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Abstract

This paper will present my master project which is a collaboration with the Israeli composer Matan Ben Zahav. The idea behind this work, came from my wish to widen the kind of contemporary repertoire I wish to play more of, these days and in the future.

The pieces we dealt with in the project were a sonata for recorder and keyboard and a recorder trio that Ben Zahav composed. The trio was composed before the idea for the project was fully formed and helped me think of the idea for the project. After forming an idea, I asked Ben Zahav if he was willing to compose a sonata and that's how the project started. I decided that I would investigate the process and product of a collaborative work with Ben Zahav on the sonata for recorder and keyboard and recorder trio. The collaboration started during rehearsals in which we explored the new repertoire both musically and technically, we suggested different options and tried to make the pieces as comfortable for the recorder as we could.

This exploration revealed the different opportunities and benefits that a collaboration can bring.
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Introduction

When I look at the reality of classical music today, I wonder, what will be my role in it? I am a recorder player who aspires to be a professional performer and creator of classical music, but at the same time, every day, as I go about my studies, seminars, lessons with my recorder teacher, rehearsals with fellow students and individual practice, the larger question that keeps occupying my mind is: what kind of classical music will I be dealing with?

This question might have been less relevant earlier in history, but today it is a legitimate and maybe a crucial question. Playing an instrument that always had a bit of a fragile role in the history of classical music and always had a hard time finding its place also in other genres, I tend to feel that a lot of doors are closed for me.

One of the key moments that helped me see an interesting path for me to explore and develop, was meeting Matan Ben Zahav. When we met, Ben Zahav was a student for composition and we got to know each other through a course in The Jerusalem Academy for Music and Dance. As a part of that course we both attended I got to know Ben Zahav's music, approach to contemporary music and I also had a first short experience of working with a living composer, experience which was new to me.

In the project I'm about to present, I describe a collaboration I carried out with Ben Zahav. This collaboration was inspired by the first experience of working with Ben Zahav and the connection I felt to his music. The aim of this project is to explore and describe the nature of a collaboration; what is the character of this collaboration? Additionally, I would like to investigate what benefits a performer can gain from a collaboration with a composer?

To enrich and explain my project I investigated a study that defines and explains different forms of collaborations. In addition, I look at different models of collaboration between performers and creators. These will support and enrich this project.
Background

The modern recorder player

The recorder will always be considered somewhat of an unusual instrument. It's lack of popularity can be explained by many technical reasons, but the main one and the one I think is the most relevant, will be its disappearance. The recorder flourished during the long years of the Baroque (1600-1750) but as other instruments had gone through some mechanical changes\(^1\), the recorder stood in place and therefore, gradually disappeared. From the middle of the 18th century to the end of the 19th century the recorder was hardly in use\(^2\).

When resurfaced, players started to experiment with the instrument and while rediscovering long forgotten repertoire also started to compose new pieces in different modern styles.

One of the first encounters I had with modern music for recorder was with the *Virtuose Suite* by Hans Ulrich Staeps. This kind of music was so different from everything I heard and dealt with before.

In his compositions, Staeps brings out the best features of the recorder. He presents the ability of the instrument to be lyrical and the ability to play many different articulations, Staeps also knew when during the piece, those abilities will sound at their best, such as:

The versatile articulation that is best demonstrated in the variations of the 1\(^{st}\) movement:

The lyrical and expressive qualities and abilities that are brought out in the 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) movements:

---

\(^1\) Boeke, "Recorder Now", 1.
\(^3\) Staeps, *Virtuose Suite*, 4.
\(^4\) Ibid 4.
\(^5\) Ibid 5.
\(^6\) Ibid 6.
The use of the recorder's basic qualities to create a specific effect as it is clearly presented in the 4th movement:

Later on in my practice I kept on looking for pieces that reminded me the work I did on the piece by Staeps. I got to know the Sonatina by Lennox Berkeley⁹ and another Sonatina by Walter Leigh¹⁰. Those three pieces are a representation for the kind of music I know I would like to both play more, and hear more recorder players perform. The meeting with Ben Zahav's introduced me to the concept of producing a repertoire that is compatible with the style I wish to play and hear.

The first meeting with Ben Zahav's music and working with a living composer

The first time I got to play a piece by Matan Ben Zahav, I knew I was dealing again with the kind of music I was searching for, after the experience I had with Staeps's music. Both his music and the fact that I got the opportunity to work with the composer himself, made me feel like I found an interesting path to pursue regarding contemporary music.

⁷ Staeps, Virtuose Suite 8.
⁸ Ibid 10.
⁹ Berkeley, Sonatina.
¹⁰ Leigh, Sonatina.
Matan Ben Zahav is a musicology student, a multi-instrumentalist (Ben Zahav plays clarinet, saxophone and piano professionally, in addition, Ben Zahav can play the guitar and flute on a basic level) and a graduate of a master's degree in composition, from the Jerusalem Academy of Music and Dance. Ben Zahav's music is influenced by different musical styles and also from his connection to Judaism. You might hear in his music themes from Jewish hymns.

As part of a course during my Bachelor studies, Ben Zahav offered to compose a piece for my friend Guy Pardo and me, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*\(^{11}\). We didn't have a lot of time to work with Ben Zahav as part of the course, but Pardo and I had a few months to work and rehearse before we played it on stage for the first time. In the few meetings we did have with Ben Zahav, we discussed everything from technical problems, to the actual music and it was an extremely enlightening experience to try and understand the piece through the composer's mind.

At first, we looked at the theme, it's character and musical features. We decided how we would like it to sound and how it should sound later in the piece when making different appearances.

First appearance of the theme, unisono, staccato and in \(f\) in both parts, there is no polyphony at that point, the theme is the only important thing coming loud and clear after the cluster that starts the piece.

Right after this strong statement we hear it again but in a completely different manner, solo recorder, \(p\), more articulation.

\(^{11}\) Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*.
\(^{12}\) Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*, 1, b3.
\(^{13}\) Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*, 1, b4-5.
Different features of the theme will appear again and again, as part of the polyphony:

We hear it as a bridge between the different parts in the piece:

And it will also appear as the last statement of the piece:

The discussion regarding the theme also led us to talk about the tempo Ben Zahav set for us. Since it was more important for us to always hear the rhythmical aspect of the melody, we decided to set a new slower tempo which we thought will bring out those aspects.

