



**Winfried Lüdemann** is an Emeritus Professor of Musicology at Stellenbosch University and former Chair of the Department of Music. He has published widely on a diverse range of topics, including South African music and a biography of the German composer Hugo Distler (Augsburg, 2002). He has a keen interest in the music of Roelof Temmingh and has written several articles on this composer, including the respective contributions to the new *Grove Encyclopaedia of Music and Musicians* and the German encyclopaedia *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.

Tel. 082 865 0040 Email: [w1@sun.ac.za](mailto:w1@sun.ac.za)

## ROELOF TEMMINGH'S MUSIC FOR ORGAN

WINFRIED LÜDEMANN  
EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF MUSICOLOGY  
STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY

### ABSTRACT

Numerous church organists, concert performers and composers have contributed to the long and proud tradition of organ music in South Africa. Amongst them the composer Roelof Temmingh represents a voice that has not yet been given the recognition that it deserves. His compositional output in the field of liturgical music is small, but his two organ concertos as well as the concert piece *Chant d'éloge* must rank amongst the finest and most significant contributions to the field of secular South African organ music. This article discusses all Temmingh's organ works, examines the circumstances of their origin and provides brief formal and stylistic analyses of each.

### OPSOMMING

Talle kerk- en konsertorreliste en komponiste het tot die lang en trotse tradisie van orrelmusiek in Suid-Afrika bygedra. Binne hierdie tradisie verteenwoordig die komponis Roelof Temmingh 'n stem wat nog nie die erkenning geniet wat dit verdien nie. Op die gebied van liturgiese musiek is sy bydrae beperk, maar sy twee orrelkonserte sowel as die konsertstuk *Chant d'éloge* is sekerlik van

die belangrikste bydraes op die terrein van sekulêre Suid-Afrikaanse orrelmusiek. Hierdie artikel bespreek al Temmingh se orrelwerke, ondersoek hulle ontstaansgeskiedenis en verskaf kort vorm- en stylanalises van elk.

---

Roelof Temmingh (1946-2012) was born into a family steeped in sacred music. The organ and organ music held pride of place, together with boundless admiration for the art of Johann Sebastian Bach. Temmingh's father, Roelof Temmingh (senior), a pupil of the renowned Dutch organist Jan Zwart, took up the position of organist of the Groote Kerk in Cape Town two years after the family had emigrated to South Africa in 1958 (Troskie, 2002: 153-154). Therefore, it is not surprising that Roelof (junior), as well as his elder brother Henk, followed in their father's footsteps and became organists themselves. After giving up his initial intention to study theology and become a minister of religion, Temmingh enrolled as a student at the College of Music, University of Cape Town, where he studied organ with Barry Smith, but majored in composition. Although he subsequently followed a distinguished career as a composer and academic, spending by far the longest time of this career at Stellenbosch University, Temmingh was also active as a church organist. He served the NG Kerk Stellenbosch-Wes in this capacity with great dedication for more than three decades, 1973 until 2005, to be precise. Here he made a name for himself as a highly accomplished improviser rather than as a performer of other composers' works, concentrating on the various requirements of the divine service rather than on concerts or recitals.

Given this background, it is surprising to find that Temmingh's worklist of more than 130 compositions includes only a handful of works written specifically for the organ, although numerous pieces make use of the organ as accompanying or ensemble instrument. His keen interest in sacred music was expressed rather in the genre of vocal music. In this area his contribution is vast, ranging from several large-scale works, like the cantata on the German hymn "Wenn wir in höchsten Nöten sein" and the oratorio-like *Kantorium* (also in German), to choral works with (piano) accompaniment, like *Himne*, and motet-like a cappella compositions, like *Nisi dominus*. By comparison his sacred organ works pale into insignificance; his interest in organ music was rather realised in a number of important secular compositions.

The complete list of Temmingh's organ works is as follows:

*Monofonie* (organ solo; 1971)

*Psalm 42* (two chorale preludes for organ solo; 1975) (published in the series *Liturgiese Orrelmusiek*, vol. 2)

*Fantasie op Gesang 128* (chorale prelude for organ solo; 1978) (published in the series *Liturgiese Orrelmusiek*, vol. 3)

*Chant d'éloge* (organ solo; 1979)

*Organ Concerto No. 1* (organ and symphony orchestra; 1983)

*Organ Concerto No. 2* (organ and symphony orchestra; 1993)

*Artificial Realities* (organ solo; 1999)

*Laat my met U verenig lewe* (organ solo; 2010) (published in the *SAKOV 30 Feesbundel*)<sup>1</sup>

Most of these works were written on commission or request, indicating that they were not composed spontaneously for the composer's own use. Yet, because of their compositional qualities, and despite their small number, they must be regarded as significant contributions to the South African repertoire for organ. Furthermore, they are representative of Temmingh's development as a composer from an early stage on and reflect the stylistic diversity that characterised his music during the first part of his career as well as the more uniform style of his later works. In that sense, a discussion of Temmingh's organ music gains a significance that goes beyond the works themselves. In the absence of a comprehensive biography of the composer and a stylistic analysis of his oeuvre as a whole, it is imperative that the kind of interpretation that is presented in a discussion of his *Kantorium* by Viljoen and Viljoen (2009), has to be complemented by quite basic, factual and analytical information as is presented in the present article. Dismissal of such research as positivist rests on a fundamental misunderstanding of the term.

Of Temmingh's organ works, only the chorale preludes have been published. The status of *Artificial Realities* could not be ascertained. The other works are in manuscript only. A survey of the scholarly literature on South African organ music shows that some recognition has been given to the existence of Temmingh's early chorale preludes, those that were published in *Liturgiese Orrelmusiek* (see Groenewald, 1990; Luitingh, 2010; van Schoor, 2014 as representative examples). However, these studies do not contain analyses of the works or evaluations that go beyond pointing out the "modern" style in which they are written and that for this reason they have not been popular with organists and congregations. (There seems to be a reluctance amongst these researchers to engage analytically with the music.) Apart from newspaper reviews of *Chant d'éloge* and the first organ concerto nothing of substance seems to have been written about any of the other organ works, probably for the simple reason that this music is not in the public domain. An extensive discussion of Temmingh's organ music is, therefore, long overdue and should be of much interest to organists in South Africa.

The only publicly available recording of any of Temmingh's organ music is of *Laat my met U verenig lewe*. A recording of this prelude was made by Theo van Wyk and was released together with the publication of the *SAKOV 30 Feesbundel* (Jordaan, 2012). Informal recordings of *Chant d'éloge* and the *Organ Concerto No. 1* exist. Both were made during performances of these pieces in the Department of Music, Stellenbosch University. A copy of the latter is in the possession of the SABC. They were taken into account in the research for this article. As far as could be ascertained no recordings exist of any of the other organ pieces.

---

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Liezl-Marét Jacobs for providing me with most of these details. Where no specific sources are given to substantiate a particular point made in this article, the information provided is based on first-hand knowledge on the part of the author, who was a colleague and friend of the composer.

## Monofonie

The list of Temmingh's organ works begins with *Monofonie*. The autograph of this work consists of a title page, six pages of score in unconventional graphic notation and a final page that contains only words. The date 1971 appears on the title page, confirmed on the final page by the more exact date "18-8-71". However, according to the composer's own worklist of July 2000, the work was composed in 1972. (Temmingh gave me a copy of this list soon after he had compiled it; it forms the basis of the updated list of works that can be viewed on the website <http://www.musictapestry.com/list-of-works/>.) The list of Temmingh's works that are registered with SAMRO also gives 1972 as the date of composition (Chorn, 2017). Is this simply an error? The dating of *Monofonie* is of some significance because 1972 was the year in which Temmingh attended the Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik in Darmstadt on a SAMRO scholarship, after having won the SAMRO competition for young composers. From the dates on the autograph it is clear that he composed this avant-garde piece prior to his visit to Darmstadt and not as a result of impressions gained there. I could not ascertain whether, where or by whom *Monofonie* was performed for the first time, but it can be presumed that a performance must have been given by the composer shortly after he had composed it. The date 1971 would suggest a first performance in Port Elizabeth, where Temmingh held a position as university lecturer at the time, prior to his relocation to Stellenbosch in 1973.

