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Abstract

This thesis examines the works for violin and piano by Leoš Janáček and Antonín Dvořák to uncover aspects of compositional aesthetic which can inform the interpretative process of a modern performer. Theoretical focus on works broadly considered as the composers’ definitive compositional masterpieces, has meant that works deemed ‘less important’, including much of the repertoire for violin and piano, have been denied an equivalent depth of analysis. Many forms of analysis provide only a limited insight for a performer who seeks to establish a well-founded understanding and replication of the particular aesthetic within which a composer worked or a composition was created.

By using aspects of phenomenological analysis, stemming from the work of Husserl, Clifton and Kerman, this study seeks to engage with the nature of music as an ‘experienced phenomenon’ and consider how “musical meaning arises from the view of music as a participatory aspect of a lived-in-world.” Therefore, the analysis of these works is closely linked to the exploration of the Czech violin aesthetic from a historical and cultural viewpoint. Examination of the relationship between Dvořák and Janáček and their major personal and professional influences frames the discussion of their compositional processes.

The nature of this analysis is peculiarly relevant to issues of violin performance with the aim of establishing what is idiomatic in the violin writing of Dvořák and Janáček and how best to bring this to the surface in performance. By examining works from a similar period and in a similar form, the unifying and contrasting features of these works have been identified and further articulated and used to compare the features of Dvořák and Janáček’s aesthetic of writing for violin and piano.

---
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Historically informed performance is becoming more important in conservatories and concert halls around the world. In the training of a performing musician today, there is an increased emphasis placed upon a well-founded understanding and replication of the particular aesthetic within which a composer worked or a composition was created. The process of analysis for performance often encourages us to ask what style is and how it is formed? The motivation in pursuing this topic stems from an interest in better understanding the relationship between composers and the violin. What are the cultural and historical influences upon this relationship and how do they balance with personal and professional influences?

The canon of western music prominently includes an enduring influence by many Czech composers including Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček. Both composers wrote works which are frequently performed and studied by modern performers, some at a great geographical and cultural remove from the works’ inception. It is almost a given that contemporary performers have some measure of understanding about the aesthetic of J.S. Bach’s violin works. Factors such as the performance conventions of the period and the purpose and intention of the composition are widely researched, discussed and considered when preparing, analysing and performing Bach’s works. There is, comparably, very little to inform a modern performer about the peculiarly Czech relationship with the violin and the effective performance of Czech composition for the violin in the nineteenth century.

A wealth of multi-dimensional international scholarship on Czech music has uncovered a large amount of historical and cultural information and has provided in-
depth analysis of the main oeuvres of both Dvořák and Janáček, namely their Symphonic and Operatic writing. However this theoretical focus on works broadly considered as the composers’ definitive compositional masterpieces, has meant that works deemed ‘less important’, including much of the repertoire for violin and piano, have been denied an equivalent depth of analysis.

Surely a more nuanced understanding of the works for violin and piano would enable a more sincere and effective approach to performance. Would a greater understanding of the differences between Czech writing and pan-Slavic or pan-European styles also enable a more sophisticated process of analysis for performance? It is the aim of this thesis to mount an enquiry which will also include an exploration of differences in the musical aesthetic of the two major Czech regions, Bohemia and Moravia. Did the historical differences in musical practice in these regions affect the nineteenth-century aesthetic of writing for violin and piano? And to what extent does this influence determine the style and aesthetic of the music of Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček?

The scope of this thesis has been narrowed to the chamber works for violin and piano by Dvořák and Janáček for two main reasons. Firstly, it is clear that there are considerable, inherent aesthetic differences between writing for violin and piano and writing for violin with orchestra. Secondly, by focusing only on the works for violin and piano the parameters of the study are kept more consistent and in-depth examination is possible within the confines of a relatively short thesis, linked to a recital and a performers process of analysis for performance.

In attempting to further understand this area, research will be included on the musical characteristics identified in the greater output of Dvořák and Janáček and this thesis will explore the extent to which these characteristics are apparent in their
writing for violin and piano. The intent of this discussion is to compare these two composers and identify the source of their differences in style with specific focus on their regional and personal influences.

The analysis of these works will be closely linked to the exploration of the development of the Czech violin aesthetic from a historical and cultural viewpoint. It is important to keep the analysis relevant to issues of violin performance with the aim of establishing what is idiomatic to the violin writing of Dvořák and Janáček and how best to bring this to the surface in performance. In examining these works features that will be identified will include the melodic function of the instruments, voicing, rhythmic capacity of the violin through the use of bow and other such considerations.

Methods of analysis for performance are discussed throughout the literature with frequent allusion to an instinctive process, instilled in a player as part of their instrumental training. A violinist will approach a composition from several key perspectives to serve both interpretive and practical concerns. Players must establish a workable bowing which serves the gesture and expression of the music while considering matters like bow speed, colour of sound, string crossings and so on. Likewise, fingerings which utilise the full range of timbres available and provide contrast are often explored. A player must also find the tempo and pulse which serves the instrumental figurations and phrases to best convey the character of the musical

---

2 John Rink’s review of Johnathan Dunsby’s Performing Music: Shared Concerns articulates succinctly Dunsby’s principal goal “to portray the ‘reality’ of performance – ‘how we do it, and observe it being done’, although not ‘how we learn music’ (p. 27). Written in ‘non-technical language’, the book tries to provide ‘insight into how performers think, and what they think about’, and to identify ‘what aspects of the activity are a mystery even to the musicians themselves, and which are amenable to scrutiny, experiment, and improvement’. John Rink, ”[Untitled],” Music & Letters 77, no. 2 (1996). 253-254.

material. How may a violinist approach these instrumental considerations while always serving the aesthetic characteristics of the piece to be performed? Which methods of analysis will best connect the performer and thus the audience with an authentic experience of a piece of music in performance?
Analytical Approach

A performer faces many decisions during the process of preparing a work for performance. This process can be aided by a number of approaches including a form of analysis one may refer to as “phenomenological”. The study of phenomenology has developed greatly since the work of Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) who sought to provide philosophy and science with a methodology which directly examined phenomena, or immediate, conscious experience. Phenomenological analysis of music seeks to engage with the nature of music as an experienced phenomenon and discover what is directly given. As Sansom describes it, “the adoption of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis from psychology to consider musical meaning arises from the view of music as a participatory aspect of a lived-in-world.”

Since the early 1980s, the work of Thomas Clifton, Joseph Kerman and Lawrence Ferrara, and others has extended and challenged concepts of the nature of musical analysis and the assumptions which provide the basis for our understanding and knowledge of musical works. Sansom summarises the nature of the mainstream analytical approach:

Traditional notation-based analysis rests upon an assumed subject-object split whereby the musical object (a notational re-presentation of a musical event) can be probed by the analyst in such a way as to reveal its underlying systems, within which its perception as ‘meaningful’ resides. Its structuralist agenda is to identify an inherent musical-system constructed from relations between and within combinations

---

4 A direct definition of phenomenology is difficult to acquire. As Clifton writes, “this question [what is phenomenology] was asked by Merleau-Ponty in 1945 in the preface to his Phenomenology of Perception, when Husserlian phenomenology was already about 40yrs old.” Clifton summarises that, as it was not yet sufficiently answered by either Husserl or Merleau-Ponty, he would respectfully decline the task himself. Thomas Clifton, Music as Heard; a Study in Applied Phenomenology (Binghamton, N.Y.: Yale University Press, 1983). Preface viii.
of formal elements (such as melody, rhythm, tonality, texture etc.). The musical meaning is in part (sometimes in whole) attributed to the power of selected structural functions to evoke affect in the perceiver.\textsuperscript{7}

Clifton describes the application of the phenomenological attitude to music analysis as an attempt to refrain “as much as possible from constructing a prefabricated method to impose on the composition” and to engage in “a thorough exploration of the notion, held by all true scientists, that ‘objectivity’ has a subjective (person-oriented) foundation.”\textsuperscript{8}

The complex language of phenomenology is not a compulsory aspect of the phenomenological analysis of music. To further burden the language of music analysis with that of phenomenology would not necessarily bring the analyst closer to understanding of the type this author is seeking through this project.\textsuperscript{9} Clifton confirms that “it is possible to think and write phenomenologically without getting bogged down in questions of method … the better part of wisdom lies precisely in communicating a phenomenological attitude.”\textsuperscript{10}

To approach analysis with a phenomenological attitude provides, “a way of uttering meaningful statements which are objective in the sense that they attempt to describe the musical object adequately, and subjective in the sense that they issue from a subject to whom an object has some meaning.”\textsuperscript{11} Within this perspective, music is defined as presentative rather than denotative and is distinguished from compositional technique and from sounds as physical objects.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{7} Sansom adds that “of course a great deal of today’s musicology and ethnomusicology contextualised such analysis within more post-structuralist informed approaches.” Sansom, "Understanding Musical Meaning: Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis and Improvisation.", 2.

\textsuperscript{8} Clifton, \textit{Music as Heard; a Study in Applied Phenomenology}. Preface viii.

\textsuperscript{9} Clifton describes music as burdened with ‘–isms’ and ‘–ologies’ and quotes Kerman’s warning that “methodologies resemble ideologies in their tendency to lead charmed lives of their own absurdly abstracted from the real world. (Joseph Kerman. \textit{The Beethoven Quartets}, p.379)” Ibid. Preface viii.

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid. Preface vii.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid. Preface viii–ix.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid. 6–7.
In approaching the analysis of music with a phenomenological attitude both Clifton and Ferrara prioritise the neglected consideration of what Clifton describes as “reciprocity”\(^\text{13}\) and Ferrara as “referential meaning”\(^\text{14}\). Although not necessarily analogous terms, they indicate priorities of subjective meaning and the response of the listener to an experience created by the performer.

The practical analytical process of ‘describing’ a work’s features is still a relevant aspect of the process in this experiential method and perspective. Clifton expands, “in describing, I engage in an act of communication with myself. This act helps to transform latent knowledge into the kind of explicit knowledge which is useful in learning about the gestures and textures of the world.”\(^\text{15}\) This act of description also facilitates a dialogue with other people. “While each person’s experience is invisible to other people, they can communicate their experience through behaviour: through facial or bodily expressions, language, or by paraphrasing the experience in another artistic creation, conceivably even in a different medium.”\(^\text{16}\)

And so analysis with the intention of performance is an actualization of the “possibility of a shared experience.” The phenomenological attitude may facilitate a performance whereby the musician can communicate their subjective experience through their actions, movements and sound. Furthermore it may become possible to more closely convey the subjectivity of the work itself, the intrinsic compositional meaning represented by the sound world or the phenomena of the actualisation of a musical work.

The phenomenological perspective provides methods to describe and engage with experienced phenomena without being purely an individual or subjective

\(^{13}\) Ibid. 10.
\(^{15}\) Clifton, *Music as Heard; a Study in Applied Phenomenology*. 6.
\(^{16}\) Ibid. 7.
‘opinion’. In this thesis, I will attempt to articulate the nature of shared reaction and shared meaning understood in the specific aural and physical interaction of the violin and piano in the works of Dvořák and Janáček. As Ferrara describes it, “listeners experience music as a multiplicity of levels of significance which may include the sound-in-time, formal properties or syntax, the symbolic transformation of human feelings and the exemplification of a sense of the historical epoch in which the musical work was created.”

And so with a wide ranging investigation of the historical epoch within which Dvořák and Janáček composed, the major influences upon their compositional aesthetics may be identified. With more specific focus on the works for violin and piano, the aesthetics born of this combination of historical epoch and compositional identity can be examined and compared in more concrete terms. Further investigation of the nature and context of the works for violin and piano may lead to a more effective and affecting performance and help define a more profound understanding of the musical communication inherent in the experience of performing the works of Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček.

Chapter One: A Reflection on Historical Epoch

1.1 A Summary of Historical Influences on Czech Musical Identity

The tumultuous history of the Czech people was a potent force in shaping the political, aesthetic and musical landscape in the time of Antonín Dvořák and Leos Janáček. Jiří Berkovec identified that, “it is a symbolic fact for Czech music that its historically proved beginnings blend with the moving events of social progress.” It is important to begin with a brief summary of the overriding aspects of the Czech musical identity and Czech traditional music most pertinent to my study.

The Czech Republic we know today centres around the Bohemian capital of Prague. It shares borders with Germany to the west, Poland to the north, Austria to the south and Slovakia to the east. The region of Moravia is in the east of the Czech Republic, sharing a border with Slovakia and, in the north, covering part of the Silesian region which is today primarily Polish. The term ‘Bohemian’ is often used synonymously with ‘Czech’, thereby complicating understanding of the different developments in the Bohemian and Moravian regions.

Czech culture was continually exposed to the influences of outside forces. For many centuries Czech lands were ruled by other nations who imposed their religious practice, language and culture, with varying degrees of severity. Austrian rule was instrumental in shaping the Czech character and imbued a long tradition of political struggle which permeates Czech culture. The struggle against the Germanicisation of Czech culture was central to the political spheres of both Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček. The willingness to align Czech culture with that of other Slavic nations, particularly Russia, was a tendency of both composers. Only Janáček would live to

---

see the Austrians defeated and expelled during World War One. This thesis will expand upon the significance of this struggle in the lives and works of Dvořák and Janáček in the following section.

The impact of the Habsburg rule on the development of Czech musical practice was principally reflected in the growth of sacred and secular music in the Bohemian and Moravian palaces and churches of the Habsburg nobility. After the radical reforms of the eighteenth century the Royal Bohemian Chancellery was merged with the Austrian Chancellery and the status of Prague thus demoted to a “provincial city.” There was no longer much incentive for Habsburg’s noblemen to make use of their Prague palaces and country estates which severely limited the available posts for Czech musicians in Bohemia and Moravia. Czechs migrated in search of a more fruitful and tolerant existence in other European countries. Musicians such as Johan Stamitz (1717–1757) in Mannheim, František Benda (1709–1786) in Dresden and Berlin and Josef Mysliveček (1731–1781) in Italy represent a wave of excellent Czech musicians who had an indelible influence upon their adopted musical spheres. This helped further establish the reputation of Prague as the ‘Conservatoire of Europe’ as well as continually ensuring the interaction of Czech music and musicians with musical culture throughout Europe.

The Czech violin school was long established by the eighteenth century and produced virtuoso performers including Josef Slavík (1806–1833) in Vienna and Ferdinand Laub (1832–1875), a famous violinist of Czech origins, who became a professor of violin at the Moscow Conservatory and co-founded the Russian violin school. Tchaikovsky dedicated his third String Quartet to Laub’s memory. Other internationally famous Czech violin virtuosos included František Ondříček (1857–

---

20 Ibid.
The teachings of Otakar Ševčík (1852–1934) remain central to the modern study of violin technique. Educated at the Prague Conservatory, Ševčík is a prime example of a Czech pedagogue of exceptional standard who worked at the highest level and disseminated his knowledge through his position at the Prague Conservatory from 1892 until 1906 and through private teaching. A contemporary of Dvořák and Janáček, Ševčík is an example of the highly developed Czech relationship to the violin in the nineteenth century.

**Czech Song**

Song has always been central to Czech culture, politics, worship and education. The Czech hymns *Hospodine pomiluj ny* (*God, Have Mercy On Us*) and *Svatý Václave* (*Saint Wenceslas*) are considered to be the oldest memorials of spiritual folk songs in a national language on the European continent. Documented as originating as early as the eleventh century, both songs were used like modern anthems, sung for centuries by Czech commoners and noblemen alike as well as being used for official ceremonies. Though awareness of the long history of these songs is referred to by Berkovec as “burdensome,” their cultural significance would continue well into the time of Dvořák and Janáček and beyond.

---

22 *God, Have Mercy On Us* originated in the eleventh century, chronicled by Kosmas as being sung at the throning of Pring Spythhněv II in 1055. In the fourteenth century *Saint Wenceslas* was chronicled by Kravice as the song “known since long ago.” Ibid. 62–63.
23 Ibid. 63.
24 *Ballad of Blanik* is a lesser known orchestral work by Janáček, premiered in 1920, which is based on Jaroslav Vrchlický’s treatment of the Wenceslas legend. *Blanik* (or *Blanek*) is known in Czech and Slavic legends as the resting place of Saint Wenceslas and his knights – great heroes and warriors ready to rise from their sleep and free the people in their hour of need. The legend is also the subject of a Fibich opera and part of Smetana’s *Ma Vlast*. The melody of *St Wenceslas* was used by Dvořák, Suk and Novák amongst others. Clapham, "Czech Republic."
Parish schools throughout Czech lands emphasised the equal importance of singing, reading, writing and arithmetic. By the fourteenth century, there were almost two thousand schools that prioritised daily choir singing and the employment of musicians over pedagogues. Congregational singing was a central pillar of Czech worship with simple and popular melodies and hymns already integral to the Czech musical identity. Berkovec describes Christmas celebrations where local composers and musicians would play Czech folk songs and dances including social ideas of equality, revolution and patriotic Czech messages.