It was the first time I dealt with a piece which had such clear divisions in it. Every single one of the parts had a different atmosphere, but at the same time they were all related and bound by the features of the theme and together created a story. Ben Zahav had to direct our attention to different parts in the piece, in order to clarify places in which he thought we need to bring out some of the polyphony that was written and we, didn’t treat right.

14 Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*, 4, b31-32.
15 Ibid, b33.
17 Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*, 16, b121-122.
He also explained some of the choices he made for certain themes in the piece, for example the twisted appearance of the liturgical poem "Shalom Aleichem" (a Jewish hymn) that appears in the left hand in one of the harpsichord's solos:

![Midi notation]

The work we did on articulation in the piece was very important and, in my opinion, one of the significant aspects in Ben Zahav's melodical parts. Apart from creating an interesting texture in the piece, the articulation brings another form of communication between the keyboard and the recorder's parts.

Part F in the piece is full of playful articulation that brings a fresh and bright character to the piece:

![Midi notation]

Dynamics will always be a problematic subject when one plays the recorder, while in other wind instruments there is built-in resistance to the stream of air we blow into the instrument (like reeds in oboes, clarinets, bassoons and saxophones), the recorder is built with almost no resistance. The lack of resistance causes a great influence on the dynamic abilities of the instrument, if we blow too hard the pitch can become relatively too high and when we do not blow enough, the pitch can be relatively too low. While this is true to some extent also to other wind instrument, the lack of resistance I mentioned makes the recorder even more affected to the way we blow the air into it.

Together with Ben Zahav we had to find the way to create the dynamics without playing dynamically. The main tools to create the tension and

18 Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*, 8, b67-68.
19 Ibid, b69.
20 Ben Zahav, *Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord*, 10, b77.
21 Ibid, b80.
release instead of using dynamics are articulation and rubato, two tools that are very versatile and can be used in many interesting ways.

This first project with Ben Zahav's composition resulted in only two concerts, but we didn't stop working on the piece and one year later, we performed it in a competition and won in the "Israeli performance" section of the competition with it. This relative success may have planted the seeds for the next piece Ben Zahav would write for recorder which would lead to my project.

A short investigation of the nature of collaborations in art

When I started to think about my master's project and what would I like to explore in it, all those questions regarding my place in the classical music world of today, started to rise. The memories from the work on Ben Zahav's music and the actual experience of working with him, came to me and guided me towards the subject of collaborations. The last time we worked together, it was a part of a course and both Ben Zahav as the composer and Pardo and myself, were conducted by the course lecturer. It was a guided collaboration. I knew that if I take on a collaboration as a project, I will have to explore the subject of collaborations and its effect on the performance.

The clarinet performer and teacher Paul Roe wrote in his PhD "A Phenomenology of Collaboration in Contemporary Composition and Performance":

"The number of authors who have dealt with collaboration between composer and performer in western classical music is very small indeed. There are tangential references in the literature to some composer-performer relationships such as Brahms and Joachim, Stockhausen and Stephens, and also Cage and Tudor. This literature, however, tends to prioritize outcomes and not the processes of engagement."22

Roe's paper explores the subject of collaborations in the arts and specifically in western classical music in a most thorough way. First exploring the meaning of the word collaboration and later presenting many different definitions of the word and its meaning. While managing to give a few examples of collaborations between composers and artists from other artistic fields (choreographers, film directors, visual artists etc.) Roe has a harder time, when trying to give examples for collaborations between composers and performers, he says:

"When it comes to a composer working with a performer, however, the essential material distinctions become messier, as the disjunction between the media of sound and script creates challenges in assigning artistic equity."23

23 Ibid 48.
Music is the most abstract form of art. When performers deal with any piece of music, the hardest mission standing before them is the interpretation of the text. While technical difficulties in a piece can be an obstacle for performance, they are most likely to be solved. However, interpretation of a piece is an aspect of our work that is never fully resolved.

Interpretation is affected by our growing knowledge, musical skills and day to day experiences and for that reason, it is also more sensitive and susceptible to change.

As Roe suggests:

“In forms where there are specific physical outcomes (film, dance, theatre, etc.), it seems to be easier to develop significant partnerships, as individual artistic identification with specific material products is more easily achieved.”

When we can see our goal and describe it in a visual manner, it can be more achievable to work together, we can find ways to explain ourselves.

Roe is aware of the difficulties that might present themselves in a collaboration between a performer and a composer, so he used his background knowledge to help him to investigate as he went along with the process and defining the outcome

Since I knew my research will be similar to Roe's, I chose to use some of the tools I learned from his analyses. I wanted to define different kinds of collaborations so later I will be able to characterize and portray the experience I had.

In his research, Roe talks about some different models of collaborations as they were defined by people who investigated the subject. I chose to use his summery of Vera John-Steiner, author of Creative Collaboration and Creativity and Development. According to Roe, John-Steiner defines four models of collaboration: "distributed collaboration", "complementarity collaboration", "family collaboration" and "integrative collaboration”.

I would like to focus on three of those models, those that will help me defined my collaboration in the best way:

"Distributed Collaboration”:

"This practice is widespread taking place in casual settings and also more organized contexts. Included amongst these are conversations at conferences electronic discourse communities and artists sharing the same Space. In these situations, the participants explore ideas and thoughts and also exchange information. These roles are informal and involuntary. Participants share common interests and some new personal insights may accrue."
This suggested model of collaboration is quite "informal". The situation in which people from the same field of work share a space that leads to exchange of information that can direct to new ideas. The possible outcomes of this model of collaboration are most likely to be individual, but they are influenced by the contact between people.

"Complementarity Collaboration":

"This is the most widely practiced form of collaboration. It is based on complementary expertise, discipline knowledge, clear roles and temperament. It is characterized by a clear division of labor based on expertise..."27

"This category sees a greater element of mutual appropriation in which shared experiences sustain the partners' creative endeavors..."28

This suggested model of collaboration regards a situation in which people with different set of expertise, skills and knowledge come together to achieve a certain goal and produce a specific product. In this case, the only way they can achieve the wanted outcome, is by joining forces.