A number of other interesting details can be observed on the autograph. One of them is that the composer still writes his name as Roelof Temmingh jr., indicating deference by the twenty-five-year-old composer to his then more well-known father. Another is that Temmingh seems to have had doubts about the wording of the title. On the title page he writes "Ses Monofone vir Orrel", while on the next page he uses the linguistically more satisfactory "6 Monofonieë vir ORREL". His final choice seems to have fallen on "Monofonie", according to the worklist of July 2000. The reason for this change of mind was that Temmingh composed two other works with related titles at the same time: *Ortofonie* (for flute, clarinet, percussion and pianoforte) and *Polifonie* (an octet for three flutes, four clarinets and pianoforte). These works are also in graphic notation. *Monofonie* should then be seen in the context of this larger project. That also accounts for the heading *Trifonie 2* at the top of page 2 of the autograph, which refers to the three works collectively, since no work by the title of *Trifonie* appears on the list of works. It also indicates that *Monofonie* is the second work of the group, a conclusion that would be supported by the date 1971 - 72 on the title page. *Ortofonie* was the first and *Polifonie* the third work of the trilogy.<sup>2</sup> If *Polifonie* was composed for eight instruments, it makes sense that a work for a single instrument is then called *Monofonie*. (These titles, therefore, do not refer to the texture of the music, as one might expect.) The appearance of the name "Ben B. Blut" as composer of the piece poses another riddle, as does the catalogue number "opus 20". I happen to know that Temmingh did, on occasion, use the name Ben Blut as a pseudonym, especially for the numerous letters he wrote to the newspaper, sometimes abbreviated merely to Ben. When I asked him about the significance of this pseudonym he said, with a smile on his face, "ben blut" was Dutch for "I am broke". Since this heading seems to

---

<sup>2</sup> Liezl-Marét Jacobs assisted me with information to arrive at this conclusion (Jacobs, 2017).

have been pasted onto the autograph at a later stage and since Temmingh did not use pseudonyms or opus numbers on any other autographs that I have seen, it raises the possibility that *Monofonie* was one of the pieces that he entered for the SAMRO competition mentioned above. Unfortunately, no record could be found in the SAMRO archives on the precise titles of the works Temmingh submitted for the competition, so this possibility could not be verified. However, according to SAMRO's records, a composition in "contemporary hieroglyphics", showing Temmingh's interest in the techniques of Stockhausen and other avant-garde composers, was submitted for the competition in addition to the adjudicable compositions on which the decision was based to award Temmingh the scholarship in 1972 (information supplied by Chorn, 2017). This could well refer to *Monofonie*. It is also noteworthy that the end of *Polifonie* is signed with the words "Aan Sandra, Ben B. Blut 1972". (The name Sandra refers to Temmingh's first wife.) According to the worklist Temmingh had not written 20 works by 1971, so this quite high opus number, if regarded seriously, must have counted juvenile works that were subsequently disregarded in the list of works, or it was a fictitious number, thrown in for good measure and with tongue in cheek. I would not put the latter possibility past Temmingh.

The music example below illustrates the kind of graphic notation that is used for the entire piece. It is notation that is difficult or impossible to understand if one does not already know the intention of the signs, since there is no key for their interpretation, as is the case in many other unconventional scores. Therefore, a performance based on this score by someone without that prior knowledge seems to be out of the question. For the same reason, a conventional analysis based on a musical text consisting of notes on a score is not feasible either. However, a number of significant analytical observations can be made nonetheless.

The heading at the top of the page (*Skepping*) as well as the words at the bottom steer the analytical observations in the direction of the larger form of the work. As one of the work's titles indicates (*6 Monofonieë*), the work consists of six sections, each represented by one page in the score. The respective headings and typed words at the bottom or top of the pages are as follows:

## 1. Skepping

en die aarde was woens en leeg ...  
en die duisternis was op die wêreldvloed ...  
en die Gees van God het gesweef op die waters ...  
en God het gesê: laat daar lig wees ...

## 2. Sondeval

en hulle was altwee naak, die mens en sy vrou ...  
maar hulle het hul nie geskaam nie ...  
toe gaan altwee se oë oop ...  
en hulle word gewaar dat hulle naak is ...<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This idiosyncratic interpretation of humans' fall into sin shall be left without comment for now.

### 1. Skepping

The image shows a complex musical score for a piece titled 'Skepping'. It consists of several staves. The top staff is a vocal line with lyrics and dynamic markings like 'pppp' and 'mf'. Below it are several piano accompaniment staves. A large black wedge-shaped area covers a significant portion of the middle staves, with the label 'C. m. v. (lion)' and 'fff' next to it. There are various musical notations including notes, rests, and dynamic markings such as 'ppp', 'pp', 'p', 'f', and 'fff'. The score is annotated with numbers 1 through 7 and includes a legend for 'C. m. v. (lion)'.

**Teks:** en die aarde was woes en leeg...  
en die duisternis was op die wêreldvloed...  
en die Gees van God het gesweef op die waters...  
en God het gesê: laat daar lig wees...

<sup>4</sup> Permission to reproduce all the music examples in this article has been obtained from the relevant copyright holders. These include Dr. Liezl-Marét Jacobs, Durban, the Odeion School of Music, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein and the Suid-Afrikaanse Kerkorrelistevereniging (SAKOV).

### 3. Krete

my God, my God , waarom verlaat u my? ...  
ver van my hulp, van die woorde van my gebrul? ...  
my oog het dof geword van verdriet ...  
Here, tot hoelank? ...

### 4. Kruis

Eli ...  
Eli ...  
lama ...  
sabagtáni?

### 5. Opstanding

Moenie vrees nie want Hy is nie hier nie ...  
Hy het opgestaan uit die dode ...  
laat alles wat asem het, die Here loof ...  
halleluja ...

### 6. Eenkant

o God, hou u nie stil nie, swyg nie, rus nie ...  
u vyande maak rumoer, hulle smee listige planne ...  
hulle versin ongeregtighede, met vleierende lippe  
neig u oor tot my, luister na my woord ...

The back of the final page of the score contains the words

hoelank?  
tot hoelank?  
my oog het dof geword van verdriet.

From this overview it is clear that *Monofonie* is a deeply felt religious work that spans the entire Christian faith right from Creation to beyond the Resurrection and to the subjective situation of despair of the present believer. (The other two works of *Trifonie* do not have any religious inscriptions.) The eighteen-minute-long music (this duration is given on the list of works) dwells on each of these six topics in the form of separate sections or scenes of one page each. As can be concluded from Example 1, the style is that of avant-garde music, employed here for the purpose of what can only be described as programme music. Each page is divided into several distinctive sound events, all of them

clearly numbered from 1 to 6 or 7. Between the sound events of indeterminate pitch (e.g. wide or narrow clusters) and rhythm, there are fragments of definite pitch, either in the form of brief melodic phrases, series of notes that include all twelve pitch classes and have the appearance of twelve-tone rows, or quotations of known melodic material. In *Skepping* the fragment C-C#-D#-E (sound event 5) is mirrored by B-B<sup>b</sup>-A<sup>b</sup>-G (sound event 6). In its descending form, this group of four notes – they represent a section of the octatonic scale – seems to have occupied Temmingh throughout his life (see discussion of *Hoor hoe die Regter deur die regters* below). *Sondeval*, *Kruis* and *Eenkant* each contains series of notes that resemble twelve-tone rows, while *Kruis* incorporates the full hymn tune *O Haupt, voll Blut und Wunden* (“O Hoof, bedek met wonde”) into sections of indefinite pitch and rhythm. *Eenkant* includes quotations of the respective first phrases of *Die Stem van Suid-Afrika*, *God save the Queen* and *Gaudeamus igitur*, preceded by the words “djollie politiek”. Incorporating musical quotations of far-reaching meaning into his music was something Temmingh did throughout his career.

With hindsight, a most remarkable aspect of *Monofonie* is that in its topics and its outlay it foreshadows by more than thirty years Temmingh’s masterwork *Kantorium* (2003). What the composer presents on a grand scale in *Kantorium* (“Auf [...] universelle Ebene gelangte Temmingh in *Kantorium*, das in grandioser Schau die Grundaussagen des christlichen Glaubens von der Schöpfung bis zur Endzeit darstellt.”<sup>5</sup>) is already present in a nutshell in *Monofonie*. If for no other reason it is in this respect that great significance has to be attributed to the work.