**Hussite and Reformation Causes**

The Hussite cause and its push for religious reformation and social transformations in the fifteenth century affected all aspects of Czech life. The Hussite wars resulted in the first significant period of political isolation from outside musical influence. This is one of the few periods in which Moravia was separated from the Bohemian crown. Fortunately this did not bring musical and cultural activity to a standstill, but instead promoted the development of Czech cultural identity. Propaganda songs, campaign songs and battle songs spread through the Czech lands, providing spiritual armour against real foes. Berkovec makes reference to several of these songs including Kdož jsú boží bojovníci (The Warriors of God), a battle call of the troops led by Jan Žižka. The significance of these melodies would continue for centuries, symbolising Hussite topics and the nation’s history in works by Smetana and in Antonín Dvořák’s Husitská. Smaczny refers to The Warriors of God as a symbol of national identity.

---

26 Ibid. 68–69.
27 Music became more monodic, with polyphony and instrumentation discouraged, and displayed what Smaczny describes as “distinct folk traits”. Clapham, “Czech Republic.”
28 Ibid.
and defiance in the Czech struggle for independence which would continue into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{30}

At the end of the eighteenth century, the Czech National Revival movement, with the support of some of the Bohemian aristocracy, started a campaign for restoration of the kingdom’s historic rights. Central to this was the push for Czech language to replace German as the language of administration. Hugh LeCaine Agnew writes that, “the status of Czech, once spoken by kings and great aristocrats, had fallen to such an extent that proposals were being made to root it out.”\textsuperscript{31} A series of Czech dissertations, the earliest of which were written in German, encouraged a renaissance of Czech culture and language.\textsuperscript{32} The Czech National Revival movement had a large impact on both Dvořák and Janáček who, like most of their contemporaries, were educated in German.

The themes integral to the Czech, Bohemian and Moravian identities in the nineteenth century have been evidenced as the fruit of seeds planted over 1000 years before. The patriotic elements of the creative spheres of Dvořák and Janáček were not merely a product of interaction with the nineteenth-century nationalist movements, but rather, an integral part of the Czech identity.

\textsuperscript{30} Clapham, “Czech Republic.”
\textsuperscript{32} Growing pride in the native Czech literary tradition encouraged publication of old and new Czech poems and plays. In 1791 a chair of Czech language and literature was founded at the Prague University. Ryba published a set of Czech songs in 1800 followed by Dolžálek and Tomášek. The Bilingual performers of the ‘Patriotic Theatre’ company staged Czech versions of German Singspiele, Mozart and Rossini opera, and many other works. Clapham, “Czech Republic.”
1.2 A Summary of Czech Traditional Music

Jan Racek and Jiří Vysloužil describe the connection between contemporary Czech music and the native traditions as being “perhaps at its strongest at the turn of the nineteenth century.”33 Czech traditional music is broadly divided into two categories. Bohemian and West-Moravian music shows the influence of adjoining Germany and Austria and demonstrates Western European features. The primary result of this influence is the prevalence of instrumental music and the use of Western European harmonic systems. Melodies are often written in 3/4 time and have regular rhythms. 34

East-Moravia and Silesia are divided from the west by the Morava River and is largely independent of the western tonal system.35 East-Moravian and Silesian music, the region referred to by Janáček in his collections of Moravian song, shows the influence of its neighbours Slovakia and Poland with melody, harmony and rhythms suggesting west Carpathian origins. Vocal music dominates the repertory with the relationship between text and melody being central and many rhythmic structures drawn from textual rhythms. Long-songs, in a rubato style, are characteristic as well as spinning or rotating dances.36 Pilková describes the eastern style as “asymmetrical” and hi-lights the vocal “recitative” style of the melody.37

35 Though the characteristics of East-Moravian and Silesian traditional music testify to the region’s independence from western art music developments this is only a general representation. Tyllner acknowledges the influence the Baroque and Classical styles introduced by folk musicians who had played at aristocratic homes in Western Moravia. The arrival of Valach shepherds in the sixteenth and seventeenth century also had an influence on music making in the eastern regions.
36 Ibid.
37 Pilková, "Janáček and Czech Music.", 156.
Scales used in these regions contain modal elements and tri-tones and the Moravian use of the minor seventh above the tonic. Zezelj-Gualdi summarises the main modal features in Czech folk music:

 Alteration of the major and minor mode (expressing a mood change), lowered 7th degree of the scale ("Moravian Modulation"), [and] raised 4th degree, which, in combination with the minor 3rd degree, becomes "Lydian minor" (Janáček’s favourite mode). 38

**Vocal Music and Song**

In Clapham’s text *Czech Republic*, Tyllner has identified the Hussite period of reformation as the divisive force that would see traditional Bohemian and West-Moravian music take on the influence of the adjoining western European countries while East-Moravian and Silesian music remained connected to Slovakian and Polish influences. 39 The unparalleled expansion of religious song in the Hussite period led to the development of sixteenth-century song types which were the structural example for much traditional song into the twentieth century. Most of the traditional songs and dances collected in Bohemia in the nineteenth century had survived from the eighteenth century with only a few of earlier origin.

Bohemian and West-Moravian vocal music characteristically features chordal motifs combined with the elongation of a single syllable over several beats. Dominated by the use of the major triad, most songs are monophonic with the occasional addition of a second voice in thirds or sixths. Modulation is unusual with the overall structure based on repetition of identical phrases. Though more symmetrically organised than East-Moravian songs, West-Moravian songs frequently feature five, six or seven bar phrases. 40 The typically declamatory style has links to church singing and Gregorian chant as well as dance music, trumpet signals and

38 Danijela Zezelj-Gualdi, "Leos Janacek's Violin Sonata and How It Compares to the Violin Sonatas of Brahms and Debussy" (University of Georgia, 2006). 18.
39 Clapham, "Czech Republic."
40 Pilková, "Janáček and Czech Music.", 156.
military marches. Most of the traditional music which survived from the eighteenth century consisted of melody rooted in instrumental dance music.\textsuperscript{41}

Like Bohemian traditional music, East-Moravian and Silesian song is predominantly monophonic with occasional harmonisation in thirds and sixths. Older songs usually have a small range and use frequent repetition of melodic and rhythmic motifs. Legends and ballads are ‘epic’ songs which depict family and social life. Dance songs have slightly different characteristics in East-Moravian and Silesian music including fixed forms and metres.

\textbf{Instrumental Music}

Early Czech instruments include wooden shepherds’ pipe, transverse and end-blown flutes, panpipes, the cow or ox horn and the \textit{sušle} or conch-shell trumpet. The most widespread and widely played instrument was the bagpipe (or \textit{dudy}) which was known in Bohemia from the thirteenth century onwards. The bagpipes were chiefly used to accompany singing, alone or in combination with other instruments.

Another of the most widely used instruments was the \textit{skřipsky}, a home-made fiddle with three or four strings. The short necked violin was used in southern and western Bohemia and was altered with a \textit{capo tasto} to facilitate use in an ensemble with clarinet and bagpipe. This ensemble was known as a ‘small barn band’ and later featured a double bass and some instrumental doubling. Dulcimers were used in the eighteenth century along with \textit{zithers}.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{41} As Tyllner notes, in the earliest manuscript collection of folksongs from Bohemia, made from 1819-20, more that 80\% are dance-songs or songs sung to dance. There are noticeable similarities between Bavarian dances and those being performed by Germans in Bohemia including the landler, which shows the influence of traditional Alpine song. The \textit{furiant}, a dance in 3/4 with two-syllable metric feet, was used several times by Antonín Dvořák, for instance the third movement of his ninth symphony where \textit{a furiant} replaces the usual Scherzo. Clapham, "Czech Republic."

\textsuperscript{42} The zither is a musical string instrument, most commonly found in Slovenia, Austria, Hungary, northwestern Croatia, the southern regions of Germany, alpine Europe and East Asian cultures, including China. It is played by strumming or plucking the strings like a guitar.
The *gajdoš* or fiddle and bagpipe duo survived into the twentieth century in Silesian towns influenced by Slovak and Polish mountain bagpipe music. This usually featured the violin as the melodic instrument with a richly ornamented bagpipe accompaniment. String bands, usually with a first and second fiddle and a small double bass, used accented second and fourth beats to create rhythmic tension in the accompaniment while the first fiddle decorated the vocal melody. When a clarinet was added to this ensemble in the eighteenth century, it would usually play a second melodic line while the first fiddle played a richly ornamented melody and the other instruments provided harmony. These accompaniment lines were often based on parallel thirds, fourths and fifths and, in 2/4 time used the *duvaj* or ‘double stroke’ technique of using smooth bow strokes to achieve light, even beats.

It is instructive to identify some of these regional folk music influences in Dvořák and Janáček’s works for violin and piano. Although these works and their composers were influenced by a wide range of styles, it is possible to outline general tendencies which surface in the aesthetic of their violin writing and which remain connected to the folk music tradition. To pinpoint the complete inspiration of a musical aesthetic is perhaps an impossible task but it is the intent of this thesis to make suggestions in the analysis of the works for violin and piano which will show the importance of these historical considerations. Following this general introduction to the historical and cultural context of the life and works of Dvořák and Janáček it is possible to now identify the composers’ most influential personal and professional influences placing them more clearly in their historical epoch.
Chapter Two: Antonín Dvořák

2.1 Family and Education

Antonín Dvořák was born in 1841 in the small Bohemian village of Nelahozeves, situated on the river Vltava and only thirty kilometres north of Prague. Dvořák was baptized a Roman Catholic in the village church, St Andrews, and retained a simple but dedicated Christian belief throughout his life. He entered the village school in 1847, aged six and received his first formal musical education.

Antonín was the eldest son of František Dvořák who was an innkeeper and butcher. Many sources describe the pressure Antonín ‘must’ have felt, as the eldest son, to follow his father’s profession. Indeed, from the age of thirteen Antonín did enter into a Butcher’s apprenticeship in the nearby town of Zlonice by Slaný, emerging fully qualified by the age of fifteen. During this time in Zlonice, Dvořák was a pupil of the organist Antonín Liehmann, acquiring his first knowledge of piano and organ while continuing his violin lessons.

The Dvořák family were people of limited means but were by no means uncultured. František Dvořák played the zither and violin at least semi-professionally. David Hurwitz clarifies that Dvořák “was not a peasant, if by this one means a subsistence farmer tied to the land.”

---

43 A memoir by Dvořák’s cousin, Anna Dušková, with whom he lived during his study in Prague describes that, “Toniček (Antonín) had scarcely learned to walk when he was given the apron and hatchet that are the insignia of the butcher’s trade…Uncle [Antonín’s father]…in accordance with the family tradition, destined his sons for the butcher’s trade; there were five of them, and then three sisters. But it was mainly due to the influence of his teacher, Liehmann, that Uncle was induced to release him from following the family calling and to give him to music.” As printed in Otakar Šourek, ed. Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences (Prague: Artia,1954). 23–24.

Dvořák’s rural beginnings is becoming dispelled in the literature by more nuanced and comprehensive understandings.\footnote{Grandiose descriptions of the sheer improbability and meteoric success of Dvořák’s career frequently benefit from emphasising Dvořák’s rural beginnings. Such descriptions pepper the literature including the introduction to the edited letters of Antonín Dvořák by Otakar Šourek. Šourek, ed. \textit{Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences.} 11.}

Antonín described to Václav Novotný that “all the calamities and trials of my young life were sweetened by music, my guardian angel.”\footnote{As written by the Czech composer, writer and Critic Václav F. Novotný in his book of reminiscences “With Dvořák in England”. As printed in Ibid. 21.} The village church would host Dvořák’s first violin solo where he played under the leadership of the choirmaster and brother of his teacher. Dvořák describes his teacher in Zlonice, Antonín Liehmann:

A good musician, but he was quick-tempered and still taught according to the old methods: if a pupil could not play a passage, he got as many cuffs as there were notes on the sheet … . He was well versed in harmony – though of course his notions of harmony were different from those of the present day – and he had a good grasp of through bass: he could also read and play figured bass fluently and taught us to do the same.\footnote{From a book of recollections from Dvořák’s student, Josef Michl, named \textit{Z Dvořákovy vyprávěníl.} As translated and printed in Ibid. 23.}

By the time Antonín Dvořák arrived to study at the Prague Organ School in 1857, he already had a decent harmonic and instrumental foundation. In Prague he received a solid formal training and developed into an accomplished player of the violin and viola. Smaczny draws attention to the \textit{Stabat Mater} of 1877 in which he observes the style of Dvořák education, little changed from that given to eighteenth-century Czech musicians. Smaczny highlights the firm, continuo-like bass lines and “Baroque Figuren.”\footnote{Jan Smaczny, “Dvorak, Antonin (Leopold),” \textit{The Oxford Companion to Music}, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/opr/t114/e2154. (Accessed 07.05.2012.).}

Dvořák would reflect upon his two years at the Prague Organ School without much pleasure describing it as mouldy and complaining that “anybody who wanted to
learn anything had to know German.” Descriptions of Dvořák’s German language skills as poor, like those in Šourek’s collection of correspondence and reminiscences, are contrasted by the introduction to the critical edition of his correspondence. The editors describe Dvořák’s language education in detail, concluding that for much of his childhood Dvořák’s formal German was in fact superior to his Czech. They draw the following distinction:

Dvořák’s uncertainty about (Czech) grammatical norms never bothered him in his creative work. Although (he) did not learn much about the grammatical rules of the Czech language in the surroundings where he spent his youth, he had a command of colloquial Czech with all its picturesque expressions and phrases commonly used by the class he grew up in and belonged to.

2.2 Orchestral Musician

After leaving the Prague Organ School, Dvořák worked as a full-time professional musician. He would keep his position as violist in the Bohemian Provisional Theatre Orchestra for most of the 1860s. This was not a path that would bring Dvořák fortune or fame but one which provided a modest income and helped him gain extensive experience with a wide range of orchestral and operatic repertoire. He supplemented his income by giving piano lessons and spent what time he could spare on composition.

---

50 Ibid.
51 “Dvořák did not receive the type of school instruction whose scope and strength would equip him with at least a standard amount of language skill … . Except for the Nelahozeves general school (1847-1853), Dvořák was never taught Czech … . The Children did learn to read and write but were hardly told about the rules of the normative language. They usually wrote what they heard … . Dvořák’s knowledge of the cultural Czech language based on his school education was practically non-existent. He had not mastered even the basic grammatical rules and was often uncertain about the correct use of the most common expressions. His writing was based mainly on conversational style.” M. Kuna, Bradová, L., Čubr, A., Hallová, M., & Slavíková, J., ed. Antonín Dvořák Correspondence and Documents; a Critical Edition 1871-1884, 10 vols., vol. Vol.1 1871-1884, Antonín Dvořák Correspondence and Documents; a Critical Edition (Prague: Supraphon,1987). Introduction 78/79.
52 Ibid.
His post in the Provisional Theatre Orchestra gave Dvořák close contact with fellow musicians and composers, both local and foreign. In 1863 he participated in a single concert under the baton of Richard Wagner. Hurwitz argues against the use of this professional contact, and the fact that Dvořák openly admired Wagner’s music, as evidence which further emphasises Wagner’s influence on the young Czech composer.53 Hurwitz does acknowledge Wagner’s influence as real, “if often overstated,” but describes understanding of Dvořák’s extensive orchestral experience as neglected in the literature.54

Dvořák participated in literally hundreds of opera performances with the Provisional Theatre Orchestra which was conducted by Bedřich Smetana from 1866 onwards. The repertoire performed included operas by Meyerbeer, Gounod, Smetana, Verdi, Offenbach and Rossini. Hurwitz discusses how the music of Berlioz “took Prague by storm,” highlighting similarities between the French composer’s Romeo et Juliette “Scene d’amour” and Dvořák’s Symphony No. 2 from 1865:

You will find a remarkable coincidence in mood and texture as well as in the shape of some of the melodies. There’s the same twilit atmosphere, with long-limbed tunes broadly sung by dusky-toned strings (the violins and cellos often together); the same hints of birdsong and nocturnal rustlings in the accompaniments; and those soulful, tender melodies given to the woodwinds.55

Between 1869 and 1874 Dvořák embarked on a more experimental period of composition, perhaps in part stimulated by the new repertoire he encountered in the Provisional Theater Orchestra. Smaczny comments that, while the works in this period show the influence of Liszt and Wagner, they also show a “remarkable and

53 Hurwitz writes that this incident “does not provide a legitimate excuse for ignoring everything else that the young Czech composer played, studied, enjoyed, and found inspirational during his formative years.” Hurwitz expands on this Wagnerian influence much further in his examination of Dvořák’s operas. Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius. 16.
54 Ibid. 71.
55 Ibid. 24.
challenging individuality,” particularly the E minor Quartet and the first version of *King and Charcoal-Burner.*

During this time, Dvořák unsuccessfully courted a piano student named Josephina Čermáková, instead marrying her younger sister, Anna, with whom he had a long and happy marriage. His marriage in 1873 and the subsequent transition of Dvořák’s duty to that of a provider and father would see him leave his orchestral job and seek more stable and fruitful employment as the organist St Adalbert’s Church in Prague. This not only provided more secure income but also afforded him a higher social status and enough free time to focus on composition.