"Family Collaboration":

"This pattern of collaboration shares many of the characteristics of complementarity but also brings a greater degree of intensity because of the developed relationship. This form is characterized by modes of interaction in which roles are flexible and may change over time. Levels of independence, dependence and interdependence shift and develop depending on skill levels and experience. Whilst this particular form of Collaboration is often associated with familial relationships, it can also apply to groups that work very closely together and in which close socialization is a key dynamic..."29

In this suggested model of collaboration, a key component is the ongoing relationship between the involved people. The nature of this collaboration allows development and acquisition of new knowledge and skills that help the people involved to keep creating together.

Between Arts

As I could understand from Roe's research, the subject of collaborations between composers and performers is not well documented and there aren't many examples for those collaborations in the literature. For this reason, I decided to turn to collaborations that involved artists from two different fields of art, the first between a composer and a choreographer and the second, between two visual artists.

27 Roe, "A Phenomenology of Collaboration in Contemporary Composition and Performance", 27.
28 Ibid 27.
29 Ibid 27.
I found the story of collaboration between the composer Aaron Copland and choreographer Martha Graham that together created the ballet "Appalachian Spring".

The story of this collaboration begins in 1942, when one of the dancers in Graham's company (who later became her husband) Hawkins, wrote a letter to the library of congress's benefactor, Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge (who was both a composer and a pianist), suggesting she will commission a work by the talented dancer and choreographer 30. After a long correspondence it was settled, Graham will create choreography to Copland's composition. As each of the involved parties were located in a different part of the continent (Graham in the west coast and Copland in Mexico), the creation was mainly a product of correspondence between the two.

The composer says in an interview from 1985: "She gave me an outline of what was happening, or what was to happen in the ballet, it didn't even have a title... I just work on what she gave me... but the main thing is, that I was so very familiar with her style of dancing and choreography she creates...that it was comparatively easy to put her and her dance style to music..." 31. Mrs. Coolidge put Graham in charge of the ballet story line and had a strong opinion that the orchestration of the music should contain no more than 12 players. Copland's composition almost lived up to her expectations as the final composition included 13 players (strings, winds and a piano). With that resolute it was easy to present the performance in many locations.

The collaboration between Graham and Copland was a "complementarity collaboration". Two people who joined their complementary expertise, knowledge and skills in order to create one creation. The division of labore was clear and each of them had a certain role to play. The appreciation between them, together with the inspiration they drew from each other, made the result of this collaboration successful.

Another collaboration I explored is the one between Marcel Duchamp and Man Ray. They first met during the summer of 1915. They became artistic partners and friends after an incident in 1917 in which Ray protested in Duchamp's name so that his work "fountain", would be presented in the exhibition of the society of independent artists 32.

Over the years, the two promoted many artistic ideas together. From what I read about the friendship between them, it is clear to me that (like in many friendships) each of them had a role in the relationship. Duchamp was

30 White, “Documenting Dance: The Making of ‘Appalachian Spring’”.
31 Page, “American Mavericks: Aaron Copland”.
32 Marcadà, “The unholy trinity Duchamp, Man Ray, Picabia”.
always full of ideas and they were spreading beyond the basics of painting or sculpting and Ray, was there to support his friend's ideas and help him execute them.

Ray stands behind Duchamp's most famous works like "Rotary Glass (Precision Optics)", "Anemic Cinema", which was shot in Ray's studio, and the pictures of Rose Sélavy.33

"The first incarnation of Rotary Glass Plates (Precision Optics), nearly dealt Man Ray a serious injury- one of the spinning plates broke loose and hit him on the head."

This portrait was taken by Man Ray in 1921. It features Duchamp as a woman- Rose Sélavy who was Duchamp's feminine alter ego.

"Anemic Cinema"- seven-minute black-and-white 35 mm film, consisting of nine erotic puns inscribed on discs and ten optical discs along the lines of the Discs Bearing Spirals and the Rotoreliefs.

The collaboration between Duchamp and Ray was a "family collaboration". While Duchamp and Ray weren't related, their long friendship was the biggest contributor to the many important art works they co-created. Their ongoing friendship allowed them to grow and develop as artists and we can still enjoy the results.

I thought that the process of working with a composer would teach me a lot about the actual composition process and would bring me closer to create myself. Being able to work with another person who is interested to create new music for the recorder, would nourish both of us with new and fresh ideas and would bring an interesting outcome. I wanted to explore what will be the nature of my collaboration with Ben Zahav and see if it is similar to the other examples I studied.

33 Marcadà, “The unholy trinity Duchamp, Man Ray, Picabia”.
After exploring two collaborations between artists from different fields, I wanted to try to explore and defined a collaboration between a composer and a performer.

Not a lot is known about Joseph Leutgeb. He was an Austrian horn player and it seems that he was a great virtuoso. It is known that he was acquainted with Joseph Haydn and the latter might have written his horn concerto in D major for him\textsuperscript{34}. Apart from Haydn, Leutgeb had a strong and long-lasting friendship with the Mozart family.

It seems that he met them in Milan in February 1773, although his name is mentioned in one of Leopold Mozart's letters to his wife already in November 1772, as he was expecting Leutgeb's arrival "So H Leutgeb is planning to go to Rome?... If he were here at the beginning of December, in other words, during the first few days of the month, he could be asked to accompany an aria at the opera."\textsuperscript{35}. Leutgeb's name is mentioned in Leopold's letters to his wife from the end of 1772 to the first months of 1773, furthermore, it is mentioned in one of the letters, that young Wolfgang (26 years old at the time) is upset that Leutgeb will miss a performance of his opera "Wolfg. is sorry that Leitgeb will arrive too late and won’t be able to hear his opera."\textsuperscript{36}.

In 1777, Leutgeb moved from Salzburg to Vienna to take over a cheese shop he inherited\textsuperscript{37}. Leutgeb and Mozart stayed in touch over the years and when the latter came to Vienna in 1781, the two became close friends. Luckily, the friendship between the horn player and the Mozarts, produced creative fruits, as it is undeniable that Mozart's works for the horn, were written with Leutgeb's image in mind.