**Psalms 42** (two chorale preludes for organ solo; 1975)

**Fantasie op Gesang 128** (chorale prelude for organ solo; 1978)<sup>6</sup>

These chorale preludes were published in the series *Liturgiese Orrelmusiek*, initiated by Barbara Louw and Jacobus Kloppers, both of whom were organ lecturers at the then University of the Orange Free State in Bloemfontein. The aim of the series was to provide church organists (especially those of the various Afrikaans Reformed churches) with literature that was of practical use in their service. The first volume (music for wedding ceremonies and funeral services) appeared in 1972. The second volume, in which Temmingh’s *Psalms 42* was included, was published in 1975. It was devoted entirely

---

<sup>5</sup> “Temmingh achieves a universal level of expression in *Kantorium* by presenting a grandiose view of the basic tenets of the Christian faith from the Creation up to the end of time.” ([Lüdemann, 2006:680. This and all other translations in the article are by the author.] See Viljoen and Viljoen 2009 for a detailed analysis and evaluation of *Kantorium*.)

<sup>6</sup> The numbering 128 of this hymn tune refers to the hymnal *Psalms en Gesange* of 1976. In the more recent *Liedboek van die Kerk* (2001) the hymn can be found under the number 382. The words by Attie van der Colf of the hymn that determined the title of Temmingh’s piece (“Hoor hoe die Regter van die regters veroordeel word”) have been altered considerably in the newer version. The respective verse line is now: “Hoor hoe die seun van God bespot word”.

to compositions on the well-loved melody of this Genevan psalm, so Temmingh was commissioned by the compilers to compose his work on this melody. It is not known whether there was a formal occasion on which Temmingh's *Psalm 42* was performed for the first time. By the time the third volume appeared in 1979 Kloppers had emigrated to Canada and the collection was now compiled by J.H. Potgieter and G.G. Cillié, together with Barbara Louw. Again, the compilers determined the hymn tunes on which the various contributors to the volume were to write their compositions.<sup>7</sup> This time a formal occasion on which Temmingh's *Fantasie* was performed for the first time was indeed arranged (together with contributions by several of the other composers represented in the volume). It took place in the Odeion concert hall of the University of the (Orange) Free State in Bloemfontein on 16 April 1979. Temmingh's piece was played by Martina Viljoen.

These two small-scale chorale preludes are typical of Temmingh's non-avant-garde compositional style at the time. Since this style has to be described as "modern" compared to that of most of the other pieces in the series *Liturgiese Orrelmusiek*, it is worthwhile to refer to the study by Wilna Groenewald (1990), mentioned above, in which she tried to ascertain the reception of the music in the six volumes of the series amongst organists and congregations. Her survey found overwhelming opposition to music that exhibited dissonant qualities to any significant degree:

Uit bogenoemde gegewens blyk dit [...] dat alle werke in 'n barok-, klassieke en romantiese komposisiestyl die belangstelling van beide orrelis en gemeentelid bevredig, terwyl moderne werke, wat baie dissonansie bevat, algeheel onaantwoordbaar is. [...] Die koraalvoorspele wat in 'n moderne skryfstyl geskryf is, word baie streng deur die orreliste aengekeur, aangesien dit die gemeente 'ontstem en onrustig maak' (Groenewald, 1990: 52-53).

The findings of this survey are again reported on by Janándi van Schoor, but are left without comment, even though her study was written fifteen years later (2014:73-74). Temmingh's preludes will have been amongst the works that elicited this extremely negative response. This is probably the reason why he was not requested to contribute to later compilations in the series.

Whether the negative response reported upon in Groenewald's research is part of the normal tension between new music and its constituency, and the time delay that is inherent in this tension, or whether it should be seen, more regretfully, as a failure and indictment of sacred music as an institution in South Africa to bring about some convergence between composers and their constituency (as a composer like John Rutter has proved is possible today), is a matter that cannot be pursued here, save to express the hope that in the case of Temmingh it is the former. Given the far-reaching changes that sacred music is undergoing in South African churches at present, it is doubtful that a similar survey conducted today would be comparable to that of Groenewald anyway. However, including Temmingh's little chorale preludes in a discussion of his organ music as a whole is one way of keeping interest in these exceptional pieces alive. And since they are in the public domain they will be discussed in some detail here.

---

<sup>7</sup> See the Foreword of Volume 3, where this procedure is described at length.

The music for **Psalm 42** consists of two parts. According to the heading, they relate to the first and third stanzas of the hymn, pointing to a link between the music and the respective words.<sup>8</sup> The words “Soos ’n hert in dorre streke skreeuend dors ... skreeu my siel na U, o God! Ja, my siel dors na die Heer ...” seem to have inspired the music for the first stanza. The repeated low C# in the pedal throughout the piece as well as the highly dissonant ostinato-like motive in the lower manual both have a forbidding sound that could well be linked to the arid landscape of which the psalm speaks so eloquently. The embellished melody is played on a separate manual in the RH voice and could be linked to the words of the languishing soul expressing thirst for the Lord. The mostly stepwise melodic movement of this voice stands in stark contrast to the almost expressionist music of the third stanza, with its wide and jagged leaps, underscored by searing dissonant harmony. “O my siel, waarom onrustig? En wat buig jy jou in my?” are the words that come to mind in this music, while the combative or quarrelsome dialogue between the voices, where the exclamation in one voice is consistently accompanied by sustained notes in the other, could refer to the enemy taunting the psalmist: “... as die vyand jou bestry”. They are played on the same manual, although the texture is that of a trio.

Of interest is the way in which the composer alters the melodic and rhythmic characteristics of Loys Bourgeois’s tonal hymn tune not only to express the meaning of the words but to integrate it into his largely atonal style. This applies to both stanzas. In the first stanza the underlying “cantus firmus” is in the RH voice, while in the second it is in that of the LH. To illustrate this, the first phrase of each is quoted below, with the notes that mark the recognisable outline of the melody indicated by circles:

Example 2 *Psalm 42, Vers 1, m. 1-5; Vers 3, m. 1-6* (continues on next page)

Whereas the bar form (AAB) and the articulation of the phrases in the first piece corresponds almost exactly to those of the underlying hymn tune, the second stanza makes use of additional means to articulate the respective phrases (which are not indicated by any kind of caesura). A motive that coincides consistently with the beginning of several of the phrases (e.g. in m. 1, 7, 24 and 27; see m. 1-3

<sup>8</sup> The words quoted in the following sentences are taken from the Afrikaans hymnal of 1937, which the composer had at his disposal at the time of composition. The same applies to the melody.

**Allegro**

The musical score consists of two systems. The first system has a treble clef staff with a forte (*f*) dynamic and a bass clef staff with a mezzo-forte (*mf*) dynamic. The second system continues the piece with similar dynamics. The key signature has one flat (B-flat).

of Example 2) is followed by different versions of a clearly delineated closing motive (in m. 11-12, 23, 29-30 and 36-37). The absence of the introductory motive (m. 1-3) at the beginning of the B section (m. 13-23) and its return towards the end (from m. 24 onwards) emphasises the contrast characteristic at this point of a piece in bar form. This is a particularly skilful way of creating form in a piece in which tonal forces no longer have a formative function.

In contrast to *Psalm 42* there is no obvious link to the four stanzas of the hymn in the case of the **Fantasie op Gesang 128**, “Hoor hoe die Regter van die regters veroordeel word”.<sup>9</sup> Perhaps the striking motive with which the piece begins can be heard as the call for condemnation that is expressed in the text. But then, the motive is so typical of Temmingh’s melodic style in general at the time when this piece was composed that such a quite literal association becomes untenable.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, it could also be understood simply as a particularly striking ritornello theme that introduces the cantus firmus

<sup>9</sup> Contrary to the indication on the score (probably added by the editors) the underlying melody is not that of the well-known German hymn “Wenn wir in höchsten Nöten sein”.