Anna Dvořák would eventually bear nine children, the first three of whom did not survive infancy as was common at the time. This strong familial presence inspired Dvořák’s life-long devotion to providing for them and fostered his realistic and practical approach to composition. Dvořák was an extremely hard worker and exceptionally productive. Through his many letters to friends and colleagues, it is possible to observe his struggle to dedicate his art to its highest purposes while facing the practical challenges of meeting material demands. In 1891 Dvořák refused the offer of a professorship of composition and instrumentation at the Prague Conservatory, preferring to concentrate on his own composition. He later reconsidered after a quarrel with his publisher over the payment for his eighth symphony.

---

56 Smaczny, “Dvorak, Antonin (Leopold).”
57 For Josephina, Dvořák composed the song cycle *Cypress Trees* based on lyrics by Gustav Pfleger Moravský. Moravský (Karasin July 27, 1833 - September 20, 1875 Prague) was a Moravian writer, poet and playwright.
2.3 Simrock, Brahms and Symphonic Writing

Dvořák’s long relationship with his publisher Fritz Simrock was at times fraught with frustration. Dvořák was first recommended to the German publisher by Johannes Brahms. In 1874 Dvořák applied for an Austrian state grant, seeking financial support that would allow him to provide for his family while immersing himself in composition. Brahms was a member of the adjudication panel and immediately took a liking to the Czech composer. Dvořák was awarded this grant in 1874 and for the subsequent five years.

A long relationship between Dvořák and Brahms was beginning, built upon genuine and significant mutual admiration and generous personal and professional interaction.\(^{59}\) Yet, reading much of Dvořák’s communication, one is struck by the persistent humility and self-deprecation of a man who, even at the end of his long career, described himself as “a simple Czech musician.”\(^{60}\) Brahms offered his younger colleague the brilliant and scholarly intellect demonstrated in his own formal mastery. Dvořák was occasionally advised that he took too many formal liberties and did not value brevity highly enough. In the earliest days of their relationship Brahms also urged Dvořák to be more meticulous when adding accidentals and reviewing the voicing of his compositions.\(^{61}\)

It is frequently observed that Dvořák’s compositions from the time of the fifth Symphony, 1875, were less harmonically adventurous and showed a closer attention

---

\(^{59}\) Hurwitz compares the relationship between Dvořák and Brahms to that which existed between Haydn and Mozart; one built on companionship completely without envy. He suggests the two composers identified their talents as being complementary but also ‘that they were the two finest composers around and therefore members of a very special club’. Hurwitz, *Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius*. 7.

\(^{60}\) Dvořák deflects the praise of an admirer who sent a letter of “excessive devoutness and humility, so that it would seem as if you were speaking to some demigod.” Dvořák clarifies, “I am just an ordinary Czech musician, who does not love such exaggerated humbleness, and although I have moved quite enough in the great musical world, I still remain what I have always been – a simple Czech musician.” Šourek, ed. *Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences*. 13.

\(^{61}\) From a letter addressed to Dvořák in Prague from Brahms in Vienna, III. 1878. As printed in Ibid. 42–43.
to classical form and symmetrical melody. Hurwitz argues that it is Dvořák’s chamber music which most clearly demonstrates his love of the classical tradition. What distinguishes Dvořák’s interaction with the classical tradition is that he was not bound by it, as much as he revered it. He distinguishes himself through extensive orchestral experience, a profuse melodic gift and colourful orchestral voicing. What can perhaps be considered the greatest success of their friendship is that they respected deeply what they had in common. As Hurwitz frames it, understanding of the importance of Brahms in Dvořák’s life in a more accurate perspective helps show how Brahms “may have … [helped] him realize his musical ambitions in those areas where their interests converged.”

Brahms and Dvořák represent champions of Symphonic writing in a period which was, in many ways, dominated by the virtuoso composer-performer. Dvořák was almost unique in this period as a major composer who was not primarily a pianist. At the same time it is important to recognize that Dvořák was still a proficient pianist and composed using the piano. Hurwitz describes the second half of the nineteenth century simply as “a bad time for the German symphonic tradition,” noting that Beethoven’s legacy was continued by Schumann and Mendelssohn, neither of whom would make the symphony their defining genre. Indeed, Wagner would be so bold as to declare the symphony “dead.”

---

62 Smaczny is one theorist who makes this observation in Smaczny, ”Dvorak, Antonin (Leopold)."
63 Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius. 97.
64 Hurwitz describes common overviews of this relationship as mistakenly depicting “Brahms [as] a worldly, urban sophisticate working in the glorious German musical tradition” and Dvořák as being “of racially inferior peasant stock from the Czech provinces, a naïve country bumpkin of scant intellectual resources with the knack for writing good tunes.” The exaggerated language of this description already makes clear Hurwitz’s strong objection to this understanding of an important friendship which was “much more than mere charity.” Ibid. 3–4.
65 Ibid. 7.
66 Ibid. 11.

Yet, it was certainly not “dead.” The transition from aristocratic arts patronage to public-performance institutions, following the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars, created a vacuum of opportunity for composers to see their works performed. The expense of establishing and maintaining an orchestra
Hurwitz outlines the principal distinctions in the symphonic writing of Brahms and Dvořák.\textsuperscript{67} He refers to Dvořák’s treatment of the woodwind section as influenced by Czech style dating back to the eighteenth century which favours the “bright and penetrating sounds of piccolo, English horn, and triangle.”\textsuperscript{68} Hurwitz goes on to expand these observations to wider distinctions between Czech cultivation of a lighter basic sonority and the Germanic tendency towards thicker and richer sonorities. He argues that the brighter Czech complexion, though susceptible to sounding brash and lean, is better suited to the peculiarly Czech rhythmic characteristics which stem from folk music and the accentuations of Czech language.\textsuperscript{69}

The fundamental qualities of Dvořák’s symphonic style remained a constant throughout his career, informed in part by his many years experience in a professional orchestra.\textsuperscript{70} What most particularly distinguishes Dvořák’s symphonic style is the successful combination of the classical tradition with the Romantic tendency towards virtuosity, heightened emotional expression and national elements as well as what Hurwitz describes as “colorful exploitation of the full resources of the modern orchestra.”\textsuperscript{71}
2.4 Intimate and International Relationships

Dvořák’s musical aspirations were always outward looking. While the Czech composer fiercely loved his homeland, and drew special inspiration from the Czech landscape, he consistently resisted nationalism in all its forms.72 Dvořák approached his role of creating Czech music for Czech people from a very different perspective to his predecessors, most notably Smetana. Dvořák’s desire to be legitimately received as a composer of great art music conflicted with cultural and racial stereotypes attached to being “the Czech composer.” In defiance of the possibility of being identified as an exotic curiosity or “the Czech Brahms,” Dvořák labelled most of his outwardly nationalistic pieces as Slavonic. He also used dance forms and rhythms from pan-slavic regions including Poland, Ukraine and Russia. In his dramatic works, he set the action in England, Alfred, Poland, Vanda, and Russia, Dimitrij. Hurwitz describes this tendency to look beyond his native frontiers as a compositional habit which enlarged the expressive reach of his music.73 This perhaps is in part why Dvořák’s music had such an international appeal and enduring presence in the concert repertoire.

Dvořák was remarkably well-travelled, journeying all over Europe to be a part of the increasingly frequent performances of his works. He was invited to England in 1884 and after appearing to great acclaim returned no less than nine times between 1884 and 1891. Dvořák often served as conductor in these concerts and festivals and worked hard to become proficient in English. Dvořák wrote his seventh symphony to be premiered in London in 1885 and in 1891 journeyed to the University of

---

72 David Hurwitz uses this interaction between Dvořák and American music to clarify the Czech composer’s beliefs, “although he never discussed the issue at length as an ideological proposition, it’s probably fair to say that he was a great patriot (that is, he loved his country and his heritage) but he despised nationalism (the assertion of one group’s inherent superiority over others), of which he had been a victim, and struggled against, all his life.” Ibid. 50–51.
73 Ibid. 6.
Cambridge to receive an honorary degree. In 1890 Dvořák travelled to Moscow and St. Petersburg to be part of concerts facilitated, in part, by his friend Pyotr Illyich Tchaikovsky.

When reading selections of Dvořák’s surviving correspondence, one is struck by the intense loyalty, love and affection Dvořák held for his dearest friends and relatives. Dvořák had close professional relationships with Hans Richter and Gustav Mahler who, in their rolls as successive conductors of the Vienna Philharmonic, frequently programmed his orchestral works. Other conductors who helped bring Dvořák to the European public included Hans von Bülow, Arthur Nikisch, Joseph Barnby and as well as Anton Seidl in New York. Musicians who had close personal and professional ties with Dvořák include Joseph Joachim, the noted Czech cellist Hanuš Wiihan, Czech violin virtuoso František Ondříček, violinist and son-in-law Joseph Suk as well as the Bohemian, Hellmesberger and Kneisel Quartets.

The Dvořák family’s country house at Vysoka was a treasured family residence. Set in rolling hills with an apple orchard and coops of the Pigeons he so lovingly raised, Dvořák was both restored and inspired by life at Vysoka. It is perhaps testament to the Dvořák’s adventurousness that they would leave such a fulfilling existence for their years spent in America. The journey involved a distance and newness which overwhelmed Tchaikovsky and a ravaging journey across the Atlantic which would have thoroughly discouraged Brahms.

---

74 Collections of Dvořák’s correspondence have been compiled in several forms including the comprehensive Critical Edition in ten volumes. Kuna, ed. *Antonín Dvořák Correspondence and Documents; a Critical Edition 1871-1884*. And Šourek, ed. *Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences*.


76 Roberta Finlayson Samsour expands on Dvořák’s professional relationships in her foreword to the translation of Antonín Dvořák’s correspondence, collected and edited by Otakar Šourek. Ibid. 7–9.

77 Tchaikovsky wrote of his twenty-five day visit to America, “Despite [my] success … I was racked with homesickness and with all my soul craved to come back home.” Brahms wrote to his dear friend Dvořák of being so “haunted by visions of seasickness” that he wouldn’t brave the crossing of the
What almost certainly contributed to Dvořák love of travel and being immersed in different cultures were his deeply held humanist beliefs. Tens of thousands of Czech émigrés had accepted the opportunity for a new life of freedom and opportunity offered in America. The centuries old struggle for Czech liberation from political and cultural domination strongly affected Dvořák’s deep respect for - and fascination with the ideals of the ‘New World’. Peress cites Dvořák’s mantel as the father of Czech music, inherited from Smetana, as the central inspiration of Jeanette Thurber who sought Dvořák as the new director of the National Conservatory of Music of America. As a founder of this Conservatory, Thurber prioritized the goal of establishing an American school of music and felt the proud Czech composer could help inspire and establish this new movement.78 Dvořák would go on to fulfil this role, influencing musicians and composers through his distinguished teaching legacy, firmly held ideas of equality and independence and overwhelming support of Native American and African American musicians.79

Not only would Dvořák’s time in America be “one of the most significant cultural exchanges in American history,” but it would also inspire the works of his “American” period which are among his most highly celebrated, examined and performed compositions to this day.80 His time in America enhanced and intensified aspects of Dvořák’s own style, most noticeably his use of pentatonicism and ostinatos. It was during this period that Dvořák wrote his Sonatina for Violin and Piano, Opus 100.

---


78 “In the Negro melodies of America I discover all that is needed for a great and noble school of music. They are Pathétic, tender, passionate, melancholy, solemn, religious, bold, merry, gay or what you will. It is music that suits itself to any mood or purpose. There is nothing in the whole range of composition that cannot be supplied with themes from this source. The American musician understands these tunes and they move sentiment in him” – Antonin Dvořák, *New York Herald*, May 21, 1893. Peress, *Dvořák to Duke Ellington*. 6.

80 Ibid. 7.
The works of Dvořák’s American period, from 1893–95, draw melodic inspiration from Negro spirituals and American popular song which manifests in his work in the same way as Czech song. Dvořák never copied melody directly, using inspiration to write his own original melodies in the same vein while always retaining his distinctive aesthetic and Slavic characteristics. Part of the sensational response to Dvořák’s *New World* Symphony in D Major was to the use of a Czech dance, a *furiant*, in place of the Scherzo third movement. Berkovec also describes the American connection with Dvořák’s works as being based on a deep appreciation of the melodic and rhythmic wealth of his aesthetic, his generosity of scale and his monumental vocal compositions.\(^{81}\)

2.5 Dvořák, the Composer

With consideration of just these central aspects of Dvořák’s personal and professional world, certain aesthetic influences have already been made apparent. Though this study aims to focus on the manifestations of the aesthetic of writing for violin and piano, it is also relevant to consider the sheer breath of Dvořák’s career and the historical epoch in which the composer’s relationship with the violin was developed and in which the works for violin and piano were created.

Dvořák was one of the most versatile composers of the nineteenth century, writing successfully in a wide range of genres. Šourek describes Dvořák “as one of the most fertile and original creative spirits which Czech music has ever had or is ever likely to have.”82 Indeed, Dvořák could arguably be labelled one of the strongest and most individual musical personalities from any nation. He assimilated a huge range of influences into his writing without ever being derivative. As Hurwitz observes, “you certainly won’t find many other composers whose reach extends as far back as Bach and Handel, and simultaneously as far forward as Art Tatum.”83

To what extent his Czech influences were dominant over other influences is hard to qualify. What is perhaps a more useful observation is that his ‘Czech’ musical style was not cultivated simply for his patriotic pieces of the late 1870s. Hurwitz compares thematic material from Dvořák’s second symphony to the main theme of Smetana’s overture to The Bartered Bride which was premiered in 1866. While this may be understood as an unexceptional influence from an elder in the Czech compositional style, it is a revelation to realise that, in fact, Dvořák wrote it first.84 From the very beginning, the second symphony, written in 1865, demonstrates that the very core of Dvořák’s aesthetic was inextricably linked to his Czech roots. And

83 Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius. 9.
84 Ibid. 24–25.
yet it reflects a musical identity distinctly unique to Antonín Dvořák and a process of synthesis that was present from the very beginning of his compositional life.

Dvořák had an interest in Czech folk music and, never copied directly from folk material, instead he sometimes wrote in the style and manner of folk music. Many of Dvořák’s melodies use strongly accented repeated notes and evoke the natural rhythms of speech. In Czech language, accents are primarily on the first syllable.

Dvořák’s own use of form is perhaps most accurately described as determined by the needs of individual pieces. In his first string quartet, finished in 1862, Dvořák employs cyclical form. Dvořák also shared themes and variation structures between movements to unify his first symphony. It is a sign of Dvořák’s mastery that he could be highly organised yet break strikingly with formal tradition when he felt it served the music, as is the case with the violin concerto.85

The universal appreciation of Dvořák’s music is often due to his unique and gifted compositional approach to melody. It could easily be argued that Dvořák’s skill of variation and development was as great as this melodic gift. Hurwitz laments that, because Dvořák’s work lacks theoretical pretentiousness and often sounds so recklessly pretty, it risks underestimation. An examination of the depths of his music will often uncover the artfulness of his invention.86 It can also illuminate the genesis of Dvořák’s melodies as they transform throughout the work to produce ‘new’ themes.

85 Dvořák’s own violinistic expertise meant he rarely had to suffer the indignity of revision by an outside party yet he accepted and incorporated many of Joseph Joachim’s demands regarding the violin concerto. It was the issue of conforming to a more balanced form and therefore including an extra cadenza which finally compelled Dvořák to refuse any more changes and disagree with its dedicatee, Joachim, who never performed the work.
86 Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius. 9.
Frequently observable in Dvořák’s output are several melodic devices or archetypes which help form and develop musical themes. He created many simple themes by outlining the basic underlying harmony using scales and arpeggios. (Fig 1.) These most simple melodies often use intentionally primitive shapes and nursery-like tunes to great effect. Dvořák was artful at writing child-like music which is never childish, as is observable in his Sonatina for Violin and Piano. (Fig 1.) Dvořák often combined this with unusual phrase structures and interesting harmonic twists which are testament to the great artfulness with which he employed simplicity.

Hurwitz identifies another melodic shape which he names a “mirror theme.” Referring to the opening Mozart’s Eine kleine Nachtmusik as a prime example, Hurwitz describes two short figures, the second of which is an exact (or almost exact) mirror image of the first. The opening of the fourth movement of Dvořák’s first

---

Fig 1. Bars 1-14 from Sonatina for Violin and Piano, Movement 1 by Dvořák.
Note: Antecedent phrase built with arpeggios. Rhythmic roles reversed in repetition of first phrase.

---

symphony features a mirror theme. (Fig 2.) Interestingly, Zezely-Gualdi discusses the concept of ‘mirror rhythmic patterns’ in the Violin Sonata of Janáček. I expand upon this identification in more detail in my analysis section.