Evidence for this, can be found in Mozart's 1\textsuperscript{st} horn concerto, where the composer left comments for Leutgeb\textsuperscript{38}:

I had some difficulty defining this collaboration between Leutgeb and Mozart. It can be considered as a "distributed collaboration", the manner in which Mozart's concerto came to be, was affected by their friendship and in any friendship, there is exchange of thoughts and ideas, but we can't know for sure how much actual contact the two actually had.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Lorenz, “A Little Leitgeb Research”.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Eisen, “In Mozart's Words”, Letter 266.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Eisen, “In Mozart's Words”, Letter 281.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Morley-pegge, Hiebert, Leutgeb Joseph.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Mozart, \textit{Horn Concerto in D Major}.
\end{itemize}
The Project

Recorder Sonata

Composition process

We dived into the project without exactly knowing how this collaboration would work. The initial idea I had in mind was to compose a piece together. I wanted to be able to shape a piece in a certain style that like Steaps's Suite, will bring out those raw qualities of the recorder, and for that reason it was important to me to be as involved as I can in the process of shaping the piece.

The first discussion Ben Zahav and I had, led us to decide that as a starting point I will come up with themes for the piece and apart from that, I suggested that the piece will take the form of a sonata of four movements, like most baroque sonatas, or of three movements like some of the Italian sonatas by Sammartini - sonatas of three movements that shows progress of tempo and musical substance from one movement to the other.

I presented to Ben Zahav my first idea for a theme, two phrases that in my mind, I have already heard their harmony and were pretty long.

Ben Zahav suggested to look at a theme in a different way, as a short sequence of notes, and inside that sequence the importance will be of the intervals. I was to think mainly of the melodic aspect and use rhythm in order to demonstrate the tempo or atmosphere I wanted to give each of those themes.

Coming up with short themes was a harder mission than what I thought it would be. I had to limit my ambition and listen to the instrument, listen closer to what I would like to hear played on it.
I came up with two themes:

The first theme I saw as more lyrical, the coulement (the ornament before the last note) could be used in many ways, if before or after the bit, as an ornament or as a main note. This sequence was specified to a slow movement.
The second theme I heard as more energetic and I used the triplets to represent to Ben Zahav the restlessness I heard in it.

My work was not finished by simply introducing the short themes to Ben Zahav. It was important to the process that I'll also think about the different recorders in relation to those melodies and check them in some different keys and ranges so the outcome will fit the instrument the best it can. After all, the initial idea was to compose music that is idiomatic to the recorder. Ben Zahav examined the themes and gave me his approval together with some ideas that will make the use of those themes more interesting. He gave me the vision he had for shaping those melodies and make them two movements a slow one and a fast and energetic one.

At that point of the process, I understood that my vision to be more involved in the actual composition process might have been too ambitious. The situation could have been different if I had much more knowledge and experience in composition but unfortunately my experience with that field is limited to one, partly successful attempt, to compose a short jazz tune and couple less successful attempts during high-school.

The themes were in Ben Zahav's hands for a while and then he presented me a fast movement based on the material I sent him. He first submitted only the recorder part and still didn't know if the accompaniment will be for Piano or for Harpsichord.
The idea was to play that movement on a tenor recorder but since it was written in a range that complemented an alto recorder, I decided to ask for Ben Zahav's permission to try and practice on the alto. After practicing the piece for a while, I reached the conclusion that apart from the range, the features of the movements, which includes many short fragments and a lot of restless breaks in a low register will sound better on the alto recorder especially taking into account the upcoming accompaniment.

I shared my thoughts with Ben Zahav and after listening to the recordings that I sent him he accepted my opinions.

We went through the same process for the slow movement Ben Zahav presented to me. After receiving the material, I practiced and recorded it for him and he replayed with both general thoughts about the way I should think when approaching the movement, and some more specific notes about the things he heard in the recordings.

From movement to movement and from three pieces to, three movements

First, came a piano accompaniment for the fast movement and it was time to start the rehearsal process with the pianist Joline Granath. I had a few rehearsals and I made it a habit to send Ben Zahav recordings from those rehearsals and discuss the progress and both his and my thoughts of different aspects of the music.

During one of our discussions, he brought up the Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord and told me that he would like to include this piece in the sonata and make it a three-movement sonata. I quite liked the idea and thought it can give the Duet a clearer place in a program of a concert or a
CD, if it will come to it. Ben Zahav took a bit of time to make some changes in the notes of the Duet in order to make it fit better for piano and changed the name from Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord, to Restlessness. Now, we had two out of three movements for our sonata and the last one, we knew, had to be a slow one, in order to present a contrast for the other two.

In the end, even though he already composed a recorder part for a slow movement out of my theme, Ben Zahav chose not to use this existing material and instead, started a new process for this last movement. He came up with 20-20, a lyrical movement that was born out of a melody he had in his mind during the quarantine in Israel due to the Corona virus.

We had three movements and Ben Zahav requested that the order will be: Restlessness, 20-20 and Rondo. This order of movements and development in the piece is similar to some of the modern sonatas I enjoyed playing and those that gave me inspiration for this project. Restlessness as a big first movement, quite long and eventful followed by the lyrical 20-20, full of beautiful harmonies and then an energetic and short last movement, Rondo. The same structure can be found in pieces like Lennox Berkeley Sonatina or in the Sonatina by Walter Leigh.

The similarity between this new piece we worked on and the pieces that inspired me and helped me consolidate my idea around the whole project, and showed me that the intention is clear and fully formed.

Forming the sonata

We started working on the sonata when we only had the Rondo. Joline and I met at first after each of us had a bit of time to go over the piece and right from that beginning, the process of work felt like nothing I did before. Not knowing how the instrument will react to the brand-new music, and how the two instruments will react to each other through the music was especially intriguing.

The first step is of course trying to apply all that the composer wrote in the score. Making the dynamics work, bringing out the written tempi instructions and articulations.