<sup>10</sup> A personal bit of information: because I was present when this work was tried out for the first time on behalf of the compilers of Vol. 3 of *Liturgiese Orreلمusiek*, I happen to know that Temmingh’s original notation of the first bar did not contain rests. These were suggested by the compilers for the sake of clearer articulation, to which the composer agreed when asked about the suggestion. I am not convinced that the rests do a performance of the melodic line at this point any good and believe that they do not reflect the composer’s original intention.

section, divides its four phrases into two sections and concludes the music by means of its cadential formula at the end. The final four notes of this “ritornello” deserve some comment. They consist of the same intervals (descending semitone, whole-tone, semitone, representing a section of the octotonic scale) that also occur in one of the sound events in the first “scene” of *Monofonie*. As mentioned above, this phrase seems to have occupied Temmingh throughout his life as a composer and occurs in numerous works. Furthermore, the descending semitone, a part of this series of notes, is used frequently as a cadential formula (see Lüdemann, 1987:172). Another permutation of the series is the so-called Shostakovich-motive D-E<sup>b</sup>-C-B, for which Temmingh had an almost obsessive affinity (see the discussion of the first organ concerto).

Example 3 *Hoor hoe die Regter van die regters veroordeel word*, m. 1 - 6

The image displays a musical score for Example 3, measures 1 through 6. The score is written in 4/4 time and features a cantus firmus in the tenor register on a separate manual. The accompaniment consists of two voices in a note-against-note chorale style. The first system shows the beginning of the piece with a forte dynamic and a tempo marking of 'f (8', 4', 2', mikstuur)'. The second system shows the continuation of the piece, with the cantus firmus and accompaniment voices clearly defined.

The unaltered cantus firmus is presented in the tenor register on a separate manual. The texture of the accompaniment in the other two voices is almost a note-against-note chorale-style harmonisation. However, the resultant, largely dissonant harmony emerges from the mostly stepwise movement in all the voices, which is not typical of chorale style. Therefore, the dissonant harmonies are the result of strict voice-leading rather than chordal progression, even in the few instances where they form unexpected and unconnected consonances, that later become a characteristic of Temmingh’s harmonic vocabulary.

The two sections of the work are arranged in a ternary structure, with the first section to be repeated in Da Capo fashion at the end of the second. The implication of such a ternary structure is that the middle section should form a contrast, which, indeed, it does with its two-voice texture

on separate manuals.<sup>11</sup> (It is difficult to determine whether the composer had the ancient genre of *bicinium* in mind when he wrote the piece.) In addition, this B section presents the *cantus firmus* in a highly distorted form, even if the original phrase structure is largely maintained. Not only are the interval relationships within each phrase altered (see the replacement of *F#* by *F* natural in m. 4 of the example below), the scale degrees on which the respective phrases are placed also deviate from the original *G* major, that is still left intact in the A section.

Example 4 *Hoor hoe die Regter van die regters veroordeel word*, B section, m. 1 - 9

Another, less obvious, but not less remarkable feature of this section is that the accompanying voice begins by repeating the first nine pitches from the *ritornello* motive of the A section (see m. 1 – 2 in the example above, repeated in m. 3 – 4 and presented in transposed form in m. 11 and elsewhere). In an earlier analysis of this chorale prelude, I discussed the stylistic characteristics of the *ritornello* motive, which are then also pertinent to the accompanying voice in the B section:

[T]he entire phrase includes eleven of the twelve available pitch classes, while the various octaves include, on average, nine pitch classes. In the first bar, melodic movement takes place in major and minor seconds, constantly changing direction. No pitch is able to establish dominance because it always occurs in close proximity to its chromatic alteration, thereby cancelling any tonal connotations that may have arisen. [...] This use of major and minor seconds is responsible for the extremely melodious nature of much of Temmingh's music, and also contributes to the somewhat nervous or restless character of his melodies. In the next two bars, Temmingh follows another typical procedure. The melodic curve becomes

<sup>11</sup> According to the Foreword of Volume 3, the performance indications in the volume were supplied by the composers, so the indications in Temmingh's work can be regarded as authentic. That would then also explain why the composer does not indicate the choice of separate manuals in any other way (for example, by referring to Great or Swell, or to I or II).

more jagged as sevenths are included in the movement [displacing the seconds into another octave]. These intervals have the same function as the major and minor seconds occurring in the first bar. (Lüdemann 1987: 171)

Most of what is said here can also be observed in *Psalms 42*. The other significant feature of Temmingh's style to be recognised in this work has already been alluded to: the frequent use of descending seconds as cadential figures. Both sections exhibit this feature. In m. 4<sup>4</sup> – 5 this descending semitone is preceded by another descending semitone, creating the already discussed melodic gesture C-B-A-G#.

Organists are to be encouraged to include Temmingh's chorale preludes in their repertoire. They have lost nothing of their originality and their "modern" style should not alienate congregations anymore.

### **Chant d'éloge** (organ solo; 1979)

In contrast to the chorale preludes discussed above, *Chant d'éloge* was not written for a liturgical purpose, but is a large-scale concert work. The composer intended the piece to be a "song of praise" for the organ as instrument, rather than as a religious song of praise, as one could be forgiven for thinking if one does not understand the secular implication of the French title. According to notes on the score, the work was commissioned by the Cape Organ Guild<sup>12</sup> for the third South African Organ Festival in 1980. It was completed on 4 June 1979.

Between 1976 and 1987, the Cape Organ Guild mounted six organ festivals. An organ competition formed the centrepiece of each of these festivals and each time the Guild commissioned a new work to be included in the final round recital on the Hill organ in St. George's Cathedral, Cape Town. Some of the competitions, including the one for which Temmingh composed his piece, were sponsored by the Oude Meester Foundation. The work's first performance then took place during this competition in January 1980, which, incidentally, was judged by luminaries such as Gillian Weir, Simon Preston and John Birch as well as a number of local adjudicators.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> The Cape Organ Guild was formerly known as the Cape Guild of Organists (see Thomas, 1979).

<sup>13</sup> This information was provided to me by Shirley Gie (2017), who, together with Barry Smith, was one of the initiators and organisers of these organ festivals. She describes the festivals as follows: "The Organ Festivals were the brainchild of Committees of the Cape Organ Guild starting in 1976 and continuing in 1978, 1980, 1983, 1985, 1987. The organisation of the Festivals was achieved through enthusiastic members of the Committees (elected at the AGMs of the Cape Guild of Organists / Cape Organ Guild) and master-minded by Chairpersons of those Committees. Barry Smith and I master-minded these Organ Festivals (each of us served three times over the years, as President of the CGO) based on our experiences of English ones (notably those at St. Albans Cathedral). I myself lived and taught in St. Albans for a time and attended some of these amazing events. It was these that we wished to base our own efforts upon."

A subsequent performance of *Chant d'éloge* took place on the Marcussen organ in the Endler Hall, Stellenbosch on 19 October 1980 during a concert devoted exclusively to music by five Stellenbosch composers and organised by the Komitee vir Eietydse Musiek.<sup>14</sup> The organist was Kenau van der Walt, a senior organ student of Boudewijn Scholten. The reason for mentioning this event is the fact that my copy of the score contains a record of the stops that were chosen for that performance on the Marcussen organ in the handwriting of Boudewijn Scholten, who, together with the composer, supervised the performance by Kenau van der Walt. These indications, together with a recording of that performance, allow one to reconstruct the various timbres that were employed to outline the formal profile of the work. Of course, the Hill organ in St. George's Cathedral, with which Temmingh was familiar, was able to do even more justice to the kind of sound he had in mind.

In many respects *Chant d'éloge* is a remarkable work. It is a virtuoso piece that is intended to show off to good effect the various possibilities of which the organ is capable. One senses that it was written by someone with a thorough understanding of the instrument. As the French title and the various timbral requirements indicate, it is closer to the French school of organ music than to the neo-Baroque sound of the twentieth century German organ revival. It says a great deal about Temmingh the composer that he was able to toss off – in a manner of speaking, because he composed pieces like this with great ease – a work of such remarkable originality and structural coherence. It boasts characteristics that are otherwise associated with dodecaphonic music, but without sacrificing its thematic and formal profile to serial procedures. It is basically a monothematic work, the theme of which contains 11 of the 12 chromatic pitch classes, while presenting some of these pitches more than once. In that respect it has to be described as a theme rather than a series. On the other hand, it resembles a series in the sense that its pitches provide the tonal material for most of the music and because it is defined more by its pitches than by its rhythmic character.