Fig 2. Bars 1-11 from Symphony No.1, Movement 4 by Dvořák. Note: Only woodwind parts shown. Inexact mirror theme descends in bars 1 and 2 and ascends in bars 3 and 4.

Numerous melodic archetypes would remain a fixture of Dvořák’s music throughout his life and would continually pay homage to the sounds which fascinated him. Hurwitz argues these melodic archetypes indisputably proclaim Dvořák’s

---

90 Antonín Dvořák, "Symphony No.1 'the Bells of Zlonice'," (Státní hudební vydavatelství (SHV), 1865). 185.
91 Jared Burrows discusses the concept of a ‘Musical Archetype’ in relation to improvised music in a manner pertinent to examination of Archetypes in composition: “There is clearly a deep level of connection which allows improvisors to come to collective decisions about the direction and general harmonic, rhythmic, textural and timbral features of an improvisation. As I mentioned before, the very notion that cognition can be distributed implies a connection that goes much deeper than a simple stimulus-reaction explanation. I suggest that the process of hearing and making improvised music constructs its own time-dependent meanings – let’s call them short-term archetypes – specific to improvisation…. ”
Fundamental to his aesthetic was Dvořák’s love of bird song. As an extremely early riser, Dvořák habitually walked in the mornings, taking in the sounds before the human world was awake. He also raised pigeons and his correspondence with friends shows just how tenderly he cared for them.

Another of Dvořák’s more personal obsessions was locomotives which he liked to look at every day if possible. During his time in New York he found it difficult to convince the Station Masters to let him get close to the trains and so would journey on most days to a place where he could watch them go by. Hurwitz identifies a figure he labels ‘train tunes’ as being specifically Dvořák’s creation. This is not necessarily the same thing as trying to depict a train within music but features a particular interaction between voices. Hurwitz describes ‘several industrial-strength melodies accompanied by regular, chugging rhythms that convey the impression of rapid, powerful physical movement.’

One of Dvořák’s most artful techniques was the way he managed to accommodate bustling independent instrumental lines without subjecting them to strict contrapuntal forms. This is not simply a feature of his accompaniment figures but also observable in the way his melodies interact, imitate and combine.

“Terms such as ‘language’ or ‘vocabulary’ have more specific and durable meanings and relate to a system of signs and symbols which is far too specific for music … For Jung, archetypes are recurrent thematic elements of the unconscious which help explain the general currents and directions of unconscious thought. Jungian archetypes help us construct meanings in a flexible and general way. Similarly, the musical archetype is any kind of generative or recurrent thematic element which helps to explain the structure or emergent qualities of a piece of improvised music.” Burrows, J. "Musical Archetypes and Collective Consciousness: Cognitive Distribution and Free Improvisation." In Critical Studies in Improvisation / Études critiques en improvisation, 2004. Available at: <http://www.criticalimprov.com/article/view/11/35>. Date accessed: 10 Oct. 2012.

92 Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius. 17.

93 From B. Fidler’s Recollections of Ant. Dvořák: “Master Dvořák was also a great lover of singing birds. At home and in the garden arbour at Vysoká he used to have a great many cages with songsters, mostly thrushes, and always when they sang he would say to me: “Do you hear them? How they sing! They are the real masters!” As printed in Šourek, ed. Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences. 82–83.

Perhaps the antithesis of this are march-like tunes which feature rigorous rhythmic unison. Hurwitz notes a characteristic opening to these themes which he dubs ‘ready-set-go’; three long notes, usually the same pitch repeated, which launch the music into thematic material.\textsuperscript{95}

Hurwitz uses evidence of these melodic archetypes, the vocabulary of Dvořák’s unique compositional style, to explain the great listener appeal and vitality of his music, specifically his symphonies.\textsuperscript{96} Later in this thesis the extent of these techniques and Dvořák’s compositional vocabulary will be explored in the works for violin and piano.

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid. 20.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid. 49.
Chapter Three: Leoš Janáček

3.1 Family and Křížkovský

Leoš Janáček was born in Hukvaldy, in the Moravian-Silesian region, in 1854. He was born into the Czech cantor tradition with his father and grandfather, both named Jiří Janáček, leading cultural figures in the community. Their work as teachers and musicians is considered especially significant as the younger Jiří, the father of Leoš, was teacher to Pavel Křížkovský who went on to be one of the most influential Moravian musicians and pedagogues of all time. Křížkovský would, in turn, be one of Leoš Janáček’s most influential teachers and supporters.

Leoš, the fourth of eight children, was a gifted child and showed an early musical talent in choral singing. At the age of eleven Janáček was sent to be a chorister at the Augustinian ‘Queen’s’ Monastery in Old Brno. In Brno the choirmaster of the monastery, Pavel Křížkovský, took a keen interest in his musical education. As a ward of the Abbey of St. Thomas, Janáček was joining an institution with paid musical scholars which had been established since 1650. The school developed under Křížkovský to be the finest institution of its kind in Moravia, operating much like a conservatory. The boys, aged between nine and twelve years, received strict and systematic training in piano, singing, quartet and ensemble work, figured bass, harmony and counterpoint.

---

97 Leoš’s Grandfather, Jiří, lived from 1778–1848 and was a leading figure in the small town of Albrechtice in northern Moravia. Beckerman refers to a biography of Jiří, written by one of his sons, Vincenc, as revealing a man of extraordinary talent as an organizer and musician and having a personality very similar to his grandson, Leoš Janáček. Leoš’s father, Jiří, lived from 1815-1866 was also a fine musician and teacher and gave Leoš his first musical education. Leoš’s mother, Amalie, (née Grulichová) Janáčková, lived from 1819-1884. Michael Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist (Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1994). 1.
98 Brno was the Moravian capital until the thirty-years war of the seventeenth century when Olomouc became the dual capital.
99 Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 3.
Křížkovský had taken monastic vows and served as a teacher of liturgical music at the monastery from 1848 to 1872. Michael Beckerman describes Křížkovský’s “dynamic effect on Brno’s cultural life” as including the organisation of concerts introducing works by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Cherubini as well as contemporary German music and Czech compositions in the Czech language.¹⁰⁰ Křížkovský is perhaps most importantly remembered as an ardent nationalist who spent his career devoted to restructuring and organizing Moravian church music. His most outstanding compositional works are referred to as ‘folk echoes’; paraphrases of folk songs set for chorus in a simple style. He employed traditional formal techniques including rondo-form and variation form but had a gift for contrapuntal writing and a peculiarly individual harmonic style which complimented the modality of folk song without destroying it.¹⁰¹

The influence of Křížkovský on the developing musical mind of Janáček was exceptional. Křížkovský’s famous strictness was balanced by his intrinsic belief that freedom of imagination was a necessary analytical tool. As Janáček described, “he was able to feel the spirit of the pieces he selected, and from this he let his compositions grow … he thereby did justice to the songs, and served Czech music as well.”¹⁰²

After completing his basic schooling, including three years at the German Realschule in Old Brno, Janáček progressed to the Czech Teachers’ Institute where he excelled, supported by a state scholarship.¹⁰³ Graduating in 1872, Janáček was obliged to serve for the next two years as an unpaid teacher’s assistant at a school run by the institute. During this time Janáček became assistant conductor to Křížkovský at

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 2.
¹⁰¹ Ibid. 2.
¹⁰² Leoš Janáček, “P. Křížkovský’s Significance etc.,” op. cit., p. 263. As printed in Ibid. 4.
¹⁰³ Known in Czech as Slovanský Ústav ku Vzdělání Učitelů.
the monastery and acted as choirmaster when Křížkovský was transferred to Olomouc Cathedral. Janáček proved a capable and dedicated choirmaster bringing a wide variety of music to performance at church services. Repertoire included works by Palestrina, Haydn and contemporary Czech and German music. Janáček’s formidable and exciting musical talent was demonstrated regularly from the organ loft where, “after the mass, singers clustered … listening with excitement to the wonders which Janáček’s fingers produced.”

Janáček’s success in this role led to his appointment in 1873 as the choirmaster of a working-men’s choral society named the Svatopluk Artisan’s Association, which he lead until 1876. John Tyrrell describes the positive effects of Janáček’s stewardship of Svatopluk; “[raising] the level of the society from its Liedertafel traditions, moving the concerts out of the taverns into the new Besední Dům, and [widening] the repertory.” It was also for Svatopluk that Janáček wrote his first choruses which were simple four-part settings of folk music very much like those by his teacher, Křížkovský.

Jiří Fukač has explored the identification of Janáček as a “composing folklorist, a lowly worker in the field of folk heritage, a primitive, a natural-born or barbarian talent” and scoured the evidence from his childhood to see whether this view is in fact legitimate. He concludes that it cannot be justified by Janáček’s uncurbed temperament, folkloristic activity nor his village origin and asks the question: “What parallel can be found between his individual or creative type and his ancestral, social and regional origin?” Fukač reasons that the architectonic

---

104 Janáček ve vzpomínkách a dopisech (Janáček in Letters and Reminiscences), ed. Bohumír Štědroň, Prague: 1946. 63. As printed in Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 4
manifestations of Archbishopric power and the cultural activities related to school teaching had been connected with the Janáček dynasty since the late eighteenth century. His ancestors were educated and struggled under conditions of proletarianization for their social establishment and advancement. Fukač argues that this struggle stamped a “special dynamic” on nearly all members of Janáček’s family and resulted in Janáček’s lifetime of manoeuvring between different power structures, patterns of social life and free opportunities. Perhaps Fukač’s identification of “struggle” at the very core of Janáček’s identity can be further generalised to describe a significant aspect of the Czech identity as a whole, identified in my introduction.

3.2 Prague and Skuherský

After passing his examinations at the Teachers’ Institute in 1874, Janáček became a paid teacher’s assistant. With a recommendation from Křížkovský, Janáček was granted leave to enrol at the Prague Organ School in October 1874. Already a well-trained and remarkably talented musician, it is characteristic of Janáček’s temperament that he sought further training. His days as a student in Prague were particularly impoverished. Despite being unable to afford a piano, Janáček completed what usually fills the first two years of study in just one year. On 24 July 1875 Janáček graduated with the most outstanding results of any student in the first, second or third year classes.108

František Blažek, a noted author and theorist, taught the first year curriculum including music theory, harmony, figured bass, liturgical singing and organ studies, in

107 Fukač gives examples of this ‘partly ingenious, partly awkward maneuvering’ as being between ecclesiastical and secular institutions, Brno and Prague, motherland and foreign countries, ideal conformism and non conformism, school discipline and verbal looseness in teaching, paternalism in his own family or surroundings and “dandyism” in public. Ibid. 378.

108 On 22 and 23 July 1875 Janáček sat examinations in harmony, chorale, single and double counterpoint, imitation and fugue, organ playing, figured bass realization, prelude, and modulation without preparation. Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 8.
which Janáček was already well versed. František Skuherský taught the core of the curriculum, usually delivered in the second and third years of study, and was the director of the Prague Organ School as well as a lecturer at the Prague Conservatory and the Czech University. Skuherský is noted as an excellent musician, composer and a brilliant teacher who was the author of the first major modern treatise on music in the Czech language.  

His harmonic conception was based on an understanding of the counterpoint of Bach and the classicists but extended into the newest harmonic theories of the time. Skuherský’s interest in new harmonic systems and contemporary theoretical issues lead him to be critical of theorists including Hanslick, Helmholtz and Riemann and proved what Beckerman describes as his “complete command of contemporary theoretical issues.”

His delivery of what was conventionally the second year content, including modulation, counterpoint and polyphony, had a significant effect on Janáček. Skuherský taught by using many Wagnerian examples for harmonic instruction.

Perhaps the most important theoretical influence Skuherský had on Janáček was his descriptive attitude towards music formations, identified by their level of dissonance, and his rejection of the diatonic system as ill equipped for new musical and harmonic developments. Beckerman summarises from Skuherský’s writings, his central maxim that “every interval and every chord is found on every degree of every scale” and that “it is possible to move immediately from one key to any other key.”

109 Found in the first part of Theory of Musical Composition: On Cadences and Modulation and in Theory of Harmony on a Scientific Basis. František Skuherský, Nauka o hudební komposici: I. O. závěru a modulaci, Prague: 1880; and Nauka o harmonii na vědeckém základě ve forme nejjednodušší se zvláštním zřetelem na mohutny rozvoj harmonie v nejnovější době (Theory of Harmony on a Scientific Basis In the Simplest Form With Special Regard to the Impressive Development of Harmony In the Newest Age). Prague: F.A. Urbánek, 1885.

110 Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 5.

111 Skuhersky, 80. As translated and printed in Ibid., 5.
Like Křížkovský, Skuherský was a strict and thorough teacher with a strong belief in the need for artistic freedom and integrity. His concept of dissonance as a product of the interrelationship of two equally participating tones reflects some principles of Herbartian philosophical theories which had a significant presence in Prague and would, in turn, influence Janáček. Skuherský’s theories were both remarkably individual and prophetic in their anticipation of the development of twelve-tone composition. His quasi-scientific approach also compared music with language using the principles of direction and declivity in his writings. Again, this influence is evident in Janáček’s own concept of music and languages.\textsuperscript{112}

Beckerman draws special attention to Janáček’s study of modulation, commenting on the great impact it had on his future development as a theorist. Janáček endeavoured to incorporate Skuherský’s theory that the manner of modulation should be driven by the aesthetic nature and goal of a work and not by an abstract set of rules.\textsuperscript{113}

At the conclusion of these studies at the Prague Organ School, Janáček was fully certified as a musician, professional organist and composer. Vladimír Helfert made a study of all of Janáček’s materials from his time as a student in Prague. His notebooks testify to a dedicated, systematic and serious approach to study. Helfert concludes:

The result and the intensity of his study, as shown by his notebooks and assignments, reveal that the opinion, often held, that Janáček was an autodidact, is quite false and

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid. 7.

\textsuperscript{113} Skuherský considered chord connections as being based on primary relationships, with one or more common tones, or secondary relationships, when two chords both relate to another consonant chord. The subsequent deduction that a dominant chord can be connected to any tonic chord, and then any dominant is able to follow, being connected to all dominant and diminished seventh chords, had a lasting influence on Janáček’s concept of chord connections.

Beckerman quotes Skuherský: “Modulation … not progressing above the relation of the first degree may have validity for compositions of a calm nature. Otherwise, in compositions of a stormy, passionate mood … such mild ingredients will not suffice; it is necessary to reach out to distant progressions, sudden, abrupt, sometimes even harsh. – Skuherský, op. cit., p. 94.” As printed in Ibid. 8.
in direct conflict with historical truth. On the contrary, Janáček exhibited a degree of string compositional technique in a manner almost unique for his time. It was Janáček’s great good fortune to encounter two such teachers as Křížkovský and Skuherský who delivered the core of musical training to this dedicated and industrious student and found a balance between “strictness and discipline, on the one hand, and artistic freedom and musicality on the other.”

3.3 Brno and Herbartianism

Upon his return to Brno in 1875, Janáček resumed his role as conductor of the monastery choir and Svatopluk while also gaining considerable practical experience as conductor and choirmaster of the Brno Beseda Brněnská Philharmonic Society. In the first few months of his stewardship of the Beseda, Janáček transformed it from a middle-class all male chorus into a mixed choir. With reinforcements from the monastery choir and students at the Teachers’ Institute, Janáček could muster 250 voices to perform such works as Mozart’s Requiem and Beethoven’s Missa Solemnis.

In 1876 Janáček became a piano student of Amálie Wickenhauserová-Nerudová, with whom he co-organized and performed in chamber concerts. Janáček

114 Vladimir Helfert, Leoš Janáček I - in the Shackles of Tradition (Brno1939). 89.
115 As indicated by John Tyrrell’s article for Grove. Tyrrell, “Janáček, Leoš.”
It is usually acknowledged that this was a period of private study with Skuherský though Beckerman advises this is never explicitly mentioned in Janáček’s two remaining notebooks from this time. Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 11.
116 Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 14.
117 An interruption from 1879 to 1881 aside, Janáček remained the choirmaster and conductor of the Beseda until 1888.
118 John Tyrrell describes Mozart’s Requiem as performed in 1878 and Beethoven’s Missa Solemnis in 1879. Tyrrell, “Janáček, Leoš.”
continued his apprenticeship at the Teachers’ Institute until he was at last fully qualified as a teacher in 1879. From 1876 Janáček’s pupils included the daughter of the institute’s director and his own future wife, Zdenka Schulzová.

It was during his formative years at the Teachers’ Institute that Janáček came into contact with important intellectual movements based on the philosophical system of Johann Herbart. Beckerman identifies Janáček’s involvement in Herbartian abstract formalism as “so passionate and so total” that it becomes impossible to understand his development without understanding the core Herbartian ideas.119

Johann Herbart was born in 1776 and at the age of thirty-three held the chair of philosophy, once held by Immanuel Kant, at Königsberg. Herbart was an anti-idealist and post-Humean empiricist whose philosophical writings enjoyed wide popularity throughout the nineteenth century and served as a method with which one could clarify concepts in many fields.120 Herbart believed in the unity of all things and destroying “contradiction” with a method of Ergänzung (enlargement) by which all things are articulated in their smallest possible components; entities which are fixed and unchanging.