As I explained in the chapter "The first meeting with Ben Zahav's music and working with a living composer" (p7), dynamics can be difficult to handle on the recorder. This struggle increases when the recorder is paired with a piano, which is naturally louder. The Rondo movement contains quite a lot of dynamic instructions and it took me quite a lot of time and rehearsals with Joline, to understand that in most cases, those instructions are actually just a representation to the music itself. The Rondo's theme is a
disrupted melody, small fragments with a lot of breaks, always ending in staccato and appear in a low range of the instrument.
The written dynamic is $p$, which will be quite hard to achieve in this low range of the instrument and in the speed the movement should be played in. In the beginning I was sure I would have to play in a specific way, for this $p$ qualities to come out and it was a very hard and quite unnatural way to play, but once I understood the music itself present those qualities, I could play much better and everything was brought out naturally.

The same thing happens also when the dynamic instruction is $f$. The musical lines are ascending and the articulation is fuller which by itself, creates the demanded $f$. Moreover, when the written instruction is $f$ and there is a need to play openly and with more determination, it seems that the lines are somehow getting easier to play and allowing the player to bring them out.

In some places, there is a need to use some more elaborate technical qualities of the instrument, for example, alternative fingerings for a more distinguished dynamic or leaking with the fingers in order to create a crescendo or a diminuendo on a specific note.

Apart from dynamics, we focused on the distinction between the theme and the episodes. In the first episode Ben Zahav noted specific tempo change.

40 Ibid 2, b16-17.
41 Ibid 3-4, b26-27.
42 Ibid 7, b56-57.
and instructed 'andante cantabile', moreover, in this section the meter alternates from 3 to 4 bits each bar, which helps to create a confused and soft temperament as opposed to the stressed and direct theme.

Ben Zahav didn’t note any instruction regarding the second episode and in the beginning I didn’t do much with it, but as the rehearsals with Joline went along and we developed more as a duo, I felt more comfortable to try and shape this section according to the way in which I heard it in my mind. Playing this episode was like playing an improvisation section and in one of the later rehearsals, I asked Joline to take the tempo down a little bit so we could play it more freely as an actual improvisation.

The work on this movement occurred pretty naturally and Ben Zahav’s comments on the recordings I sent him every rehearsal, were very positive. There was one place in which I wanted to ask Ben Zahav if I can make a small adjustment and raise the phrase to a higher octave. This change that I asked for, from the last bit of bar 22 and until bar 25, was meant to help me make a faded effect using second fingerings on the notes leading to the 'andante cantabile'. Ben Zahav of course understood my intention and accepted this adjustment.

The next movement we added to our work process was Restlessness. I wanted to create something new and as different as I could from the first time I had worked with it, so after retracing all the work steps from that first round, I made myself forget about it and tried to start the work with Joline with a clean slate.

The main instruction I had for Joline, was to make the articulation as clear and distinct as possible both for the musical outcome but also, in order to make the balance between the recorder and the piano clearer. Although the sound of the recorder can be quite low next to another instrument, my

---
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experience taught me that the articulation abilities on the instrument can be an advantage in cases in which we play with louder instruments. Apart from the balance management, Ben Zahav’s music is full of articulation marks which I see as part of his composition language and for that reason alone, it was important for me that it would sound as clear as possible in the performance.

One thing that I didn’t think about the last time I worked on the movement, was the repeat of the A and B parts, the presentation of the theme.

I started to think about the meaning of a repeat in the music I usually play, early music. The repeat is a tool used to establish a statement but also sometimes, a way to show a statement in a different light. With those thoughts in mind, I started to look closely into those two parts and see the subdivisions in them.

Two focal points were especially important to me. The first, was the climax in the very long opening phrase.

In order to bring out the climax in bar 8 I decided that in the repeat we will start the phrase in bar 4 slower and create an accelerando towards bar 8.

The second place I wanted to deal with in the repeat, in order to define it and create more subdivision in those sections, was in the phrase that starts in the middle of bar 29, right after another climax.

Here as well, I found that the way to make it more noticeable and important will be to start the phrase a little slower both in the piano and later on, in the recorder part.

45 Ben Zahav, Restlessness, From Sonata for Recorder and Keyboard, 2, b7-9.
46 Ibid 1, b4-6.
The K section of the movement is assembled out of long notes in the recorder part and chords in the piano part and I recalled that Pardo used to improvise over those harmonies when we played the piece with the harpsichord. In the beginning of the process on this movement, this section sounded a little empty to me after being used to have Pardo's improvisations, so I asked Ben Zahav if Joline should maybe add small improvisation to the harmonies but he asked to leave it as it is. I understood eventually, that this section draws its direction and intensity from it being the only part in the movement that is not busy with fast and active polyphony.

We worked quite a lot in order to bring our performance to the fastest tempo we could, which is still slower than the written tempo, Ben Zahav didn't want the temperament that was created out of a slower tempo we played it to begin with. After reaching a higher tempo, I listened to a recording from our rehearsal and found that this high tempo came out as too aggressive. It might be the combination between the very busy polyphony and the difference between the sound and the volume of the piano versus the harpsichord. I ended up playing it slower than what Ben Zahav had in mind but, I made sure both Joline and myself would take better care of the articulation as a tool to express the wanted temperament.

Finally, we started to work on the second movement of the piece, 20-20\textsuperscript{49}. In the beginning I was a little intimidated since Ben Zahav composed this movement for a tenor recorder and I never actually played a piece for a tenor recorder outside the boundaries of ensemble repertoire. After a few days of individual work on the movement I noticed how natural the music is

\textsuperscript{47} Ben Zahav, \textit{Restlessness}, From Sonata for Recorder and Keyboard, 4, b28-30.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid 4, b31.

\textsuperscript{49} Ben Zahav, 20-20, From Sonata for Recorder and Keyboard.
fitted on the instrument and later on, when I met with Joline, I heard how easy it was for both of us to play this movement. The shaping process of this movement happened quite fast, might have been a product of our general work process and development as a duo, but was also related to the way the music is composed, almost like a song. Ben Zahav asked me to add to the cadenza he composed and I decided to try and improvise, instead of notating it.

Since this movement was sent to us just a few weeks before the concert, I didn’t send Ben Zahav recordings from every rehearsal, but only from one of the last rehearsals before the performance we had. He was very happy with the way we performed it and didn't really have any comments.

Utilizing three different recorders in one sonata was fun not just because I never got to do it before, but also because I know it can be great representation for the recorder as a family of instruments. Each of those instruments have different colors of sound and react differently to articulation and to the piano with it, which in my opinion, will increase the level of interest in front of an audience.