The work is in a sectional form that shows much resemblance with rondo form, however, without the tonal implications that characterise a traditional rondo. The thematically contrasting sections coincide with changes in manual. In most cases the sections (or subsections) are linked by episodic material with its own motivic content. These sections could be presented schematically as follows:

A (m. 1-42; Great) B (m. 43-48; Swell) A<sup>1</sup> (m. 49-71; Choir) C (m. 72-92; Swell, alternating with Great) D (m. 93-132; Choir, alternating with Great) A<sup>2</sup> (m. 133/134-163; melody on Swell, accompaniment on Choir) B (m. 163-169; Swell, followed by Great) A<sup>3</sup> (m. 170-209; Great)

---

<sup>14</sup> The committee was chaired by the late Edward Aitchison. Two articles in *Die Burger* of 17 and 21 October 1980 highlighted the importance that was attached to this event. The programme also included works by Arnold van Wyk and Hubert du Plessis, which were performed by their respective composers.

**Section A** (Tempo indication: crotchet ca. 152 – rubato) The section is divided into several subsections. In the first of these (m. 1- 10) the theme is announced on its own, without any accompaniment:

Example 5 *Chant d'éloge*, m. 1-10

♩ = ca. 152 - rubato  
GR.  
ff

Between m. 18 and 26 and m. 29 and 32 this theme is then presented either in full or partially, with chordal accompaniment. The intermediate measures contain episodic material. A closing section follows, with the pedal added for the first time. It ends on a chord that includes all twelve pitch classes and therefore could be understood to represent a vertical presentation of the series (with the sole exception of the pitch class B, which does not make an appearance in the theme). The entire section is to be played fortissimo, increasing to fortississimo in the last five measures.

**Section B** (Tempo indication: crotchet ca. 72) This section represents a marked thematic and dynamic contrast. The composer indicates pianissimo. For the Stellenbosch performance stops like the Gamba and Vox celesta were used on the Swell, with sub-bass 16 and 8 in the pedal, thus also providing a strong contrast in timbre, against the plenum sound, rich in mixtures, of the Great organ in Section A. Compared to the toccata-like character of the music thus far, section B has the character of a soft four-part chorale with two phrases of equal length. Close examination of the notes reveals an unexpected but very interesting feature: the entire section is created from a serial-like vertical and horizontal application of the pitch classes of the theme, as indicated in the following example:<sup>15</sup>

Example 6 *Chant d'éloge*, m. 43-48

SW  
pp  
SW  
pp  
pp

<sup>15</sup> The application in the second phrase is not quite as strict as in the first.

**Section A<sup>1</sup>** (Tempo indication: crotchet ca. 104) After a brief reference to the main theme in the RH voice, the theme is now presented in the pedal. It appears in augmented note values and its division into phrases is altered. The accompanying contrapuntal voices are played on the choir organ at the dynamic level of mezzo piano.

**Section C** (Tempo indication: crotchet ca. 152) There is a return to the tempo of the opening section here and the music alternates between the Swell and Great and dynamic levels of mezzo piano and forte respectively, with brief references to the episodic motivic material as well as to the main theme.

**Section D** (The tempo indication remains unchanged on crotchet ca. 152) The pitch classes from the theme are arranged in a pointillistic, but less than strict fashion in the first part of this section, played mezzo piano on the choir organ without pedal (which, in the Stellenbosch performance, included stops such as the tierce).

Example 7 *Chant d'éloge*, m. 93-96

In a subsequent subsection of Section D this is alternated by another application of pitch classes from the theme, now presented on the Great, with pedal, at the dynamic level of forte:

Example 8 *Chant d'éloge*, m. 97-99

In subsequent renditions of this subsection first one and then two parallel voices are added to the manual parts, building up to a grand climax based on the episodic motivic material.

**Section A<sup>2</sup>** (Tempo indication: crotchet ca. 72) A lyrical mood is created in this section by presenting the theme in full (with some licence in respect of the pitches), but with its own distinctive rhythm and phrasing, to be performed “espressivo” on the Swell, with accompaniment on the choir organ. For the Stellenbosch performance the stops for the Swell included Gamba 8', as well as sesquialtera and 1<sup>3/5</sup>, while the accompaniment was done only on a Gedackt 8'. A second presentation of the lyrical melody fizzles out after a while and leads into a repetition of

**Section B** (Tempo indication: crotchet 72) The second phrase of the chorale is now to be played on the Great, which is then followed by a crescendo based on the episodic motive that leads into

**Section A<sup>3</sup>**, which is a slightly extended and fuller recapitulation of the second half of section A (m. 18-42), again ending on the twelve-tone chord in m. 42, but this time repeated after the G, with which the work begins, is held over on its own for an entire bar. This G also features prominently elsewhere in the work, thus attaining some significance as a central pitch in an otherwise atonal musical language.

*Chant d'éloge* is a rare masterwork and deserves to become included into the canon of South African repertoire for organ, not only because it is a wonderful showpiece but also for its outstanding compositional originality and integrity.

### **Organ Concerto No. I** (organ and symphony orchestra; 1983)

Temmingh wrote his first organ concerto for the newly established University of Stellenbosch Symphony Orchestra and its conductor Eric Rycroft. It is to Rycroft's lasting credit that he made this ensemble available for new works by Temmingh (and numerous other South African composers) on a regular basis. Several of Temmingh's other compositions were also premièred in this way. The organ concerto was performed for the first time on 29 May 1983 in the Endler Hall, Stellenbosch University with the composer as soloist. The dedicatee was Dr Dora Steyn, Temmingh's physician for many years. According to the concert review by Louis Heyneman the concert drew a full house and “hundreds of enthusiasts had to be turned away at the doors”, not only because of the concerto but because of the novel experience of hearing a full symphony orchestra in the Endler Hall (Heyneman, 1983). As a member of the orchestra on that occasion I can remember that the concerto was performed with great enthusiasm by the youthful ensemble and was met with much acclaim and applause by the audience. The composer's intention to present a work of unashamed “Gebrauchsmusik”, as he called it in the programme notes, the purpose of which was to “communicate”, was received well by the listeners (programme in my possession; see also Stegman, 1983).<sup>16</sup> In these notes Temmingh describes his desire to present music that is not “unintelligible”, so as to bridge the “gulf between contemporary

---

<sup>16</sup> The programme notes are given in their entirety in the Appendix.

composer and public” (ibid.). For that reason, the work is not experimental, but follows in the tradition of concertos by earlier twentieth century composers such as Bartók or Shostakovich.

This is the second of Temmingh’s eleven concertos and the first for solo instrument and full symphony orchestra (the earlier *Oboe Concerto No. 1* was scored for string orchestra only). It is also the only concerto where the composer performed the solo part himself, which perhaps accounts for the lack of the kind of virtuoso passages one expects in a concerto. It is a characteristic acknowledged by the composer in his programme notes. Nonetheless, the work contains a wealth of attractive thematic material of the kind that impresses itself upon the listener in an immediate way. When, in the programme notes, Temmingh points out that allusions to the “well-known Dmitri Shostakovich motive (D-E<sup>b</sup>-C-B)”<sup>17</sup> are present throughout the work, albeit in transposed form and as something he only discovered “to his own surprise” after completion of the work, he could have added that the thematic material as a whole has a sound that is reminiscent of this Soviet composer.<sup>18</sup>

Apart from its audience-friendly musical language the concerto boasts a number of neoclassical formal and stylistic characteristics. Foremost amongst these is the inclusion of sections that the composer describes as “fughetta” and “passacaglia”, both of them reminiscent of the great tradition of seventeenth- and eighteenth century organ music. The composer describes the one-movement concerto as follows:

Hierdie komposisie is “eenvoudig” en “eendelig”: inleiding, uiteensetting, fughetta, passacaglia, rekapitulاسie, koda – dus nie eintlik eendelig nie, maar darem sonder onderbreking – ook dalk nie eenvoudig nie maar hopelik sonder onbegryplikhede (Programme notes).

In fact, the form of the work owes more to the symmetrical outlay characteristic of works by composers like Bartók (e.g. *String Quartets* no. 4 or 5; *Concerto for Orchestra*) or Hindemith (*Mathis der Maler*) than to conventional sonata form by presenting the various sections that make up the exposition in reverse order in the recapitulation. Like many of Temmingh’s works, the concerto begins with a single sustained note followed by a gradual genesis of the thematic material (m. 1 – 23). The following organ flourish (m. 24 – 32) leads into the first theme (*allegro risoluto*), presented in unison by the higher strings to repeated chords in the organ:

---

<sup>17</sup> This is one of the permutations of the interval series that was mentioned in the discussions of *Monofonie* and *Hoor hoe die Regter*.