Most importantly for Janáček, Herbartianism became the official philosophy of the Prague University from 1832 to 1902 and was the dominant philosophy in Czech lands. The importance and esteem of Herbartian theory diminished quickly after this time. In Prague activity was centred around a group of aestheticians who endeavoured to clarify and extend Herbart’s incomplete aesthetic theories. The core of Herbart’s aesthetic observations was that general aesthetic judgements, or “value

119 Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 15.
120 Herbart’s works and made significant contributions to the “science of education.” The pedagogical movement of “Herbartianism” spread through the United States in the early twentieth century. Herbart is also remembered as making possible great advancements in the field of psychology. The doctrines of the unconscious, apperception, and introspection in Herbartian psychology played a central role in the development of experimental psychology.
judgments” are fallible and therefore, the best aesthetic is one which “clearly connects complex wholes to the underlying simple relations and the infallible judgments evoked by them.”¹²¹ Robert Zimmerman was the central figure at the Prague University who extended Herbart’s theories into a theory of abstract formalism.¹²² Zimmerman’s younger colleague, Josef Durdík, used his training in mathematics and natural sciences as a basis for philosophical proofs in rational presentation of Herbartian aesthetic formalism.¹²³

Otakar Hostinsky’s interpretation of Herbart was in contrast to those of Zimmerman and Durdík, a contrast between abstract and concrete aesthetic formalism. Durdík represented the “classical” ideas aligned with Dvořák and Hostinský championed Smetana, Wagner and new music. During his time in Prague, and while undertaking two years of musical training simultaneously, Janáček also dedicated himself to a self-taught course of aesthetics. He became a well versed and enthusiastic follower of the theories of both Durdík and Zimmerman. Beckerman describes Durdík’s notion of “part to part, part to whole” as “an ever present thread woven through the fabric of Janáček’s life and works.”¹²⁴

3.4 Friendship with Antonín Dvořák

Janáček’s time in Prague in 1874 had also brought him into close contact with Antonín Dvořák who would become a mentor and lifelong friend. Dvořák’s quiet, deliberate and reflective temperament was complementary to Janáček’s fiery,

¹¹⁹ “Aesthetic philosophy … would properly be bound not to define, nor to demonstrate, nor to deduce, nor even to distinguish species of art, or to argue about existing works, but rather to put us in possession of all the simple relations, however many there might be.” Johann Herbart, Praktische Aesthetik, 1808, in Allgemeine Praktische Philosophie, Werke II, p. 344. As translated and quoted in Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 17.
¹²² Beckerman describes Zimmerman as a “gifted teacher and a man of magnetic personality and great influence” whose thinking is indistinguishable from Herbart’s in almost every way. Ibid. 18.
¹²³ Durdík published Všeobecná estetika (General Aesthetics) in 1874.
¹²⁴ Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. 21.
impetuous and impulsive nature.\textsuperscript{125} As Alan Houtchens points out, the two composers shared many common experiences, interests, values and aspirations so that “it is easy to see why they became steadfast friends.”\textsuperscript{126} Janáček began composing in a relatively traditional romantic style, reflecting the strong influence of Dvořák during this time, and in the summer of 1877, the two composers embarked together on a walking tour of Bohemia.

Janáček also championed Dvořák, introducing to Brno audiences his \textit{Moravian Duets} and \textit{Serenade for Strings}, which is often discussed as a model for Janáček’s own string orchestra compositions.\textsuperscript{127} Derek Katz identifies Dvořák’s influence upon Janáček as far more powerful than Smetana’s, referring to Janáček’s Suite from 1877 and the \textit{Idyll} from 1878 as the most obvious products of this influence. David Beveridge uses his study \textit{Romantic and Twentieth-Century Styles in the 1870s: Music for String Orchestra by Dvořák and Janáček} to explore not just the stylistic similarities and differences between the two composers’ works. This thesis will expand on the implications and methods of Beveridge’s study in greater detail in the analysis of the works for violin and piano and will adopt aspects of Beveridge’s approach to comparing Dvořák and Janáček.

Katz describes the idea of Dvořák’s influence in later works as only “tempting” and identifies the tone of Janáček’s posthumous tributes as ranging from

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid. 256.
\textsuperscript{127} Namely the Suite jw VI/2 of 1877 and the \textit{Idylla} jw VI/3 of 1878. Dvořák was made an honorary member of the Brno Beseda and journeyed to Brno in 1880 to conduct his \textit{Slavonic Rhapsody} and third Symphony. Janáček published analyses of Dvořák’s four tone poems after Karel Jaromír Erben in \textit{Hlídka} in 1897 and 1898 and conducted the premiere of \textit{Holoubek (The Wood Dove)}. 
“respectful to reverential.” Janáček’s most famous reflection was printed in *Hudební revue* 4 in 1911 and reveals the close nature of their friendship:

> Do you know what it is like when someone takes the words out of your mouth as you are about to speak them? For me it was always like that in Dvořák’s company. I can interchange his personality with his work: he also took his melodies from my heart. Nothing in the world can destroy such ties.  

### 3.5 Leipzig and Vienna

Despite Janáček’s newfound professional status and opportunity for employment in Brno, he still sought more opportunity for further study. He considered several options of international study, including the possibility of learning with Anton Rubenstein in Russia, but resolved to study at the Leipzig Conservatory. Although tempted by the Vienna Conservatory which was significantly closer to home, Janáček was attracted to Leipzig by the formidable international reputation it held at the time. The faculty in Leipzig had previously included Mendelssohn and Schumann. Boasting an impressive reference from Skuherský, Janáček was granted leave by the Brno Teachers’ Institute and a government stipend, arriving in Leipzig at the end of September 1879.

Janáček journeyed to Leipzig with, what Beckerman describes as, “the twin goals of improving his compositional technique and hearing as much music as he could.” Beckerman also warns that examination of this period of Janáček’s education considers that, until 1881, he was officially studying to be a teacher rather

---

130 Part of Skuherský’s reference reads thus: “According to my firm conviction, Janáček is a man of the highest artistic character; he combines with the greatest harmony all the qualities necessary to achieve efficient, important, and beautiful results, namely: talent, intelligence, diligence, and reason. Janáček is already fully recognized as an advanced creative and performing artist and a man of wide knowledge in music literature. His subtle ear, combined with his rich knowledge of music theory and aesthetics is evident in both his conducting and his criticism.” From a letter by František Skuherský to the directorate of the Teacher’s Institute. Reprinted in Beckerman, *Janáček as Theorist*. 11.
131 Ibid. 11.
than a concert artist or a composer. By this time Janáček was engaged to Zdenka and his innumerable letters to her give snapshots into Janáček’s state of mind and compositional development in Leipzig. In later discussion of the Romance for violin and piano of 1880, these letters will help inform the performer about the genesis of the piece.

Janáček initially preferred to study under Oscar Paul with whom he studied piano and harmony and whose university history lectures Janáček attended. Finding Paul not critical enough as a teacher, Janáček changed to the supervision of Leo Grill who was strict and demanding. Janáček intentionally included a mistake in a fugue submitted to Paul and was appalled when he did not correct it. Despite Janáček’s “antagonism” of Paul, his teacher had a strong regard for the Moravian’s ability and incredible diligence and dedication.

Under Grill’s systematic methods Janáček produced a host of compositions, few of which survive. Janáček’s correspondence details the composition of two and three part fugues (jw X/6), seven romances for violin and piano (jw X/8), a set of piano variations (jw VIII/6) and a series of rondos jw X/14. Beckerman describes the historical bias of the Leipzig Conservatory in favour of classicism and early romanticism and with a critical stance towards Liszt and Wagner. Tyrrell’s description of the one surviving set of Janáček’s piano variations from this time as “Schumannesque” helps confirm Janáček’s complicit neo-classical approach at this time and demonstrates, as Tyrrell describes, “a smoother and more imaginative

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Ibid. 15.}
\footnote{Zdeněk Hrabal, ed. \textit{Dopisy Zdence [Letters to Zdenka]}, Complete Correspondence from Leoš Janáček to Zdenka Schulzová between 1879 and 1880 (Prague: Supraphon, 1968). “Mr. Leoš Janáček participated in my harmony course and studied piano with me; he was a model of diligence. His deep talent in composition, his quick grasp of theoretical basics, his hard work in contrapuntal exercises and the study of fugue have yielded excellent results.” Oscar Paul as quoted in Beckerman, \textit{Janáček as Theorist}. 12–13.}
\footnote{Ibid. 12.}
\end{footnotes}
technique."

As with his time as a student in Prague, Janáček’s time in Leipzig was impoverished and the conditions of his seemingly endless work were fairly dismal. Unable to take full advantage of his surroundings and ultimately dissatisfied with his teachers, Janáček left Leipzig for the Vienna Conservatory on 25 January 1880. Janáček had expressed a desire to study in Paris with Camille Saint-Saëns but Schulz, his superior at the Teachers’ Institute and future father-in-law, insisted that he spend the second half of his year’s leave closer to home.

In Vienna, Janáček studied composition with Franz Krenn whose neo-romanticism was in conflict with Janáček’s own approach at the time. After receiving criticism for his piano style by his instrumental teacher, Joseph Dachs, Janáček abandoned advanced piano study in favour of his development as a composer. Janáček was already an accomplished and accredited professional musician and his opinions of the standards and methods of the school in Vienna were low. None of his compositions from this time survive and his unsuccessful submission of a violin sonata to a composition competition gave him a sufficient excuse to leave Vienna in June 1880. He departed with a very complimentary report from Krenn and arrived home to Brno where, after studying at four separate conservatories, he would at last quit his student role and marry Zdenka Schulzová, who was barely sixteen at the time.

In Brno, Janáček returned to many of his earlier musical activities and worked to establish his long-held ambition of founding an organ school in Brno. Janáček virtually ceased composing during this period. He was engaged with his teaching and

136 Tyrrell, "Janáček, Leoš."
137 Beckerman describes an unbroken line of development from the monastery school under Křžkovský to the Brno Organ School, established in 1883, and to the Brno Conservatory, established in 1919. Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist.
choral society duties and in 1884 he founded the musical journal, *Hudební listy* (Musical Letters), published by the Beseda to review musical activities. At the Beseda Janáček again extended the repertoire, including some of Dvořák’s major choral works as well as works by Brahms, Smetana, Tchaikovsky, Saint-Saëns and Liszt.\textsuperscript{138} Tyrrell describes Janáček’s limited compositional activity at this time as partly being a symptom of the disappointing end to his studies in Vienna and “partly because he was unsure where his talents lay.” Janáček wrote a few choruses including the *Mužské sbory* (Male-Voice Choruses) jw IV/17. He dedicated this to Dvořák who was “startled by the boldness of the modulations.”\textsuperscript{139}

3.6 Individualist, Russophile and Ethnomusicologist

Janáček’s personality had always presented as individualistic and was often remembered by his teachers, classmates and students as strict and uncompromising. His strongly held beliefs often led to conflict which lead him to leave the Beseda in 1881. A rapid decline in the Beseda’s performance quality meant he was invited back in 1882.

Almost from the very beginnings of their marriage, Zdenka and Leoš Janáček had a strained and tumultuous union. Zdenka came from a conservative German middle-class family and Janáček’s many letters to her during his time in Leipzig were written in German. Like most Czechs, Janáček’s education was delivered principally in German and he was more than ably versed in the language. A defining element of his beliefs from a young age was the struggle for emancipation and independence of the Czech people from Habsburg rule. As his patriotic Czech convictions became

\textsuperscript{138} Tyrrell, ”Janáček, Leoš.”
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid.
more extreme, Janáček began to insist that Zdenka only communicate with him in Czech and tried to limit her contact with her own family, refusing to speak to them in German. Shortly after the birth of their first child, Olga, in 1882, Leoš and Zdenka separated until the summer of 1884. Their second child, Vladimír, was born in 1888 but died before the age of two of meningitis.

Janáček’s anti-German stance became more pronounced through his editorial output and support for Czech language institutions including the Czech Readers’ Circle, the Brno Beseda and the Brno Organ School. Janáček used his writing for the *Hudební listy* journal to express his negative opinions on German neo-classicism and Wagner.

A central pillar of Janáček’s anti-German beliefs was his Russophilism. As it did for Dvořák and many Czechs, Russia represented for Janáček a developed and independent Slavic nation with an advanced and long established artistic identity. His active Russophilism was indicated in an extensive newspaper article detailing a visit to his brother, František, in Russia in 1896.\(^{140}\) In the following year Janáček founded the Russian Club (or Russian Circle) in Brno which promoted Russian language, literature and music. It was officially banned by the Austrian police in 1915.\(^{141}\)

Derek Katz uses his study of *Janáček, Russophilism and Pan-Slavism* to observe that Janáček’s fascination with Russian culture had bloomed over the twenty years prior to this visit to František. From 1868 until 1880 Janáček used the more Slavic-sounding “Lev” as his professional name. He studied Russian language during

---

\(^{140}\) *Jw XV/150*

\(^{141}\) Russian literature inspired two early, incomplete operas and several chamber works: Pohádka (‘Fairy Tale’) jw VII/5 for cello and piano, with a programme based on Vasily Zhukovsky, and the Piano Trio and First String Quartet, both based on Tolstoy’s tale of marital infidelity, The Kreutzer Sonata. The Russian advances at the beginning of World War I encouraged Janáček to hope that the Russians might liberate his country from the Austrians, and inspired two compositions, the Violin Sonata jw VII/7 and *Taras Bulba* jw VI/15, based on Gogol’s grisly and chauvinist tale of Cossack military life (see *jw XV/247*). Tyrrell, "Janáček, Leoš."
his time at the Brno Teachers’ Institute and used Cyrillic script for personal notes in his exercise books. His two children also received the names Olga and Vladimir which, as Katz concedes, were not unusual names in Czech lands at this time but are also the monikers of two protagonists from Pushkin’s *Eugene Onegin*.

When Janáček accepted a position teaching at the Czech Gynasium in Old Brno in 1886, it provided a close collegial relationship with philologist, folklorist and fellow teacher, František Bartoš. Together, Janáček and Bartoš published two important editions of Moravian folksongs including Lachian, Moravian Slovakian, Moravian Wallachian and Slovakian songs. The first, published in 1890, was a collection of 174 songs (jw XIII/1) and the second, a definitive collection of 2057 songs and dances called *Národní písně moravské v nově nashirané* (Moravian folksongs newly collected), was published between 1899 and 1901. In 1895 Janáček was responsible for the Moravian contribution to the Prague Ethnographic Exhibition for which he collaborated with Lucie Bakešová.

In the mid-1880s Janáček had begun to compose more systematically, producing his first opera, *Šárka*, between 1887–1888. Janáček’s preoccupation with Moravian folk song, especially during this time, reveals itself in *Šárka* which was not premiered until 1925. The relative failure of his first opera was, in part, a stimulus to throw himself into this new ethnomusicological occupation.

From 1888 until 1899 almost all of Janáček’s creative endeavours centred on Moravian folk music. This typically presented in stronger linguistic musical characteristics and melodically and rhythmically rich irregularities. Janáček was connecting with Czech traditional musicality in a very different way from the

---
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Bohemian and West-Moravian traditions accessed by Dvořák and Smetana. Tyrrell comments that this shows Janáček drawing on sources more closely connected with his Hungarian contemporary, Béla Bartók.¹⁴⁵

Janáček edited and arranged the Moravian folk music he collected and it formed the basis of his own music, using folk songs and dances in orchestral and piano arrangements.¹⁴⁶ Janáček’s interest in his regional music was well established before his collaboration with Bartoš. Many of his early choruses are based on Moravian folk song texts with two of the most celebrated utilizing Moravian dialect.¹⁴⁷ Janáček’s second, third and fourth operas, as well as his ballet, all have Moravian settings. Most of his output from this time was published between 1899 and 1901.