Creating the trio

One of the inspirations for the project was the work I did with two students from school, together we formed a recorder trio. The work with the trio went well and a few months into the work, I decided to write to Ben Zahav and ask if he would like to write a piece for a recorder trio, to my surprise he said yes.

My first inspiration was the work I did with Ben Zahav in the past on the Duet for Recorder and Harpsichord. After I had this base for the project, the work on the trio was the final push to make Ben Zahav's composition the main subject of my work.

The trio was not originally a part of my vision for the project, but after forming a clearer idea for my goals, I knew it would serve me well as a part from this project and will have a good place as part of this musical program.

Out of the two movements of the piece, we actually started the process with the second movement. This decision was based mainly on the visual impression of the notes.

Nigun, the second movement of the trio, which was first called Yearning, was quite clear and straight forward to work on. First, we all worked on our parts by ourself and when we met for the first rehearsal, I spent some time
talking and explaining Ben Zahav's subtitle for the movement, "A new point of view on Rabbi Shneur Zalman of Liadi's Nigun 'Tzama'." The Rabbi Shneur Zalman was the founder of Chabad, he was known for his ability to explain even the most complex issues of the Torah and in addition, he was also well read and informed in mathematics and science. Out of many works Ben Zahav chose the hymn 'Tzama' or 'Tzama lecha nafshi', 'my soul craves for you'.

The movement begins with a melody from the hymn in the tenor part, and is being carried through the whole movement like a leitmotif. In its first appearance Ben Zahav wanted it to be played "slow and rubato", to give it the atmosphere of a prayer.

The piece is composed like a fugue and it was important to Ben Zahav that we will be aware of the appearances of the theme, that is mostly covered in some counterpoints. We tried to focus on that from the beginning, but during our work we had to remind ourselves to pay attention to it more than once.

We decided to shape some places with rubato in order to create some dynamics but also, reshaped some places in order to create space for breathing in places it was necessary.
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As performers we also took some independent decisions for example, creating accelerando of nine bars from bar 72 towards what we saw as the climax of the movement in bar 81:

As a contrast to all the madness that occurred to the point of climax in bar 81, we decided to create piano of a few bars, 83 to the middle of bar 89, where Ben Zahav actually noted a crescendo.

Once we managed to shape the movement to the way we wanted to hear it, it was also much easier for us to practice the written music and instructions. Some technical details became easier to perform and sounded better, after we tampered a little bit with the rubato and some of the tempi.
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After we felt we made some progress with "Nigun", we moved on to practice the first movement of the trio, which had a totally different character from the second one. By only taking a look at the notes, we could see that we are facing music that is not like anything we dealt with before.

The work we did on this movement, taught me that working as a trio is much more complicated than the work I did on the sonata. Out of all the movements of the two pieces of the project, this one was the only one that actually presented me, together with my fellow players, an actual technical problem. The piece is based on the progress of long organ points and the melodies around these long notes, should be played like improvisations. When playing bigger instruments like bass and tenor recorders, one needs to use more air in order to carry out a phrase and those long notes presented a breathing problem to the lower parts, but also to the top part, played on an alto, in the tempo Ben Zahav assigned to this movement.

We tried to find breathing solutions while consulting with Ben Zahav over the different options.

After solving this technical problem, we started to encounter timing issues that were an outcome of those breathing "solutions" we created. We had to practice some areas again and again in order to understand and get used to the changes in time we created.

58 Ben Zahav, Mindfulness, 1, b1-3.
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During our work process on this movement, we communicated with Ben Zahav quite a lot not just for the technical details, but also in order to get some advice for the character of the movement. Ben Zahav helped us by making us treat the movement as if it had three different parts, he saw it as meditation process and after discussing that matter, he also changed the name of the movement from "Prelude" to "Mindfulness". After Ben Zahav helped us see this division, our work became easier and more efficient. We managed to find and define the character of each of the parts and the whole movement.

The first 28 bars represent the mind's way to relax and create meditative atmosphere. We wanted to make the melodies sound improvised even in the time frame they were written in, also, we tried to avoid specific accents and make it sound fluent. One of the most difficult aspects of this first section, was the intonation in the places we play the same note. In some of those places Ben Zahav also noted a crescendo or diminuendo and we practiced it while knowing it would be very hard to achieve.

In some places where there is more communication between the voices, more polyphony, we attempted to make it sound very organic, as though it was one instrument that is only transmitting on different frequencies.

---
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After trying to get into a meditative state and maybe succeeding in bar 28, in bar 29 something new begins. It might be the thoughts that can interrupt us while trying to stay inside our head. We decided to use clearer and sharper articulation in order to make this part different and more active. It was especially important to use clearer articulation in some bars where the alto and tenor have very similar, but not identical rhythmical parts.

This middle part features those "cries", they appear mainly in the tenor part but to make them even stronger they are being reinforced by the alto part. The two voices are playing the same note in the same time and instead of taking care of their intonation, I decided the "cry" affect will come out better if we add a lot of vibrato. This vibrato meant to make those notes sound more desperate and anxious as opposed to the calm and deep notes in the first part. This part was enhanced also by the tenor part, that for several bars is playing on an alto recorder.

In order to create a more defined transition to the final part, that supposed to be calm and represent the serenity of the mind after the journey it went through, we decided that the solo in the bass part, in bar 42 will be slower and rubato, as conclusion of what happened and the door to the next section.
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While being a conclusion to everything that happened, the last part is actually full of gestures that are not necessarily calm and serene. Our goal was to play this part in a similar way to the first part, make the different gestures sound like they glide from one voice to the other. In the same time, it was important to give more importance to some places.

The main challenge of the trio was defiantly the first movement. What helped us the most was Ben Zahav's direction to see it in three different parts, which helped us defined the right characteristic for each part and eventually, for the whole movement.

The Sounding Part

For the sounding part of my project, I choose to do a lunch concert that would be a premier, that two new pieces deserve.

At first, my intention was to do an evening concert, those usually get more audience and have a more festive feeling. While considering an evening concert, I know that I'll then have to add pieces to the program since the two pieces by Ben Zahav added up to quite a short program. Since one of my concerns regarding the project, was the way the music would be accepted by the listeners, I chose not to challenge Ben Zahav's pieces against other music and decided that a short lunch concert will serve my cause better.