<sup>18</sup> I have discussed the affinity of Temmingh for the music of Shostakovich in much detail elsewhere (see Lüdemann, 1987; 1996; 1998).

Example 9 *Organ Concerto No. 1* m. 32 – 42

Violin I

*ff*

The image shows three staves of music for Violin I. The first staff begins with a treble clef, a 6/8 time signature, and a key signature of one flat (B-flat). It contains a series of eighth and sixteenth notes, with a dynamic marking of *ff* (fortissimo) below the first measure. The second staff continues the melodic line with similar rhythmic patterns. The third staff shows a change in rhythm and dynamics, with some notes marked with accents and a dynamic of *ff*.

After some subsidiary thematic material (m. 56 – 76) the tempo slows down (andante) and a contrasting section is presented (m. 77 – 157) that contains three distinct thematic ideas (m. 77 – 103, 106 – 117 and 117 - 157). The first two of these are:

Example 10 *Organ Concerto No. 1* m. 92 – 103

Organ

*pp legato*

The image shows a musical score for Organ, consisting of three systems of staves. The first system has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble clef staff contains a melodic line starting with a whole note, followed by quarter notes. The bass clef staff contains a bass line with a dynamic marking of *pp legato* (pianissimo, legato). The second system continues the melodic and bass lines. The third system shows the continuation of the piece, with the bass line featuring a series of quarter notes and a final whole note.

Example 11 *Organ Concerto No. 1* m. 106 – 109

A brief transition (m. 152 – 157), in which the subsequent theme is foreshadowed, leads to quite an extensive “fughetta” (Vivo), the first three theme entries of which appear in the strings, oboes and bassoons:

Example 12 *Organ Concerto No. 1* m. 158 – 164<sup>1</sup>

The example shows that the conventional fugal imitation at the fifth is replaced by imitations at the sixth below and above the initial statement of the theme: A, C# and F. Subsequent entries of the theme maintain this symmetrical interval relationship. Traditional fugal techniques abound, like inversion of

the theme (m. 171), augmentation (m. 174), even larger augmentation (m. 175), stretto (m. 188 – 192) and even closer stretto with inversion (m. 199 – 204). The music then fizzles out in preparation for the subsequent passacaglia (m. 221 – 338). The sixteen-measure long theme,

Example 13 *Organ Concerto No. 1* m. 222 – 237

Adagio ♩ = 76

centred around D, is repeated five times with increasingly thicker texture by the organ solo before it is presented twice by the orchestra in unison, with figuration in the organ. The passacaglia forms the centre of the work and builds up to one of its dynamic climaxes. In my opinion, however, it does not measure up to the high level of imagination that characterises the other sections of the work. Its repetitions tend to sound laboured and eventually rather tedious. (Temmingh's idea to employ a passacaglia in a concerto was perfected in his *Cello Concerto*, with a theme that has to be described as nothing less than inspired.) The opening organ flourish enters next and links the music to the following section. During the preparation for the first performance of the concerto in Stellenbosch a last-minute change was made to the work at this point, one which is not reflected in the score. The recording of that performance bears this out. A repeat of the entire fugue was inserted here (between m. 352 and

353). This was a decision that benefitted the work tremendously in that it rounds off the symmetry of the reverse repetition of the exposition perfectly. It adds more quick movement to a work that otherwise would have suffered from too much slow music. Also, it places one section of the work (the passacaglia) at the centre of the symmetry and not two (fughetta and passacaglia), as the programme notes lead one to think. The composer did not adjust the score subsequently, probably because the work, to my knowledge, was not performed again. It says a great deal of Temmingh's integrity that this reverse recapitulation is everything but a stereotypical rearrangement of the sections in reverse order (so as to save time and effort in the composition process), but that it is done with a great sense of care. The opening organ flourish serves as a valuable link in this process, binding the various sections together. The lively fughetta is followed by most of the andante section (m. 77 – 118 is repeated in m. 353 – 393). Mediated by the flourish, the first theme (m. 404 – 428) is presented once more, leading into an extensive coda. This closing section contains what in the programme notes is described as the transposed "Shostakovich motive". The interval series in question (alluded to in the discussion of the earlier organ works), either in the permutation of stepwise descending seconds or in the order that resembles the said Shostakovich motive, is all-pervasive in the music and is the reason why Temmingh describes his work as "monothematic" in his programme notes. For example, it constitutes the cadential phrase of the first andante theme (see m. 99 – 102 in Example 10), it forms the cadential phrase in m. 116 – 117 and concludes the transition to the fughetta in m. 156 – 157. Having been a constituent of so many cadential phrases it serves well as material for the coda.

Although its musical language is not tonal, the concerto does exhibit a clear sensitivity for tonal centres. The most important one is D. This can be observed in the opening flourish of the organ (m. 24) and the main theme (m. 32), all of which is buttressed by its lower fifth G (m. 24 – 53). The fifth C-G frames the second contrasting theme (103 – 117). A, the upper fifth of D, is prominent at the beginning of the fughetta, while D is the central pitch of the entire passacaglia. The same constellation of central pitches determines the course of the recapitulation, with the coda bringing the music to an unequivocal end on D.

Placed alongside the avant-garde style of *Monofonie* and the modernist style of *Chant d'éloge*, the listener-friendly style of the organ concerto raises interesting questions. It shows that Temmingh was an exponent of stylistic diversity, especially during the first half of his career. This was commented upon quite frequently and made Temmingh seem quite a controversial figure, some would say a maverick or an *enfant terrible* (Lüdemann, 1987:192; 1996:59-61; 2006:679). Even after he had abandoned his avant-garde experiments and aligned himself more consistently with what could be described as the broad twentieth century mainstream, his style defies easy categorisation; least of all does it fit into an "apartheid aesthetics", a term that is bandied about with some vigour these days in connection with South African music in the European art music tradition. For one, it would be difficult to categorise music that shows an affinity for Shostakovich, a prominent representative of Soviet-style Socialist Realism, under an aesthetic that represents the opposite pole on the ideological spectrum. To sustain such a categorisation would require considerable intellectual concessions. Secondly, when discussing aesthetics in a South African context, one should not forget that avant-garde art, literature, theatre or

music has always been anathema to authoritarian regimes, regardless of whether they are of the Nazi or Soviet persuasion, or anything in between.

### **Organ Concerto No. 2** (organ and symphony orchestra; 1993)

When his niece, the organist Gerdi Troskie, took part in the competition for the SABC Music Prize in 1993, Temmingh saw the opportunity to compose a new concerto for her. She did not commission the work, nor was the possibility of learning the existing organ concerto, composed exactly ten years earlier, discussed between her and the composer (Troskie, 2017). Quite apart from his often-expressed sentiment that he preferred to compose a new piece rather than spend time revising an existing one, it is conceivable that Temmingh did not suggest the first organ concerto to his niece, because it did not contain enough virtuoso passages that made it a showpiece fit for a competition and perhaps because he was aware of its weaknesses. By contrast, he was “proud” of the new concerto, a work that is most definitely worthy of being taken up into the standard repertoire for organ (ibid.). According to the score, Temmingh worked on the concerto between 15 March and 15 May 1993. It was premièred four months later by Troskie on 23 September 1993 in the Johannesburg City Hall with the National Symphony Orchestra of the SABC conducted by Victor Yampolsky.<sup>19</sup> Acknowledgement is given on the score to the Foundation for the Creative Arts for financial assistance. A minor discrepancy between the programme and the score is that in the former the work is listed as “Konsert No 2 in G-majeur vir Orrel en Orkes”, while the title on the score says nothing about the key of the work. (There are numerous other obvious mistakes or printing errors in the programme, so this particular error could be ascribed to the compiler of the programme as well.) While it is correct that the pitch G plays a pivotal role throughout the work, the final cadence is on a C major chord. This indicates that central pitches or tonal centres rather than (major or minor) keys determine the course of the music.

