of the piece and are clarified through the type of notation Hübler has prescribed.

Another smaller, more historically based, contradiction is contained within the *Third String Quartet*. In the middle of the piece, between sections one and two, is a section of music that Wieland Hoban has labeled "Stretto".<sup>31</sup> This section occurs on page twenty-five in the score and lasts for only a brief moment. In the Stretto section Hübler takes textural identities from the opening of the work and places them into different parameters. For example, a rhythmic figure that once resided in the left hand is now moved to the up and down-bow parameter. This type of rhythmic transference then passes through all four instruments altered slightly each time. It is in Hübler's use of an old formal construct, such as stretto, that Hübler's knowledge in regards to the common practice tradition of music is showcased. It also presents a uniquely historical contradiction, in that it juxtaposes an old formal construction within a very new formal construction. Hübler's use of traditional formal models nested inside of a more complex structuring shows his interest in making musical progress that moves along a traditionally grounded pathway. By placing the instrument and its performer in a historically grounded framework, Hübler is actually able to free the instrument from its traditional historical role. Although this may seem like a blatant contradiction of ideas, the following will make clear this very issue.

As has already been established, Hübler's music is aimed at trying to reveal the "true spirit" of the instrument. Beyond the type of instrumental self-reflection mentioned above,

---

<sup>30</sup> Hoban, *Instrumentengeister in Zwangsjacken*, 31.

<sup>31</sup> *ibid.*, 32



revealing the "true spirit" can also be seen as a deconstruction of the instrument into its core components in order to express the very idea of self-expression. In order to successfully deconstruct the instrument into its core components he needed to use traditional notational methods and ideas. Although Hübler employs a radical notational scheme, the fundamental aspects of each parameter (left hand position, bowing, bow placement) fit into the traditional model of notation. The radical aspect of the notation comes from the deconstruction and reconstruction of these various parameters. Hübler has been quoted as saying, "Asked, what is responsibility for a composer, I would not hesitate to say musical development."<sup>32</sup> This quote, and its clear directness, exemplifies Hübler's own journey down the traditional path and it also helps to show how Hübler views his responsibility as a composer. Within the quote it can be inferred that Hübler is not interested in creating a music that is radically new, or diverges from the historical precedence already established. Instead, he feels that he is responsible for expanding the capacity of the instrument through musically meaningful ways. It is important to take note that Hübler has indicated that the capacity of the instrument is to be expanded through "meaningful" ways. One might wonder what an un-meaningful way of expansion might be in comparison to a meaningful one, and Hübler himself makes it rather clear what he sees as meaningful and not meaningful in this quote take from the same interview mentioned before, with Max Nyffeler: "...The other extreme [opposing serialism] was to purely alienate the use of instruments: using the cello with styrofoam rubbing and the like... [this] seems to be a false path of development, as all the wealth of historically acquired technical abilities is practically thrown

---

<sup>32</sup> Hübler, *Die Freiheit des Interpreten*, 383.

away."<sup>33</sup> By using the historically established techniques and forms Hübler is able to give a certain level of freedom to the instrumentalist that would otherwise be impossible to supply.

In order to put Hübler's music into proper historical perspective, a brief overview of the music immediately before it and immediately after it will be presented here. This historical perspective aims to show how Hübler's notational system was derived and how it has been expanded over time. *Pression* for solo cello written by Helmut Lachenmann is a prime example of a piece in which various regions are crossed (much akin to the regions discussed in Hübler's *Third String Quartet*). It also serves as an example of a score that uses an individuated notation system in order to show the physical actions performed on the body of the cello.<sup>34</sup> Aaron Cassidy, who has been briefly mentioned earlier, has also taken Hübler's system of notation and applied it to a wider body of instruments to a more intense degree than that found in Hübler's own music. A notable example of this is *Being itself a catastrophe, the diagram must not create a catastrophe (or, Third Study for Figures at the Base of a Crucifixion)* for oboe (doubling musette & english horn) and B-flat clarinet (doubling E-flat & bass clarinets). In this piece, the level, and specificity of the staves has been increased drastically to indicate the separate fingers of the performer, and to also indicate embouchure placement on the reed.

After taking a look at Hübler's music it can be seen how his particular notational system, combined with various physical aspects and the use of contradictions, helps to articulate a musically expressive language and emancipates the instrument from its traditional function. It can also be seen that Hübler's notational system is indeed a rather flexible one with which many

---

<sup>33</sup> Nyffeler, *Bis das Instrument*, 5.

<sup>34</sup> Helmut Lachenmann, *Pression für einen Cellisten*, (Breitkopf & Härtel), BREIT06530.

composers have found a way to adapt and make their own. Other composers that have made use of this notational system, include Richard Barrett, Pierluigi Billone, Franklin Cox, Walter Feldmann, Wieland Hoban and Claus-Steffen Mahnkopf.<sup>35</sup> It is also important to note that the music written by each of these composers have rather distinct sound-worlds, which is a direct result from the way in which they have adapted the system. The ability to use this notational system in a way that still conveys the individual composer is a true testament to the variety and flexibility inherent in the system. In Hübler's case, the notation helps to articulate both physical aspects and musical contradictions that are at the core of his musical expression. Although several composers have found successes with extended tablature notation, it cannot be said that by simply using this system of notation a work will have a more profound meaning, or distinctly different aural result. Composers themselves must have something important and pertinent to convey in their music, and most importantly, must have the imagination required to set their ideas into action. A quote by Hübler succinctly makes this point, "... any lack of ingenuity on the composer's part can very quickly distort his/her musical intentions to the point of unrecognizability."<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Avery, James, and Franklin Cox. 2010. Hübler, Klaus K(arl). Oxford Music Online. [http://0-www.oxfordmusiconline.com.maurice.bgsu.edu/subscriber/article/grove/music/2082365?q=klaus+Hübler&search=quick&pos=1&\\_start=1#firsthit](http://0-www.oxfordmusiconline.com.maurice.bgsu.edu/subscriber/article/grove/music/2082365?q=klaus+Hübler&search=quick&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit) (accessed November 02, 2010).

<sup>36</sup> Hübler, *Expanding the String Technique*, 244. Translated by Franklin Cox