I decided to place the trio first in the program mainly due to it being shorter than the sonata, but also so I might already be less stressed towards the
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sonata performance. There is something comforting about playing a trio with the same instruments while when playing a sonata, one can feel more exposed.

As the concert got closer, I started to feel more and more insecure. I knew that I carry a responsibility to represent this new music in the best way not only for my sake as a performer, but also for Ben Zahav's sake as a composer and most importantly in my opinion, for the sake of the music itself. One of my goals in promoting this project was to make more recorder players see the beauty in this kind of new repertoire and for that to happen, I knew the presentation needed to be impressive.

In an attempt to diminish my stress, I scheduled a general rehearsal a day before the concert, so for the first time I could hear the whole program as a whole. I had the luxury to perform this rehearsal in the same hall as the concert will be played in, which helped to estimate some of the decisions we made about articulation. Acoustic can be great help for an instrument but can also create unclarity in some cases. Generally, we had to make our articulation clearer and shorter even in the places we decided to play wider, in order for all the lines to come out in the best way. This detail was important mostly for the trio piece but helped also in the case of the sonata. I invited a friend who is a recorder player to listen to this rehearsal. I wanted to both hear some technical advice but mostly, I wanted to know what she thought about the pieces, as she is, in many ways, the target audience. This rehearsal proven itself to be a good idea for all of us. It created more confidence in the performance and in the idea as a whole.

Two technical issues rose from this general rehearsal, the first was the intonation in the trio piece. during our rehearsals we did work on intonation quite a lot, but playing in the hall, we learned that it's a detail we might have not put enough attention to. Knowing that, we tried to listen more and be more attentive while performing.

The second problem I discovered, also has to do with intonation but in a very different way, had to do with the fact the sonata, is played on different recorders.

Wooden instruments are very sensitive to any new environment and recorder are especially so, when one just starts to play without warming out the instrument at least for a little while, before playing. Each movement of the sonata is played on a different instrument and in quite long gaps. When practicing the piece or even recording it, the problem is not as drastic, one can always pause for a little while, treat the instrument and go on, in a concert it is a bit more problematic. The only satisfactory solution I could find was for one of the trio players to warm the recorders that are about to be played. Before each movement my friend came up to stage and gave me the instrument. this solution might not look very smooth for a performance, but I believe it is the professional thing to do, in order to play on an
instrument that can be tuned better with the piano, and also, just perform better.

Before playing every piece, I presented them shortly, but made sure to include information that was important both for me and for Ben Zahav.

The concert was livestreamed from KMH on the 31st of March 2021 at 12:30.

Performing effect
My project was based on my will to create music that I enjoy playing and that I think will make my instrument more acceptable, maybe even more loved by my audience. I also wanted to create more interest in this kind of music within the recorder players community. Naturally, after performing the music and sharing the recording on social media, I started to ask myself a lot of questions regarding my cause and the effect it had on me, the audience and the musicians around me.

Did we manage to touch people and raise interest in Ben Zahav's music? Did we managed to create more interest and love for our instrument, the recorder? Will other musicians be interested in playing and listening to this kind of repertoire played on the recorder? Did we manage to bring out what we as recorder players hear while playing our instrument? After performing the pieces, did I still feel the same towards this kind of repertoire?

I think that the answers to most of those questions can't and even shouldn't be answered after only one performance of this music or any kind of new music. Both the non-musicians and musicians who might have listened to the concert we had, can't judge this music or the recorder, after experiencing it just once, I can only wish that it raised interest and will to hear more.

From the quite little feedback I did manage to get, Ben Zahav's pieces were accepted very well both by the non- musician audience and the musicians who listened, I even got a request to get the note sheets. I can also say that after performing the pieces I got to appreciate them even more and had the feeling I would like to move this project forward.

Lessons in leading a project
Another side of the process I wanted to examine was the way in which I managed to lead the project up to the concert day.

Did I encourage the other players and made them see what I see in Ben Zahav's music? Did they have a good experience working with me as the leader of this project? Did I manage to express Ben Zahav's wishes in a clear way and bring them out through the work we did? And of course, as a project leader, what would I improve and try to do better for the next time?
I learned that the process of creating the sonata was smoother in general. There are many factors contributing to the situation, like the fact that we were only two musicians dealing with the music, as well as the fact that I got to learn most of the music myself before starting the rehearsals. I knew how I wanted it to sound and therefore what to ask from Joline. While the interpretation of the piece was in the hands of me and Ben Zahav, as the pianist, Joline contributed to the technical part of the performance. With her help we found the path to perform the piece in a way that made both instruments work best together. One very important point was that our work was conducted by what music was ready for us, I didn't have to jump from movement to movement which helped me not get confused. We worked on each movement and later on we worked on putting them all together. This kind of process created more focused work not just for us, but also for my interaction with Ben Zahav.

Ben Zahav's overview of the outcome was extremely positive. He enjoyed our interpretation and told us that it went hand in hand with his interpretation of his composition.

The work on the trio piece was much more complicated from all aspects. We had to deal with music we never heard before, even as someone who already played Ben Zahav's music, the trio's material was unfamiliar.

Recorder trio is a large subject of work with many different technical difficulties. The subject of tuning is a big issue in a recorder trio situation (as well as any other size of recorder ensemble) which require a lot of very focused work that can take a long time. Both articulation and the matter of mutual sound becomes much more sensitive. If I try to summarize what I think we should have done differently, I would say that maybe we should have worked independently longer, before starting to rehearse together. Maybe some technical problems would have been solved better without the pressure of rehearsing together and being exposed so early in the rehearsal process.

Ben Zahav was very grateful for the performance of the trio but he also said that it didn't really match his expectations. He did point out that in many cases there is a gap between what a composer hears in his mind and what can be performed. We managed to put the piece together and bring out everything we worked on but musically, Ben Zahav expected to hear a more focused and maybe fiercer interpretation.