To anyone familiar with Temmingh’s (organ) music the most immediate observation on hearing or studying the *Organ Concerto No. 2* is the fact that its main theme is taken almost exactly from the *Chant d’éloge*. This is quite a startling discovery, because it raises the tricky question of composers borrowing from their own works. With performances of new works being difficult to arrange – second performances of new works are even more difficult to achieve – a composer might feel that good thematic material deserves another airing and therefore is tempted to use it again. That Temmingh was not averse to this practice can be observed in a number of his other compositions, one of the more recent examples being the overture *In Memoriam* (2007), in which he quotes material from the earlier works *Mors* and *Kantorium*, or a quote of the passacaglia from the cello concerto in *Herinneringe*. What makes the *Organ Concerto No. 2* different, however, is that the earlier thematic material is not merely quoted, but forms the basis for an entirely new, essentially monothematic work. It could be said that the formal principle of the concerto is a constant reconfiguration of the initial thematic material into ever new guises. It is a telling indication of the composer’s creative imagination that he is

---

<sup>19</sup> See programme booklet of that event. Unfortunately, it contains no programme notes by the composer or anyone else.

able to do this without repeating anything but the theme from *Chant d'éloge*; the concerto, therefore, cannot be construed as a reworking of the solo organ piece for organ and orchestra, but is a work in its own right. A second observation is that Temmingh must have had the first organ concerto at the back of his mind when he composed this piece, because, by contrast, it contains numerous decidedly virtuoso passages for the soloist to negotiate, and because some of its formal characteristics echo the earlier work (e.g. the single-movement form, chorale-, fugue- and passacaglia-like sections, the use of a descending “flourish”-like motive in the solo instrument as binding link between some of the sections), while, taken as a whole, the concerto comes across as a more mature work. This is not surprising, since it is the sixth on his list of eleven concertos and it follows immediately after the highly acclaimed *Cello Concerto* of 1992. Another observation is that although the theme is never employed in a “serial” manner, as in *Chant d'éloge*, its composition of eleven of the twelve available pitch classes similarly leads to a musical language that is not tonal, even if central pitches can be heard throughout the work.

Example 14 *Organ Concerto No. 2*, m. 1 – 23

The above example represents the theme of the concerto. Comparing it to Example 5, a number of differences are apparent. Apart from alterations in the rhythmic profile, phrasing and the addition of an extra phrase at the end, the most far-reaching change is the alteration of the second note from A to A<sup>b</sup>. This aligns the first few notes of the theme with what by now has become an almost obsessive signature motive of Temmingh, the Shostakovich motive.

The concerto can be divided into the following broad sections: An extensive exposition (m. 1-178), a slow section, suggestive of a “slow movement” (m. 179-217), a transition passage that leads to an imitative section (m. 247-276), a first passacaglia-like section (m. 276-306), a full passacaglia (m. 307-385), a transition that leads into an abridged recapitulation of the first section (m. 438- 496) and an extensive coda (m. 497- 436).

In the course of the exposition the theme is heard in various guises. After its initial presentation (see Example 14) the theme is heard in augmentation on the Swell in a five-part texture that is vaguely reminiscent of the chorale-style section of *Chant d'éloge*, without being a chorale in the full sense, because of the long-sustained notes in the bass line. This chorale-like version of the thematic material

is extended for some length (up to m. 87). The first phrase of this section is quoted here to show how it is derived from the theme:

Example 15 *Organ Concerto No. 2* m. 25-32

A rhythmic diminution of the first few notes of the theme (into semiquavers) is used to generate material for a link that serves the same binding function as the flourish in the first concerto. In the remainder of the exposition the theme is presented in differently constituted harmonic contexts. Throughout, the note G, later buttressed by C#, takes on the role of a central tone. Ultimately this leads into the section that is suggestive of a slow movement (m. 179-271). A beautiful variant of the theme is generated by inverting its intervals and presenting it in a slow, lyrical melody for clarinet, which leads to a dialogue with counter-melodies in other woodwind instruments, while being accompanied in the strings, with an augmented version of the original theme in the basses, transposed up by a major second. F replaces G as the central pitch in this section.

Example 16 *Organ Concerto No. 2* m. 179-185 (continues on next page)

Unconnected triads make up part of the harmonic vocabulary in this section (e.g. 190-194 in the violoncellos). The pitch F continues to have a central role. After an expansive transition, in which the

thematic material is presented in smaller fragments, follows a section in which the theme is treated in imitative fashion. It does not quite achieve the expanse of the fughetto in the first organ concerto but is comparable with its light and fast-moving spirit. Its derivation from the main theme is illustrated in the following example. The first ten notes are taken directly from the theme, while the subsequent fourths B-F#-C# seem to be derived from the theme's third phrase (m. 18:A-E-B).

Example 17 *Organ Concerto No. 2* m. 247-250

After the initial entry of the theme, beginning on G, the next imitations begin on fifths above (D, m. 249; A, m. 251;) and below the initial statement (G, m. 253; C, m. 255; F, m. 257). Conventional techniques such as inversion, augmentation and stretto are also employed later on. A final entry, beginning again on G, is presented in the organ (m. 274) and then makes way for a varied version that is repeated thirteen times on the same pitch, but in various registers and instruments, each time with a different contrapuntal configuration (m. 276-302). A constant alternation between 3/4- and 7/8-time signatures marks the entire section. The only reason why this does not sound like a passacaglia is because of the light-heartedness of the theme derivate. However, a true passacaglia follows, based on a new derivation of the theme. It is in a slow tempo, sixteen measures long and divides into four phrases:

Example 18 *Organ Concerto No. 2* m. 307- 321 organ

ca. 69  
SW  
Organ  
pp  
CH  
pp  
pp  
pp

Because of its length, the theme initially is presented only four times. A rhythmically varied version in a 6/8 time is then heard (m. 355-361), followed by a final presentation of the theme in the organ (plenum) and orchestra (tutti) to create a huge climax (m. 386). G is again the central tone. Passacaglia is a compositional technique for which Temmingh had a great affinity, as can be seen from the fact that it is shared with the first organ concerto and the cello concerto.

Another expansive transition leads to the recapitulation (from m. 438 onwards). In contrast to the recapitulation in the first organ concerto, the thematic material is repeated here rather briefly and not in reverse order. For example, the chorale-like section is omitted. An extensive coda concludes the work, in which the similarity between the first four notes of the theme and the Shostakovich motive is exploited to the full by being repeated almost like an ostinato. Although this motive begins on G, the other notes of the motive (A<sup>b</sup>-F-E) suggest a final cadence on C major, in which E represents the third of the chord. Both orchestra and organ present this in the fashion of a grand climax.

Concertos for organ and orchestra are a rarity and concert organists do not have the opportunity to perform with an orchestra as frequently as pianists, violinists or cellists. If this discussion of Roelof Temmingh's second organ concerto will help to generate interest in the work and possibly a new performance and recording, it will have served its purpose. The work most definitely deserves it.

## Laat my met U verenig lewe (organ solo; 2010) (published in SAKOV 30 Feesbundel)

Apart from *Monofonie*, the prelude *Laat my met U verenig lewe* seems to be the only other organ work that was composed from a truly personal impulse. One of the compilers of the *SAKOV 30 Feesbundel*, Gerrit Jordaan, telephoned the composer during 2010 and asked him if he had any organ chorale arrangements that were waiting to be published (Jordaan, 2017).<sup>20</sup> Temmingh answered that he would compose something, but that he thought that most people considered his music to be terrible (“vreeslik”). Approximately a week later Jordaan received by fax a handwritten copy of the new work. Temmingh said that he would be pleased if the compilers would find the piece suitable for inclusion in the volume but added that he (Jordaan) would get a fright (“dood skrik”) when he saw the music. It was decided to include the work nonetheless, because the compilers – Daleen Kruger was also involved as editor of the volume – were keen to have a variety of styles and grades of difficulty represented in the collection. It is clear, then, that the hymn on which to base his chorale prelude was chosen by the composer himself and was not suggested or commissioned by anyone else. As has been mentioned, a recording of the piece was included on the CD album that accompanied the release of the volume, performed by Theo van Wyk (Jordaan, 2012).