The period of Janáček’s intense engagement with Moravian folk music was a timely liberation from the stylistic constraints of mainstream musical developments. It helped enrich Janáček’s personal compositional style and emphasise the connection he felt to his Slovakian and Slavic neighbours. Milan Adamčiak describes Janáček as perceiving “no frontiers between Moravia and Slovakia; they were amalgamated in his mentality, his humanism, and his national and social feelings.” Janáček visited Slovakia several times and made harmonisations and adaptations of Slovak folk songs as well as recording speech melodies and elements of the natural environment.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.
¹⁴⁶ Orchestral dances and dance suites include the Valašské tance (Valachian Dances) jw VI/4 and the Suite for orchestra jw VI/6. John Tyrrell notes, “That Janáček thought he had found his true direction is signalled by the opus numbers, op. 2 and op. 3, which he added to these two works, the only ones to be so honoured (the putative “op. 1” is thought to be the early piano variations jw VIII/6).” Two stage works were based on folk dances with Janáček simply adding voice parts. Rákoš Rákoczy jw I/2 was hurriedly put together for the 1891 Jubilee Exhibition in Prague. The one-act opera Počátek románu (The Beginning of a Romance) jw I/3 used a libretto adapted from Gabriela Preissová. Janáček withdrew the unassuming work, which was well received, after only four performances when he decided it had greater potential as an opera. Ibid.
¹⁴⁷ Choruses from jw IV/28.
including waterfalls and bird sounds from the high Tatras.\textsuperscript{148}

John Tyrrell warns against the definition of Janáček purely as a “Moravian composer,” stressing that he was proudly Czech, identifying Prague as the Czech capital which he was glad to visit frequently.\textsuperscript{149} It’s also pertinent to observe that as Janáček grew into his mature style he would transcend his “Moravian” period and develop a unique compositional language and style. Jaroslav Jiránek suggests that Janáček’s attraction to folk song was in part because he regarded conventional European musical romanticism as simultaneously attractive and unacceptable. Janáček’s insistence on avoiding anything “second hand” helped him to identify the unique source he had found in folk music serving as an aid with which to understand the life of the people. Jiránek identifies his interest in the incentives and inspirations of songs as well as their environment, conditions and their “outside linguistic” situations as being the starting point for Janáček’s development of “speech tunes.”\textsuperscript{150}

Beckerman’s defence of Janáček’s extensive musical training contradicts Tyrrell’s description of “piecemeal training” and makes distinctions between the confusion of Janáček’s compositional and pedagogical theory.\textsuperscript{151} Janáček’s extensive output as music theorist\textsuperscript{152} is complex and, in the words of Beckerman, “often combined with disorganization, inconsistency, and at times, incoherence.”\textsuperscript{153}


\textsuperscript{149} Tyrrell adds, “Two of his nine operas (Brouček and Makropulos) and several choruses, e.g., those to words by F.S. Procházka (jw IV/40-41, 44), were set in Prague.” Tyrrell, "Janáček, Leoš.."


\textsuperscript{151} Beckerman, Janáček as Theorist. Preface xii.

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid. Introduction xi.

\textsuperscript{153} Janáček’s output as music theorist stretches from 1877 to 1927 and includes contributions to the journals Cecilie, Hlída and Dalibor as well as his role as writer and editor for the Huděbní listy. Janáček also completed several extensive studies including Úplná nauka o harmonii (The Complete Harmony Theory), O skladbě souzvuků a jejich spojích (On the Construction of Chords and Their
Beckerman’s extensive examination of *Janáček as Theorist* provides innumerable insights into the composer’s theoretical works. These do not necessarily correlate with Janáček’s creative purpose and provide limited understanding of his musical works, especially those for violin and piano. The theoretical works indicate Janáček’s constant drive to improve, develop and challenge his concepts of music and philosophy.

3.7 *Opera, Jenůfa* and Speech Melodies

Vocal music had always dominated Janáček’s compositional output. As Tyrrell observes, “writing choruses served as a preparation and as a substitute for operas.” From Janáček’s Šárka, completed in 1888, onwards there was scarcely any time when he was not writing, planning or revising an opera.

Shortly before he resumed work on *Jenůfa* in 1901, Janáček wrote several works seemingly in response to his Russian trip in 1896. These show autobiographical elements as well as indications of Janáček’s mature style in the formulation of his ideas on “speech melody.” The tragic death of Janáček’s daughter Olga, in February of 1903, proved to be the breaking point in Zdenka and Leoš’s marriage and darkly coloured Janáček’s opera *Jenůfa* which was dedicated to her memory.

---

*Connections*) and *Základy hudebního sčasování* (*Basics of Music*). In these essays and books, Janáček examined musical topics ranging from form, melody and harmony theories to chords and counterpoint as well as the exploration of several peculiarly Czech terms. Janáček also developed his own system of language with which to describe his musical concepts.

Beckerman warns, “although it is of critical importance to raise questions concerning the relationship of theory and practice in Janáček’s work, one can not automatically assume such a connection, at least not on a primary level.” Beckerman, *Janáček as Theorist*, Preface xviii.

Tyrrell notes that the most “vital and important choruses,” know as the Bezruč group, were written during a period of frustration in Janáček’s operatic work. These choruses are more obviously dramatic and use direct speech and solo voices to suggest individual characters within the chorus. Tyrrell, "Janáček, Leoš...”
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The cantata *Amarus* jw III/6 written in 1896 shows a deeply personal reflection on the loneliness of Janáček’s life at the monastery. The keyboard miniatures, *Po žarostlém chodníčku* (*On the Overgrown Path*) jw VIII/17 also show autobiographical elements.
Premiered in Brno with reasonable success in 1904, Jenůfa was denied a performance in Prague for twelve years.\footnote{158}{The refusal of a Prague performance for Jenůfa was famously a product of the mutual dislike between Janáček and the director of the National Theatre, composer Karel Kovařovic. Janáček had publically denigrated Kovařovic’s comic opera The Bridegrooms in a Hudební listy review.}

In his work with “speech melodies” Janáček was building the foundations for his late works which are often considered the pinnacle of his output. Jiránek observes that speech tunes were not, by themselves, a discovery of Janáček. He identifies their existence in musical declamation, in “pure” or “absolute” musical representations of the word, giving examples from Beethoven and Dvořák. Janáček’s obsessive note making habits extended into taking notes, in musical notation, of scraps of overheard speech. Janáček would add descriptions of the circumstances and make deductions about the emotional state of the speaker. The peculiarly Czech rhythm, pitch contour and inflections of speech underpin the distinctive vocal melodies of Jenůfa.

Czech theorist and musicologist, Hostinský, made observations about elements of the phonological characteristics of the Czech language, including the widely observed tendency to accent short syllables at the start of words. The uniqueness of Janáček’s approach lies in his development of a universal system of speech tunes which underpins his artistic style and enabled him to understand the “practically limitless emotional subtext of the spoken language,” a dialectic unity of lived reality.\footnote{159}{Jiránek, “The Conflict between Reality and Its Living in the Work of Leoš Janáček.”, 365–366.}

Shortly before the outbreak of the First World War, Janáček was one of the most respected pedagogues, composers and folklorists in Moravia and directed the chief music teaching institution. Outside Moravia, however he was still little known. The denial of a Prague premiere for Jenůfa was a blow to his aspirations as a composer and his keen desire for recognition from Prague. His writing from the time
betrays him as questioning his own abilities. Janáček destroyed some of his works and abandoned others. The finest of Janáček works from the first decade of the twentieth century are often identified as the male voice choruses Kantor Halfar jw IV/33 from 1906, Maryčka Magdónova jw IV/34-5 from 1906-7 and 70.000 jw IV/36 from 1909. These works drew on Silesian texts and were the culmination of a career’s experience writing choruses for Svatopluk. The works had, in Tyrrell’s words, “deep social and patriotic appeal for Janáček” and were set near his home town of Hukvaldy.\textsuperscript{160}

After the acceptance of Jenůfa in Prague in 1916, Janáček’s opera writing began in earnest and his choruses were by and large cast aside.\textsuperscript{161} The favourable response to Jenůfa allowed Janáček’s entry into the Prague musical scene at the age of sixty-two. The output from this late stage of Janáček’s career is commonly considered his best, most individual work and therefore is overwhelmingly examined in the literature. This remarkable creative upsurge in a man well into his sixties was in part fuelled by the newly acquired independence of Czechoslovakia in 1918 which buoyed Janáček’s patriotic pride. The Violin Sonata is considered part of Janáček’s response to the war and interpretations of this work will be discussed in further detail in the analysis section of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{160} Tyrrell, “Janáček, Leoš.”
\textsuperscript{161} Janáček had resigned himself to the significant changes made by Kovařovic to Jenůfa for its performance in Prague. The original opera, as fully conceived by Janáček, would not be performed until the 1970s. Universal Edition published the heavily edited version and promoted productions in Vienna, Berlin and other German cities.
3.8 Janáček the Composer

Janáček can be identified as part of a wave of twentieth-century composers who championed realism. Unlike Dvořák, Janáček was atheistic and built his most successful works on programmatic and often autobiographical grounds. Beckerman identifies the task of dealing with any artist as being to “balance the effects of individuality and community,” giving for example the endeavour to associate artists with the ‘isms’. He associates Janáček with nationalism, pantheism and atomism, symbolism, expressionism, impressionism and surrealism.¹⁶²

In fact, perhaps the only uncontroversial way to describe Janáček is as a composer of great originality and individuality. This frequently employed description is usually employed to make sense of Janáček’s late works which demonstrate the use of “speech melodies”, folk music and a complex modal language combined with an astounding harmonic facility.

Janáček’s expanded concept of tonality is seemingly instinctive, perhaps in part reflecting his time under Skuherský. Janáček employs unorthodox chord spacings and structures and modality without ever venturing into atonality. Vyzloužil further extends the articulation of Janáček’s “musical poetics” noting “the modal character of his horizontal lines” and “the tendency of Janáček’s musical form towards asymmetry.”¹⁶³ Tyrrell notes that Janáček’s categorisation as a twentieth-century composer should not “deny that his musical language was grounded in the nineteenth

century … his harmony operates functionally, and dissonance … reinforces rather than negates the tonal framework.”  

Smaczny identifies Janáček’s peculiarly personal style as relying greatly on the “repetition of brief melodic and rhythmic fragments … [resulting] in a kind of musical mosaic.” He argues that this was a potent vehicle for the expression of intimate and intensely passionate thoughts and emotions. His accompaniment figures and patterns create musical momentum by forming phrases of short motifs which repeat and therefore drive the music. Janáček labels these motifs as sčasovka in his theoretical works. Tyrrell describes these as, “a little flash of time, almost a kind of musical capsule, which Janáček often used in slow music as tiny swift motifs with remarkably characteristic rhythms that are supposed to pepper the musical flow.”

---
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Chapter Four: Introduction to Analysis

4.1 Dvořák and Janáček

Reflecting on the relationship between Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček and following a review of the personal and professional courses of their lives, makes certain commonalities immediately apparent. Both composers knew great loss in the deaths of their children; Dvořák lost his first three and Janáček lost his only two children. Houtchens also underlines the composers’ shared struggle against the “petty prejudices held by important members of the artistic communities in Prague and Brno.”¹⁶⁷ These are most obviously represented by Janáček’s twelve-year struggle to get Jenůfa performed in Prague and the vehemence of Novotný’s criticism of Dvořák’s German publications and difference in approach to Smetana, of whom Novotný was a staunch supporter.

Both composers had a significant element of Russophilism in their political and creative spheres and showed an early interest in pan-Slavic peoples, not simply Czechs, Bohemians or Moravians.¹⁶⁸ Dvořák and Janáček also shared particular aural fascinations which influenced their aesthetic. The most obvious example is their engagement with the natural world and use and imitation of the inflections of bird song in music. Dvořák’s hobby of breeding birds (pigeons) was an interest he shared with Janáček who raised hens. Houchens also notes the Moravian’s habit of notating “the pitches and phonetic sounds made by a bird,” describing in detail the specific interactions between the bird and other living things.¹⁶⁹ The features of Czech

¹⁶⁷ Houtchens, "Janáček and Czech Music.", 256.
¹⁶⁸ Houtchens discusses the Slavic origins of works including Janáček’s Ženich vnucený (The imposed bridegroom, 1873) and Šárka and Dvořák’s Čtyři písně na slova srbské lidové poesie (Four songs to the words of Serbian folk texts, 1872), Vanda and Dimitrij. Here, Houtchens extends upon the work presented at the international conference Dvořák, Janáček and Their Time held in Brno in 1984 by such leading theorists as Dr. Jiří Vysložil, Dr. Theodora Straková and Dr. David Beveridge. Ibid. 260.
¹⁶⁹ Ibid. 262.
language would also present a strong common element in the rhythmic features of both composers’ aesthetic.

The nature of each composer’s engagement with folk music was significantly different. Janáček’s work as an ethnomusicologist provided material with which to build compositions, especially in his output in the last decade of the nineteenth century. This work connected Janáček’s musical voice further with East-Moravian and Slovakian musical style, creating a great font of inspiration to contrast with Janáček’s education in Western European art music. Dvořák’s own compositional interaction with folk music, although significant and genuine, was less direct. The Bohemian never directly used folk material, instead letting the distinct Czech musical characteristics inspire his own melodies, rhythm and form within a more identifiably ‘European’ style.170

In part this interaction also reflects the nature of the two composers’ career paths. Dvořák travelled extensively throughout his career and enjoyed the support of musicians around the world. His interaction with the musical landscapes of many countries enhanced the international appeal of his style and aesthetic. Contrastingly, Janáček’s own career, with his immense success as a pedagogue, theorist and ethnomusicologist, provided a more localised existence. Being more firmly rooted in the musical life of Brno and Moravia was due, in part, to Janáček’s extremely slow rise to international fame. It could also perhaps be supposed that without this

---

170 Vyzloužil describes two different types of interaction with folklorism. The first he describes as “Dvořákan” or “echo folklorism” and identifies this in Dvořák’s Moravian Duets and Slavonic Dances. Vyzloužil identifies this style of folklorism in Janáček’s compositions which use folk texts or melodies or are based on a folk model. The second type of folklorism he labels as “idiomatic” and is displayed in Janáček’s “innovative and individual adoption (or absorption) of the expressive and stylistic principles of folklore.” Vyzloužil also identifies the beginnings of an inclination towards “idiomatic” folklorism in some of Dvořák’s music but argues that he does not change the fundamental style of his compositions. Vyzloužil identifies Janáček as the only Czech composer “to have adopted a folklorism which is ‘idiomatic’ in the full sense of the word.” Vyzloužil, “Janáček and Czech Music.,” 358–359.
lifetime’s work, Janáček’s mature voice would not have developed so distinctly, nor so well.

The purpose of this analysis is to explore whether examination of the works for violin and piano can bring to the surface a greater understanding of the aesthetic of these two composers, their response to their surrounds and to each other. As Alan Houtchens concludes:

Still further inquiry into the personal, professional, and artistic ties that bound Janáček and Dvořák together – ties that, for Janáček, “nothing in the world could destroy” – would surely reveal even more about the close friendship of these two composers and about the very nature of their creative personalities.171

4.2 The Works for Violin and Piano

Many scholars have attempted to build an understanding of the style of both Antonín Dvořák and Leos Janáček. These studies exist in a myriad of styles, scope and intention. It is my aim to approach my ‘analysis’ of the works for violin and piano using aspects of the phenomenological perspective, outlined in the introduction. Beckerman makes the observation that the debunked theory of Janáček as a “quirky and isolated phenomenon” reveals the limited imagination of analytical approach. He posits that “no figure is immune to the virus of contemporary culture … and Janáček drew from the streams of culture in a way which was uncommonly rich.”172 After reviewing the interaction with their contemporary culture in some detail, this author will now attempt to articulate the aesthetic differences in the writing for violin and piano of Dvořák and Janáček and to outline their approach to idiomatic writing, use of bow and instrumentation.

Dvořák’s output for violin and piano spans his career from the Sonata in F Major, Opus 57, from 1880 to the Ballade in D Minor, Opus 15, from 1885 and the

Sonatina in G Major, Opus 100, written in 1893 and dedicated to his children. A Sonata for Violin and Piano in A Minor from 1873 is unfortunately regarded as lost. There are also several celebrated works which Dvořák originally wrote for other instrumental combinations before arranging them for violin and piano including the Romance in F Minor, Opus 11, the Mazurka, Opus 49, the Nocturne in B Major and the Four Romantic Pieces for Violin and Piano, Opus 100.

David Hurwitz observes that chamber music, as a genre, tends to allow “greater structural and stylistic freedom than orchestral music,” with greater latitude

---

173 The dedication is reproduced in Czech composer and musicologist Jaroslav Burghauser’s *Antonín Dvořák: Thematic Catalogue*. Though the Sonatina was dedicated to all his children, it was intended to be played by Otilie on piano and Antonín on violin. As translated in Jan Smaczny, *Dvořák: Cello Concerto*, ed. Julian Rushton, Cambridge Music Handbooks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 100.


175 The Romance in F Minor was written for violin and orchestra from material originally from Dvořák’s String Quartet in F Minor from 1873. Dvořák dedicated the arrangement for violin and orchestra to the great Czech violinist František Ondříček. Premiered in Prague in 1877, Dvořák later worked with Josef Zubaty on the arrangement for violin and piano. Otakar Šourek, *Antonín Dvořák: His Life and Works* (Prague: Orbis, 1952). 125.

176 The Mazurka was first written for violin and orchestra in 1879 and shortly after arranged by the composer for violin and piano. The Nocturne in B Major was originally the central slow section of Dvořák’s String Quartet in E Minor from the late 1860s. Revived again as part of the G Major String Quintet, Opus 77, in 1875, Dvořák finally resolved it did not serve the work to have two slow movements and so arranged the movement for string orchestra in the same year. In 1883 Dvořák made an arrangement for violin and piano and the work also exists in an arrangement for four hands on the piano. The Romance and Mazurka have survived as concert and recital pieces in both forms.