Looking back at the work we did on the trio, I know that we had quite a lot of mess dealing with technical issues and in the end, it might have been too much for us as a trio at this point. While the thought that the music itself was not written well for the recorder did come up, I think that making such a decision after only one performance and only one group working on the piece, is premature. I can definitely say that we learned a lot about this kind of work and I think it will be great to try working on this piece again as a more experienced trio.
Discussion

The goal of this project and study was to investigate the character of my collaboration with Ben Zahav and to see if and what benefits this collaboration brings with it. I will address these two questions in this discussion. In addition, I will suggest the questions and angles of further research that this process raised for me.

What was the nature of my collaboration?

Ben Zahav and I joined forces in order to create new repertoire for recorder. My plan to be more involved in the composition process didn't work. I didn't have the right skills for that, so Ben Zahav and I had to use our complementary knowledge and skills in order to make the pieces he composed the best they can be for the recorder.

According to my initial research, my collaboration with Ben Zahav was similar to the collaboration between Martha Graham and Aaron Copland, it was a "complementarity collaboration".

One of my contributions to the piece were the themes I wrote and described earlier in this paper, for the sonata. These themes were inspirations for Ben Zahav. They also gave him a very clear picture of what I wanted to play and hear. I think that this is similar to the outline of the dance Graham gave Copland when they started working together and the mutual acquaintance and familiarity with each other's art and creations.

Ben Zahav and I also communicated regarding the technical difficulties in the pieces and did our best to find solutions, in most of the cases, our discussions led to success and we made the music better. The discussions we had regarding the musical material were interesting in the sense that we could see how much our understanding of the material matched Ben Zahav's vision. We had the chance to work on the musical ideas again and again, until the composer himself gave his "green light". Moreover, the discussions and our performances during rehearsals also changed Ben Zahav's ideas from time to time, it was interesting to experience mutual growth. Those discussions were productive and helped us understand the pieces better. Together with the other players, we did our best and worked as hard as we could for the music to be well represented.

Apart from the traits of a "complementarity collaboration", Ben Zahav and I communicated from far apart and didn't meet face to face through the whole process, similar to Graham's and Copland's work process.

Working on such a collaboration from a distance was not easy, and I wish that Ben Zahav could attend at least some of our rehearsals and react to our playing on the spot.

While I couldn't create a "Family Collaboration" in this project, after exploring the different models of collaborations and investigating the nature of my collaboration, I know that one day I do wish to find a "Family
Collaboration". To achieve this goal, I will have to learn more about composition so I will be able to reach more decisions with the other party involved.

Regarding "Distributed Collaboration" I am happy to say that I think that as long as I surround myself with fellow musicians, I will always benefit from this model of collaboration.

What are the benefits I gained from my collaboration?

As a musician who is dealing with early music most of the time, an interpretation of a piece is always quite a big dilemma. The musical text in most of the pieces I deal with, doesn't include a lot of comments from the composer, no articulation or dynamic notes.

In order to have all the possible information about a piece, we as early music musicians, have to read sources, know all that we can about the composer and the times in which he lived in, this way, we can put together all that we know and start interpret the text.

Working with a living composer is a completely different experience, it is challenging and interesting but in different ways from my practice with early music. One of the benefits I could recognize in working with Ben Zahav, is that I know him and his background. This helped me to connect and appreciate his music. additionally, it helped me to communicate with him in a way that assisted us to achieve the best musical outcome.

Ben Zahav and I share some views regarding the reality of classical music today. We had discussions on the subject and our thoughts and shared opinions regarding the subject, helped us create music that reflect those mutual ideas. We both care about the way the instruments we play sound; we both see music as a language and think that the way to represent it, is through the use of the natural abilities and traits of our instruments.

Another benefit of working with a living composer, is that there is a window of opportunity to discuss the technical aspect of a piece. While I believe it is our job as performers to work as hard as we can to perfect the technical difficulties we come across when practicing a piece, I think that if there is a possibility to consult with the composer, we should take the opportunity and try to find solutions that will help us present the piece in the best way we can. This work, on the technical side is also an opportunity to dig deeper into the abilities of the recorder as an instrument, both my personal knowledge and widening my expertise and, in the future may give way to new insights and ideas for future repertoire.

In the case of this project, I described in detail our work on the two pieces, and as one can read in the chapter "The Project", in both pieces Ben Zahav and I had some discussions on specific places that we eventually changed. The purpose of those changes was to treat the music in the best possible way so the final outcome will represent the musical ideas we talked about.
Another possible benefit from a collaboration with a composer is the feeling or reciprocation. Ben Zahav and his music were the inspiration for the project and Ben Zahav was inspired from my high motivation, from seeing how invested I was in the project and in the end, from the outcome itself. I can say with absolute certainty that I will always play early music, but after this collaboration, I can also say with certainty that I will look for more collaborations in the future. The feeling of mutual creation and what's behind it, shared ideas and visions, inspired us both to create what we think to be great music for recorder.

After completing this project, I still have questions regarding the way I handled it and how would I use what I learned from the project in the future.

Ben Zahav and I share not only our views towards music, we share a language and similar cultural experiences. Those similarities contribute to our communication and understanding of ideas. After collaborating with Ben Zahav, I wonder, what would it be like to collaborate with someone I don't share a background with?

My collaboration with Ben Zahav was motivated by my master project and I ask myself, would I consider to collaborate even if I didn't have this incentive?

Having this incentive also made me naturally more invested in the collaboration than Ben Zahav. In most collaborations one party initiates and this party will most likely be more invested in the outcome. How are collaborations effected by the fact that one side is, in most cases, more invested in the idea?

Moreover, what is the effect of a third party initiating a collaboration, like in the case of Martha Graham and Aaron Copland, that had a commissioner?

As a result of my project, I found that I would like to experience a "Family Collaboration". One of the reasons I would really like to create a "Family Collaboration", is that I think that the terms of this model don't include the same relationship of the initiator and joined party. The relationships in this model of collaboration grow and develop in a way that might create the same level of engagement from both sides. I would really like to have the opportunity to explore this model of collaboration.

Last, I ask myself, when will I have the opportunity to find another composer that will be willing to compose music for my misunderstood instrument? will the next collaboration be with a composer that shares the same views regarding modern music, or will it be someone that will manage to change my mind regarding some contemporary styles that I still don't appreciate enough?
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