The hymn on which the work is based, *Wer nur den lieben Gott lässt walten*, has its equivalent in the *Liedboek van die Kerk* as “Wie op die Heer vertrou in lyding” (no. 575). While this hymn, one of the best-loved and most frequently arranged hymns in Christian worship, was certainly familiar to Temmingh, it is noteworthy that he chose another title. This would seem to indicate a special affinity for the words of the hymn “Laat my met U verenig lewe” (*Liedboek* no. 273), which has a Dutch precursor by Jan Jacob ten Kate. Although Temmingh was reluctant to disclose personal information about his music, it is true that much of his music does, in fact, have personal connotations. This small organ piece seems to provide a rare glimpse into the inner world of the composer as artist, perhaps also against the background of his seriously deteriorating health at this time of his life.

Despite its rather free treatment, the chorale melody is quite easily recognisable in the highest voice of the composition (see encircled notes in the example below). Its first phrase and the final cadence are also present in the pedal (m. 10 – 21 and 42 – 43). Brief moments of imitation can be heard elsewhere (e.g. LH: m. 3 and 11; pedal: m. 31). Distortion of the rhythmic and metric identity of the given tune is as much a compositional device as is the displacement of the original pitches. A rather dissonant harmonic vocabulary characterises the piece as a whole, even if it ends on the tonal centre of G.

---

<sup>20</sup> This information is quoted more or less verbatim from Jordaan 2017.

Example 19 *Laat my met U verenig lewe*, m. 1 – 9.

The image displays a musical score for organ, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system includes a grand staff (treble and bass clefs) and a separate bass staff below it. The grand staff begins with a treble clef, a 4/4 time signature, and a dynamic marking of *f*. The melody in the treble clef starts with a quarter rest, followed by a series of eighth and quarter notes. The bass clef part provides a harmonic accompaniment with quarter and eighth notes. The second system continues the piece, with the treble clef part featuring more complex rhythmic patterns and the bass clef part providing a steady accompaniment. The score is written in a clear, professional style with standard musical notation.

While the bar form of the chorale is maintained (also reflected in the dynamic indications), the B section is expanded considerably by repeated presentations of one or both phrases of the tune on pitches that are either a second higher or lower than the original (m. 25 – 35). However, these are framed by sections that contain the expected pitches (m. 22 – 24 and 36 – 40).

Even if *Laat my met U verenig lewe* was an occasional composition, it exhibits the kind of compositional integrity that is characteristic of Temmingh. It closes off the composer's contribution to organ music in a fitting way by returning to sacred music and music of the liturgy, where he began. Viewed in a wider context, however, Temmingh's organ music does not only enrich the South African organ repertoire, it is also representative of the contribution this remarkable composer made to South African music in general. At a time when the fundamental premises of South African music in the European art music tradition are being questioned, there is a possibility that the oeuvre of a composer like Roelof Temmingh will simply be erased from our cultural landscape. However, the present article argues that Temmingh's music is to be recognised as a strand of great importance in the diverse musical culture of this country, as a strand that should not be overlooked.

## REFERENCES

- Chorn, A. 2017. Personal correspondence with the author on 21 September, 4 and 5 October.
- Gie, S. 2017. Personal correspondence with the author on 5, 8 and 11 August.
- Groenewald, W. 1990. *'n Bespreking van Liturgiese Orrelmusiek Bande 1-6*. (Unpublished Master's thesis.) Bloemfontein: Universiteit van die Oranje Vrystaat.
- Heyneman, L. 1983. Temmingh-Konsert vol verrassings. *Die Burger* 31 Mei.
- Jacobs, L-M. 2017. Personal correspondence with the author on 22 September.
- Jordaan, Gg. 2012. CD recording SAKOV Orrelverwerkings uit Fees- en Erediensmusiekbundels Vol. 1 & 2. No further details appear on the album.
- Jordaan, G. 2017. Personal correspondence with the author on 31 July.
- Jordaan, G. & Kruger, D. (eds.). 2010. *SAKOV 30 Feesbundel: Orrel-, Koor- en Instrumentale Verwerkings uit die Liedboek van die Kerk 2001 (Vol. 1)*. Queenswood: SAKOV.
- Lüdemann, W. 1987. Roelof Temmingh, in Peter Klatzow (ed.) *Composers in South Africa Today*, 167-192. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Lüdemann, W. 1996. Is the Chameleon Showing its True Colour? Roelof Temmingh at Fifty. *South African Journal of Musicology (SAMUS)* 16, 59-62.
- Lüdemann, W. 1998. Temmingh, Roelof. Klavierkonsert (1995). *South African Journal of Musicology (SAMUS)* 18, 83-85.
- Lüdemann, W. 2006. Temmingh, Roelof. In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Personenteil, vol. 16*, ed. Ludwig Finscher. Kassel-Basel-London-New York-Prague: Bärenreiter; Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler, 679-680.
- Luitingh, W.S. 2010. *Die Suid-Afrikaanse Komponis Hendrik (Henk) Temmingh: 'n Biografie en 'n Katalogus van sy Orrelwerke*. (Unpublished Masters thesis). Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Stegman, F. 1983. Wêreldpremière van Temmingh se Orrelkonsert. *Die Burger* 27 Mei.
- Thomas, A.S. 1979. Cape Guild of Organists, in Jacques P. Malan (ed.) *South African Music Encyclopedia*, 245. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Troskie, A. 2002. Roelof Temmingh (18.4.1913 – 8.10.2001). *Musicus* 30 (1), 153-154.
- Troskie, G. 2017. Personal correspondence with the author 27 September.
- Van Schoor, J. J. 2014. *Die Geskiedenis van die Orrel in Suid-Afrika en die Ontwikkeling van die Koraalvoorspel as 'n Genre met 'n Omvattende Katalogus*. (Unpublished Masters thesis). Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Viljoen, Martina & Viljoen, Nicol. 2009. Roelof Temmingh's Kantorium: A Reflection on Suffering and Redemption. *Acta Academica* 41 (2), 50-76.

## APPENDIX

### The composer's programme notes for the first performance of his organ concerto

Hierdie komposisie is “eenvoudig” en “eendelig”: inleiding, uiteensetting, fughetta, passacaglia, rekapitulاسie, coda – dus nie eintlik eendelig nie, maar darem sonder onderbreking – ook dalk nie eenvoudig nie, maar hopelik sonder onbegryplikhede.

Ek is daarvan oortuig dat sg. “moeilike musiek”, vanuit die uitvoerder(s), maar eweseer vanuit die luisteraar se oogpunt, ’n kategorisering is wat op ’n foutiewe opvatting berus. Bv.: Slegs ’n “groot” pianis kan ’n kamma “eenvoudige” Clementi-sonatine en ’n Liszt-vertoonstuk laat “slaag”. Of: die eerste “eenvoudige” akkoord van Beethoven se 4de Klavierkonsert is, by wyse van spreke, net so “moeilik” as die res van die hele konsert.

Daarom sou ’n beskrywing van my Orrelkonsert as “maklik” of “eenvoudig” foutief wees. Toegegee: die orrelparty en orkes-partye is nie besonder “virtuoos” nie. Ritmies, tematies en harmonies het ek steeds eenvoud nage[s]treef. Virtuositeit en vertoon verseker nie kwaliteit nie. Maar twintig minute of wat se onmiskenbare “Gebrauchsmusik”, se ondubbelsinnige, onbeskaamde musikale onskuld – in hierdie tyd waar talle komponiste blykbaar streef na die maksimum aantal onbegryplike “klankklonte” – verseker ook nie per se kwaliteit nie. Maar dit onderstreep ten minste my bedoeling: kommunikasie. Die kloof tussen hedendaagse komponis en publiek het immers al groot genoeg gegroei.

Tot my eie verbasing het ek aan die einde van hierdie komposisie tot die ontdekking gekom dat die werk boonop in wese “mono-tematies” is, en, onbeplan, op ’n heel besondere manier. Ek het ontdek dat die motief F-G<sup>b</sup>-E<sup>b</sup>-D (’n transposisie van die bekende Dmitri Sjostakowitsj-motief D-E<sup>b</sup>-C-B) op een of ander manier dwarsdeur die werk aanwesig is, sonder dat dit ooit eksplisiet gehoor word. Daarom dat dié motief in die coda “in al sy glorie” ontwikkel word en die komposisie gevolglik op ’n “eenvoudige” D eindig.