177 The genesis of the Four Pieces is not entirely clear. The most frequent description, appearing in several sources, is also given by Smaczny. It describes that Dvořák composed his famed Terzetto in C Major for Two Violins and Viola, Opus 74, in the span of just one week early in 1887. The work was intended for the enjoyment of two friends, violinist Jan Pelikan of the National Theater Orchestra and his student Josef Kruis, with Dvořák himself to play the viola part. The composition proved too demanding for Kruis and so Dvořák wrote another. The Terzetto, Opus 75, is in a simpler style and was almost immediately rearranged by Dvořák into the *Four Romantic Pieces* for Violin and Piano, a musical realisation which the composer identified as the most effective form of this music. Smaczny, "Program Notes for Recording of Dvorak Ballade by Marwood and Tomes.", 3.

A letter from Dvořák’s to Simrock is translated in the critical edition of Dvořák’s correspondence and paraphrased thus:

“Dvořák answers Simrock’s enquiry and writes that Dr. Jan Pohl was mistaken in thinking that the ‘Romantic Pieces’ op.75 (B150) were original for two violins and viola. He presumes that Dr. Pohl had in mind the Trio in C major for two violins and viola op.74 (B148), whose musical content has nothing to do with the ‘Romantic Pieces’, forgetting about another work for two violins and viola, published not until 1945 as ‘Bagatelles’ op.75a (B149), which was indeed the original version of the ‘Romantic Pieces’.” Kuna, ed. *Antonín Dvořák Correspondence and Documents; a Critical Edition 1871-1884*. 232/233.
for experimentation. Hurwitz recommends that the limitations in tone colour and volume inherent in chamber writing when compared to orchestral writing, can be overcome by a wider range of contrasts in harmony, form and rhythm. It is interesting to consider whether the original conception of pieces such as the Romance, Mazurka and Four Romantic Pieces as works for different combinations of instruments would have effected the “structural and stylistic freedom” of Dvořák’s writing. Did Dvořák’s musical conception of these pieces change and therefore necessitate a different instrumental combination and timbre? Or can these arrangements be disregarded as a practical adaptation to enhance their widespread play-ability and profitability?

Excepting his works for solo piano, Janáček’s chamber output for violin and piano is greater than that for any other instrumental combination. Though seldom mentioned, Janáček was a competent violinist and passed an exam in violin performance at the Imperial and Royal Institute for Teacher Training in 1872. Zahrádka identifies Janáček’s three-year procrastination of his next violin exam, eventually taken in 1878, as evidence of his reluctance to have his modest violinistic skills assessed. Therefore it could be safe to assume Janáček’s skills on the violin did not compare to his prowess as a pianist and organist.

---

178 Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius, 98.
Janáček’s works for violin and piano are chronologically divided into two categories about which one can make certain generalisations. The early works include the Romance of 1879 and the Dúmka of 1880. Both works were written during Janáček’s last period as a student in Leipzig and Vienna. Two sonatas for violin and piano from his time in Vienna were documented in letters from 1880. The first had two complete movements as of 18 January 1880 but was not referred to again and is now considered lost. The second student sonata was written under Krenn at the Vienna conservatory and was played in full by violinist Gustav Clinke at the Brno Beseda in 1881. It appears to have remained henceforth unplayed and there are no further reports of the work.

In his study of Music for String Orchestra by Dvořák and Janáček, David Beveridge discusses the similarities and particularly the differences in the aesthetic of Dvořák’s Serenade for Strings, from 1875, and Janáček’s Idyll for String Orchestra, from 1878. It is his recommendation that the contrasts between the two composers’ mature styles is so great that it can be more difficult to make comparisons. In Janáček’s Idyll, his style is superficially much more aligned with Dvořák’s and therefore their differences are easier to comprehend. With this in mind, it seems pertinent to examine Janáček’s Romance for Violin and Piano (jw 7/3) from 1879 and Dúmka for violin and piano (jw 7/4) from 1880 and observe the characteristics shared.

---

180 Hrabal, ed. Dopisy Zdence [Letters to Zdenka].
and not shared with Dvořák’s works for violin and piano. It is interesting to note that, despite Dvořák seniority of thirteen years, the earliest surviving work for violin and piano by each composer date from 1879 and 1880.

Janáček’s Romance is the only surviving piece from a set of romances written during the composer’s time studying at the conservatory in Leipzig. A letter to his fiancé, Zdenka, dating from 27 October 1879, reveals Janáček’s excitement at the task set by Paul; to write three romances for violin and piano. He completed the first Romance that very evening but with characteristically severe self-criticism abandoned it and, over the course of a month, completed a total of seven romances. Němcová discusses these lost romances, admitting the difficulty of discerning whether these were seven independent works or re-workings of similar material.

This surviving work, labelled number four on the manuscript, was one of only two compositions to survive from the many works Janáček wrote in Leipzig, the other being the Tema con Variazioni for Piano. Though Paul had promised Janáček a performance of the Romance in Leipzig, the first known performance was by violinist Rudolf Kratochvíl and pianist Vinvenv Šťastný on 5 July 1904 in Ivančice. The autograph was discovered in 1930 in Brno, in the archives of the Brno Men’s Teacher Training Institute, and printed by Hudební Mátice in 1938.

Janáček’s prolific letter writing offers an insight into his changing assessments of this work. He wrote: “how curious I am to know whether this Romance will go down well. It has nice harmonic turns.” The same evening he described the reception of his work: “well, the Romance as a composition was liked, but it is too heavy for a romance – in other words, it is no romance.”

---

183 Hrabal, ed. Dopisy Zdence [Letters to Zdenka]. 78.
184 Němcová, "Introduction to the Complete Critical Edition of the Works of Leoš Janáček; Compositions for Violin and Piano.", Xiii.
185 As quoted in Ibid. Xiii.
apparent mood when writing the fourth Romance on Sunday 16 November 1879. He returned from a walk along the snow-covered streets “in a quiet joyful mood … inspired by Zdenka’s letter which evidently gave him great joy.”

The genesis of the Důmka is far less thoroughly documented and therefore much less is known. Both Brod and Veselý give the date of composition as 1880 and Helfert even suggests the Důmka may be one of the Leipzig romances, renamed. It was first performed on 8 March 1885 at the second benefit concert for the Organ School in Brno, organised by the Association for the Improvement of Church Music in Moravia. Janáček played the piano, accompanying the violinist A. Sobotky.

Both pieces belong to Janáček’s ‘apprentice years’, which Němcová describes as a period in which the composer “tried to squeeze into that ‘iron cloak of rules’ which his spirit rebelled against with all its might.” This somewhat dramatic depiction of the young composer’s period of immersion in the classical-romantic sphere defies Janáček’s own respect for and interest in this style. Of course, it is also evident that the classical-romantic style of Schuman and Mendelssohn, espoused by the Leipzig Conservatory at the time of Janáček’s study there, influenced the nature of his compositions. The Důmka is noted by Němcová as particularly showing homage to the influence of Dvořák and Rubenstein, with whom Janáček was enamoured at the time. Though, as I’ve already discussed, Janáček’s close relationship with Dvořák was life-long. Perhaps then the greatest interest lies in discovering the personal features of these compositions, if indeed they exist.

These early works for violin and piano are often dismissed as mere ‘student pieces’; simple, uninteresting and not yet ‘Janáček’. The composer’s Idyll for String

---

186 Ibid. Xiii.
187 Ibid. Xiii.
188 Ibid. Xiii.
189 Ibid. Xiv.
Orchestra is often examined with serious intention and this was written in 1878, before the *Romance* and *Dúmka*. May it be a mark of respect to this highly educated young composer that we do not dismiss Janáček’s compositional choices in 1879 and 1880 as those of a man who did not yet know his own mind.

190 For example Beveridge’s comparative study. Beveridge, “Janáček and Czech Music.”
5.1 Janáček’s Romance

Form and Harmony

The Romance is written in E major and begins with Moderato material which is used to frame a larger, central section. The opening declamatory phrase is repeated at a softer dynamic and with rhythmic variation before a four bar transition into the second melodic statement at bar 13, now in an Andante tempo. This Andante melodic material forms the majority of the work and is developed with limited harmonic innovation before returning in almost exact repetition at bar 77. Janáček’s harmonic language is traditional in the Romance, reflecting his immersion in the classical-romantic style while in Leipzig, and includes slightly self-conscious modulations such as the transition to C major starting in the phrase from bar 23. Only the opening rhythmic figure of the original Moderato statement returns again from bar 110 before falling away towards the end of the piece, forming a coda.

Rhythmic Features

Appoggiaturas create rhythmic emphasis on first beats in the opening Moderato material, heightening the expression in both the piano and violin parts. (Fig 3.) This writing is the most arresting and declamatory of the Romance. The addition of triplet and sextuplet figurations to embellish the repetition of the opening phrase adds to this interest.

The central material appears to be rhythmically simple for the following reasons. The note lengths in the violin melody generally do not exceed a dotted-minim, with the material alternating between bars equally divided into minim lengths and dotted-minim/crotchet patterns. The piano plays mainly quavers outlining the relevant chord (bars 25–26) or gentle ostinato-like figures (bars 17–19). In passages
such as bars 66–75 both violin and piano move together in crotchets with the addition of arpeggiated sustained chords.

**Instrumentation and the Editions**

The writing for violin is melodic and lyrical with little bow articulation. The expression is provided by dynamic swells within a legato bow stroke (bars 39–44) and with long arching crescendos which generally follow the tessitura upwards and retreat back as the pitch descends.

The opening material would chiefly be played on the G string of the violin where the richer and darker sounds of the instrument would see the melody blend with the piano and sit more than an octave below the highest pitches of the accompaniment. (Fig 3.) In both the *Romance* and the *Dumka*, Janáček remains comfortably within the central and lower range of the instrument, drawing on the voice-like expression of the instrument.

Fig 3. Bars 1–3 of the *Romance for Violin and Piano* by Janáček.191

---

The Complete Critical Edition of the violin works of Leoš Janáček, first published in 1988 by Barenreiter and Supraphon, has inspired much discussion about the editorial process of Jan Krejčí, Alena Němcová and their associates. The editors describe the works generally as “non-material structure(s) which grew out of the mind of its creator, only taking form in acoustical reality, the notation of the work is an aid, a guide for its implementation, which is not identical to the work itself, and should not be confused with it.” They go on to describe Janáček’s process as particularly significant: “the genesis of a work is a multi-level process. Often when he returns to a work it leads to changes, not only in the notation, but also in the substance of the work itself.”

This seems to defend the nature of their editorial role as an aid to the composers own communication of the ‘true nature’ of the music. Though working principally from the surviving manuscripts, the editors also made choices to bring the edition of these works into line with accepted practice, including consistent use of accidentals and changes to voicing and dynamics. As a rule, the editors advise that

---

194 Ibid.
195 Faltus describes some of the conflicts concerning the editorial approach: “One occasional bone of contention, however, was whether to retain or change a key signature in places where actually a completely different key was already being used, modified (according to the usual custom) by local accidentals. These absurdities (from today's point of view) were removed, but this sometimes caused displeasure, as did enharmonic changes of individual notes and sometimes whole passages from double flat or double sharp to simpler notated form (obviously sounding exactly the same). The fuss tended to be greatest when there was the least reason for it, for example not in relation to instruments or voices, where changes of intonation could occur as a result of notation (in cents and not quarter tones), but in the title summarising Janacek's piano works, where tempered tuning is solidly established … . It is true that the visual impression, which helps to create the performer's semantic conception, was and perhaps remains fixed for pianists by the preceding editions. A harmony
instructions concerning expression and performance technique have remained largely unchanged.\textsuperscript{196} It is interesting and valuable for a performer to explore the original source and question why changes are made and how they effect the aesthetic of the composition.

The example most relevant to this study is the editors’ inclusion of their own version of the \textit{Romance}, as well as Janáček’s original which was first published in 1938 with an edited violin part by Jan Škědroň. This supplementary version is defended and justified by several key statements included by the editors. Apart from some “small dynamic retouching,” the principal changes were made in “correcting” the voicing and figurations in the piano part.\textsuperscript{197} In Janáček’s \textit{Romance} the violin is almost continually doubled by the piano, which also provides a chordal accompaniment. The doubling is noticeably absent in several passages including when the violin plays ostinati accompaniments. (Fig 4.)

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{unexpectedly} notated in sharps … is for example held to have an exceptional position on the basis of the note picture, and to have been distorted by subsequent transposition into flat notation together with the next five bars. Without wishing to put up too much of a defense of this particular enharmonic transcription, we believe that such instances of conservatism are understandable among Czech pianists who are today and every day concerned with Janacek's cycle, but that for foreign performers encountering Janacek's work for the first time a certain unification and simplification will benefit the reading. Leos Faltus, "Janacek in the Hands of the Edition Janacek," in \textit{The Free Library} (2002).
\textsuperscript{197} Krejči, ed. \textit{Leoš Janáček Compositions for Violin and Piano; Complete Critical Edition}. 91.
\end{flushleft}
Fig 4. Bars 40–50 of the *Romance* for Violin and Piano by Janáček.\(^{198}\)

Note: Doubling absent from bb45-48.

The editors describe their removal of much of this doubling after the opening two bar statement as intended to create a more refined sound and a more easily playable part. Their description of the "ugly sound" of this unison perhaps inflicts too harsh a judgement on the *Romance*.\(^{199}\) Engaging with the phenomenological approach to assessment of music can provide a beneficial perspective with which to approach the *Romance*. Clifton writes:

> This [phenomenological] definition of music says nothing about aesthetic standards which the object of the musical experience is supposed to meet. This doesn’t deny the existence of standards of compositional technique, but there is a difference between saying that a work is well or poorly made, which it is perhaps part of the business of aesthetics to say, and saying that a work of art is definable in terms of the goodness or badness of its technique.\(^{200}\)

It is interesting to consider how the writing in Janáček’s original arrangement would impact on the interplay between violin and piano in performance. Perhaps it

---

199 Krejčí, ed. Leoš Janáček Compositions for Violin and Piano; Complete Critical Edition. 3.
could be assumed that the frequent doubling of melodic material creates a closer connection between instruments. Would a violinist exaggerate idiomatic expressive techniques to distinguish their solo sound from the piano or minimize these aspects of sound production and expression to emphasise the union with the piano?

**Aesthetic Observations**

Closer examination of the score of the *Romance* reveals that the doubling is principally a unison between voices but the piano part does vary the octave, for example take the unison at bar 107 which drops two octaves and returns in bar 109 only to drop again in bar 110. (Fig 5.)

Fig 5. Bars 106–111 from the *Romance* for Violin and Piano by Janáček.\(^{201}\)

Note: The unison drops two octaves in bar 107 and returns in bar 109, dropping again in bar 110.

The observation would suggest that performance without Janáček’s voice doubling would produce a different interaction between parts, namely the way the melody weaves in and out of the texture of the piano. To have the piano in unison with the melody and then suddenly drop two octaves and then return would draw the listener’s attention in performance. Perhaps even more significantly, there are larger sections in Janáček’s arrangement where he does not employ the direct unison

---

between instruments at all and it could be assumed that these sections would be an aural contrast to the parts of the composition in which doubling is employed.

Performances using Janáček’s edition would result in a much thicker and richer texture which Janáček himself described as “too heavy for a romance.” Another quote used by Zahrádka further demonstrates Janáček’s attitude towards this ‘problem’: “whether it really is a romance God only knows; but I am not too concerned about that.” The term ‘Romance’ is applied with particularly loose specifications, despite the centuries-long history of the form. Originally a type of Spanish narrative ballad, by the eighteenth century it usually referred to simply lyrical pieces for both instruments and voice. The only definitive identification made in Michael Kennedy’s new edition of The Oxford Dictionary of Music is that a romance “generally … implies a specially personal or tender quality.”

Although the use of the lighter, edited Romance is now overwhelmingly the norm amongst modern violinists, experimentation and performance of the original arrangement could further illuminate some of the aesthetic features of Janáček’s early work for violin and piano. It is also interesting to note that the heavily edited version of the Romance is not included in the supplement to the 2007 Bärenreiter Edition.

In considering the preparation for performance this particular idiosyncrasy in the instrumentation of the Romance could also be considered its most arresting feature, after considering the simplicity of the formal, harmonic and rhythmic features. The composition was also written during a time in which Janáček’s main educational focus was as both pianist and composer. Perhaps the instrumental

---

202 As quoted in Němcová, "Introduction to the Complete Critical Edition of the Works of Leoš Janáček; Compositions for Violin and Piano.", Xiii.
203 Zahrádka, "Foreword to Janáček Works for Violin and Piano.", Ix
doubling in the Romance indicates this pianistic focus with the bulk of the musical information contained in the piano part with the violin providing colour in a similar way to early classical sonatas and piano trios.

It is also interesting to observe the way Janáček employs doubling in his other works, in both melodic and accompanimental figurations. Derek Katz notes in his work Janacek; Beyond the Borders:

The doubling of a vocal melody at a lower octave is … a feature of some of Janáček’s folksong arrangements, such as the song Na horách, na dol’ách from the Songs of Detva, composed in early 1916, in which the singer is doubled almost continually by the piano in the tenor range.206

We could therefore suggest that this type of writing for solo melody and piano was not merely a student mistake that was out-grown, but rather a mark of identity within a period and composition which is often dismissed as derivative.

In Janáček’s first Moravian Song the melody is placed at the pitch at which it would be sung, in an arrangement which allows both piano solo realisation as well as accompanied voice. (Fig 6.) The accompaniment in the treble moves consistently in octaves, which has two main aural effects. Firstly, the pitch is reinforced by the doubling and spaciousness and clarity is created by the absence of a secondary harmonic or melodic line. Secondly, the steady rhythmic movement of the accompaniment is emphasized by the figuration, which is arguably more likely to be performed in an even, walking movement with the right hand which would have implications for articulation.

206 Katz, Janáček: Beyond the Borders. 81.
The first song, *Tam Dole Na Dole*, from Janáček’s Five Songs for Voice and Piano shows the piano shadowing the vocal part at the exact pitch. (Fig 7.) It is interesting that in this instance, Janáček uses this device only for the opening phrase, perhaps to reinforce the first musical statement.

---

Further observations about Janáček’s use of doubling in the works for violin and piano can be found in the analysis of both the *Dumka* and the *Ballada* from the Violin Sonata.
5.2 Janáček’s Dúmka

Janáček’s *Dúmka* from 1880 has some aesthetic similarities to the *Romance*, especially the opening *Moderato* statement, but is in character quite a different composition. *Dúmka* is a musical term introduced from Ukrainian language with cognates in many Slavic languages. *Dúmka* was originally a form distinct from the related *dúma*, an “epic or ballad-like narration usually sung by men.”\(^{209}\) Tyrrell describes the *dúmka* contrastingly as “a song or lament usually sung by women” but advises that the two terms were used interchangeably by nineteenth-century scholars.\(^{210}\) William Noll states that “*dumy* are historical epics that are musically based on motives rendered in recitative.”\(^{211}\)

In the late nineteenth century *dúmky* were popularized in part by the publication of an ethnological study and analysis by Ukrainian composer Mykola Lysenko in 1873. *Dúmka* are present in the music of many Slavic and eastern European cultures and are typically described as a lament with contrasting sections of faster, more cheerful material.

Antonín Dvořák is particularly renowned for his use of *dúmka*. His final Piano Trio in E minor, Opus 90, has six movements, each one a *dúmka*, and the work as a whole is frequently referred to as the *Dumky-Trio*. Though this is perhaps his most famous interaction with the *dúmka*, Dvořák’s output includes several other *dúmka* movements. Before Janáček wrote his own *Dúmka* for violin and piano in 1880,


\(^{210}\) Tyrrell notes that the word ‘is cognate with the Czech dumat and Polish dumacę, ‘to ponder’, ‘to meditate’. Ibid.

Dvořák had already included a důmka in the Piano Quintet in A major, Opus 81, from 1887 and his String Sextet, Opus 48, published in 1879 as well as his Důmka in D Minor, Opus 35, for solo piano from 1876. H. Hollander’s article Dvořák the Czech includes discussion of how the composer’s “spontaneous” interaction with national Czech or Slavonic musical forms helped define the nature of his role as a Czech composer. Hollander writes: “it is an attested fact, by the way, that Dvořák, after having composed quite a number of důmka -like movements already, asked some of his friends what a důmka really was.”

This is a surprising anecdote considering Tyrrell’s attribution of the establishment of the nineteenth-century důmka form to the work of Dvořák. Dvořák’s důmka are primarily in duple time, in the minor, beginning slowly and in a generally pensive or melancholy mood. Other noted classical composers of důmka include Bohuslav Martinů, Pyotr Tchaikovsky, Frederic Chopin and Franz Liszt.

Zezelj-Gualdi identifies the opening theme of the fourth movement of Janáček’s Violin Sonata as being an example of a characteristic motive described by Vogel as the “Důmka”. The motive is described as consisting of an “arched four-note figure with a chromatic descent.” This identification seems to have little bearing upon Janáček’s Důmka from 1880.

**Form and Harmony**

In keeping with the style of a důmka, Janáček’s work begins with a lively Živě (con moto) section which conveys an impassioned, melancholic character. The key of c
minor colours the material darkly, and perhaps suggests to the listener the baroque and classical association of the key with an affect of unrequited or unhappy love.\textsuperscript{215}

From bars 72–100 a calmer and more contemplative \textit{Adagio} section contrasts with the first material before returning again to the impassioned \textit{Tempo 1}. In this way Janáček fulfils the description of \textit{dúmka} as being both melancholic and reflective by writing within a ternary structure which allows the presentation of two distinct musical moods. Unlike the contrasting sections of the \textit{Romance}, in the \textit{Dúmka} Janáček heightens the change by writing in b flat minor and changing the meter from 6/4 to 3/2.

It is interesting to note the possible Moravian influence on the harmonic structure of the \textit{Dúmka}. The majority of the folk songs that Janáček collected and researched began and ended in the same key and contained a contrasting middle key. Zezelj-Gualdi notes that though the most common contrasting key in minor-key songs was the relative major (III), “the next most common key of modulation is the subtonic (bVII), which Janáček himself labelled the ‘Moravian Modulation’.”\textsuperscript{216}

The change to b flat minor creates a particular change in tone colour on the violin. The resonant open D and G strings, available for use in C minor, are now muted by the addition of flats. There are opportunities to explore fingerings in higher positions to heighten the effect of this covered or muted sound and extend the contrast provided by Janáček’s choice of key.

\textsuperscript{215} Rita Steblin, ed. \textit{A History of Key Characteristics in the 18th and 19th Centuries} (UMI Research Press,1983).

Rhythmic Features

The slurring in the parts of both instruments has two complementary effects. Firstly, in the piano part it accentuates the pulse by providing one musical gesture per bar, the accompaniment figures seemingly bouncing off the single minim at the beginning of each bar. The slurring in the opening theme of the violin keeps the instrument from providing impulses on the bar or half bar, seemingly muddying the usual equal division of a 6/4 time signature. Together this effect helps propel the music and create longer musical ‘lines’ while still having relatively short slurred figurations which allow the violin to use a variety of articulations and inflections with the bow to create an expressive and interesting melodic line. (Fig 8.)

Fig 8. Bars 1–7 of the Dúmka for Violin and Piano by Janáček.²¹⁷
Note: The piano accents the pulse, providing one musical gesture per bar. The slurring in the violin part avoids equal rhythmic division of each bar.

The writing for both instruments in the central section (bars 72–100) suggests a spaciousness and sostenuto as rhythmic impulse is avoided. (Fig 9.) Appoggiaturas and rolled chords in the piano part and longer, less active melody lines in the violin

part help reinforce this change of mood. Here the slurring in the violin part suggests much longer, slower bows and a more legato, sustained sound.

Fig 9. Bars 72–80 of the Dúmka for Violin and Piano by Janáček.\textsuperscript{218}

Note: The piano figurations avoid rhythmic emphasis. The violin melody circles the same pitch, elongating the melodic line.

Instrumentation

Like the Romance, Janáček has begun the violin melody in the deepest register of the instrument. While the key of c minor helps create a tragic, impassioned character, the addition of an A# and F# as neighbour notes in the melody heightens the possibilities for expressive intonation on the violin. It is possible to play this entire opening material on the G string of the violin and use expressive shifting, portamenti and finger articulation to further convey the musical expression.

The first theme of the Adagio is composed by using short scales and leaps. (Fig 9.) This melodic material unfolds in what seem to be concentric circles

\textsuperscript{218} Ibid. 13.
conveying a sort of listlessness. Here the piano often shadows the violin melody at a lower octave to reinforce principal notes.

Contrastingly, we could view this writing in the same way as was suggested with the *Romance* where the violin is used to colour and elaborate upon the primary musical material in the piano part. With this in mind, the violinist could choose to adopt a more improvisatory feel and use expressive rubato to add interest within the framework of the piano’s music.

**Aesthetic Observations**

Janáček uses octaves to reinforce the climactic point of the *Důmka* creating a somewhat different aesthetic affect to the doubling in the *Romance*. (Fig 10.) After the impassioned c minor material has been repeated and developed, and then contrasted with the central *Adagio* material, it returns again from bar 101 to end the piece. In this final rendition the violin plays the opening phrase of the c minor material and builds upwards in pitch and dynamic. The solo violin bursts into octaves, bringing the music to the only fortissimo marking in the work. (Fig 10.) The violin octaves are continuously tied across the bar line, avoiding an emphatic separate bow on the first beat of the bar until bar 115. The feeling of climax is intensified by the arpeggiated chords in the piano part from bar 115 which seem to force the music to broaden to accommodate the sheer volume of sound being produced in this final declamatory statement.
Fig 10. Bars 108–117 from the Dúmkra for Violin and Piano by Janáček.\textsuperscript{219}

\textsuperscript{219} Ibid. 15–16.
5.3 Dvořák’s Sonata in F Major

When first approaching Dvořák’s Sonata in F major, it is interesting to consider the context of the work within Dvořák’s own output. The Sonata was written during March of 1880 when Dvořák was working on a number of songs and smaller piano pieces and, perhaps most importantly, during the composition of the Violin Concerto in A minor, Opus 53. The concerto was written in a number of realisations, the first being finished in the previous year. After writing the sonata Dvořák completed an entirely new version of the concerto between April and May of 1880. The final version, with the input of Joachim, was not completed until 1882. This close proximity to the concerto is often considered a strong influence on the sonata, identified by Bartoš as sharing an intense intimacy that characterises Dvořák’s highly unorthodox concerto.\(^{220}\)

Form and Harmony

The sonata has three contrasting movements. The Allegro ma non troppo [Mvt 1] and Allegro molto [Mvt 3] are written in F major and the Poco Sostenuto [Mvt 2] in A major. The frequent identification of the influence of Brahms on the sonata is demonstrated, in the words of Smaczny, “particularly in the manner in which the first movement ‘feels its way’ into the argument, and in the falling phrases at the start of the attractive Poco sostenuto [Mvt 2].” Though Smaczny underlines that Dvořák has

in no way surrendered his musical personality to this influence, he identifies a “Brahmsian athleticism” in the development of ideas in the sonata.\textsuperscript{221}

**Rhythmic Features**

The three movements of the Sonata in F Major are testament to the “rhythmic wealth” and masterful developmental skills identified by many scholars as central to Dvořák’s aesthetic and the popularity of his style. The first movement begins with two phrases constructed from two contrasting rhythmic motifs. (Fig 11.) First is searching legato material, with the violin syncopated and moving upwards in response to the chords of the piano part. The pace of harmonic movement combines with the use of long legato bowing to create an expansive and yet searching feeling. The second half of each phrase features the more rhythmically declamatory triplet figure which launches the music downwards to land on the beginning of each bar with a $sfz$ accent, then repeating with quickly fading emphasis in the piano. This opening introduces the primary rhythmic and motivic material within a single phrase thus providing the foundation for much of the compositional material in the first movement. Perhaps it’s possible to elaborate on Smaczny’s statement to identify the “Brahmsian” character in the first half of the phrase and the more rhetorical and declamatory “Dvořákian” character in the second half of the phrase. As Hurwitz observed, when Dvořák borrowed a technique or effect he made no attempt to hide it.\textsuperscript{222}

The sonata seems to really launch in bar 19 with a forte triplet in the violin part inviting the piano into a longer melodic phrase with an active ostinato figure of octaves in the piano part. (Fig 11.) Despite descriptions of Dvořák’s style as being heightened during his American period, including his use of driving ostinati, we can

\textsuperscript{221} Smaczny, "Program Notes for Recording of Dvorak Ballade by Marwood and Tomes.", 3.

\textsuperscript{222} Hurwitz, Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius. 35–36.
observe this technique already in use in the sonata. Ostinati dominate the work in both instruments, particularly in the sonata’s first movement.

Fig 11. Bars 1–21 from Sonata in F Major, Movement 1 by Dvořák.223

In bar 64 both instruments strongly outline each beat of the bar with a descending sequence; a two bar cell of accented crotchet beats. In bar 75 suddenly time seems suspended as the declamatory accents disappear and the violin plays an expressive, legato rendition of the material above the fading piano chord. (Fig 12.) A similar musical effect is employed in the Sonatas third movement.

The pulse is transformed in bar 78 when Dvořák’s tenuto markings under the slurred violin line create a lean on the first and fourth quavers of the bar – seemingly swinging the music in 6/8 as the syncopated figures in the piano further diffusing the distinction of three clear beats in the bar. (Fig 12.)

Instrumentation

Generally in the first and third movement, the violin and piano have equal voices, responding rhythmically and melodically to the material of the other. In places such as the passage beginning in bar 50, the descending semiquaver motif, started in the

\[ \text{Ibid. 3.} \]
piano, is passed between instruments with an inexactness which allows a different impulse, depending on the beat of the bar. This interaction closely links the expressive direction of the instruments and propels the music forward. From bar 58 the piano repeats its original statement of this material, repeating with increasing declamatory emphasis and within the developing harmonic line.

Dvořák’s use of melodic material can give the performers clues as to the most effective phrasing and interpretation of the material. Taking for example the third movement of Dvořák’s Sonata in bar 125 where the violin plays a melody labelled *espressivo* over a simple syncopated accompaniment in the piano. (Fig 13.) It would perhaps be tempting for the violinist to use a slight rhythmic inflection to heighten the *espressivo* feel; to perform the melodic material in an expressive, lilting and rhythmically free manner. From bar 133 the piano repeats the same *espressivo* material in octaves in the right hand, the pitches one and two octaves higher than the violin’s rendition. The nature of the performance on piano of a melody in octaves could be assumed to produce a simpler, more even and less inflected performance. The way Dvořák voiced the melody in the piano can thus inform a violinist about the character of this melodic material and perhaps how the composer intended the *espressivo* marking to be interpreted.

Contrastingly, the previous passage (bars 109–124) features two pairs of four bars of contrasting material. (Fig 13.) A rising rhythmic figure in the piano drives the music forward and is answered by a four-bar violin melody over a single piano chord, seemingly suspended in time. This simplicity of accompaniment in the second half of the twin phrases allows the violin to seize the opportunity to play in a more expansive, slightly imprecise manner to heighten the aesthetic effects already established by Dvořák’s instrumentation.
Fig 13. Bars 108–142 from Sonata in F Major, Movement 3 by Dvořák.\textsuperscript{225}

\textsuperscript{225} Ibid. 20–21
Aesthetic Observations and Comparison

Perhaps the most arresting and captivating movement is the third, labelled *Allegro Molto*. Smaczny refers to the “particularly Slavonic character of the finale” without further expanding on the musical characteristics which make this association useful, except for providing the information that Dvořák wrote his *Slavonic Dances* only two years before.\(^{226}\) The movement is rich in rhythmic interest with the opening melody requiring a mix of lifted strokes and accents to help the melody skip with great character through its treatment in various keys.

In this movement we can also observe the use of “bustling independent lines” which do not conform to strict contrapuntal writing. (Fig 14.) This active writing is the primary distinction between the Sonata and Janáček’s *Romance* and *Dúmka*. The sonata uses a far more complex interplay between the two instruments, treating them more as equal musical voices. The development of melodic material is more sophisticated, using more than simple embellishment to bring variety to repetitions of the theme. Dvořák’s sonata also demands significantly more of its performers in technique and uses the widely contrasting articulations possible on the violin to heighten the fluidity of the role played; at times soloist, at times accompaniment as well as a closely linked partner to the piano.

\(^{226}\) Smaczny, “Program Notes for Recording of Dvorak Ballade by Marwood and Tomes.”, 3.
Fig 14. Bars 157–170 from Sonata in F Major, Movement 3 by Dvořák.²²⁷

Chapter Six: The Ballade and Ballada

Perhaps another useful approach in the comparison and exploration of the aesthetics of Dvořák and Janáček would be to consider their writing in a shared form or from a shared inspiration. Both composers wrote a Balada, or Ballade, for violin and piano. Aesthetically these works are closely linked despite the discrepancy in their date of composition. In Czech the accepted spelling of this form is usually Balada and the term is used to refer to a simple, often sentimental narrative song. Janáček labelled his work Ballada, an idiosyncrasy which is seemingly unexplained in the literature. Chopin’s use of Ballade to refer to a longer and more dramatic type of poetical, heroic ballad is probably less closely applicable to the Baladas of Dvořák and Janáček which are both relatively short and outwardly simple.\textsuperscript{228} However, both works are deeply expressive and evocative and thus draw the listener into the realm of storytelling and rhetoric.

The Violin Sonata of 1914 is widely considered the pinnacle of Janáček’s writing for the instrument and demonstrates the composer’s mature style and a response to World War One.\textsuperscript{229} As such, the sonata has received far more scholarly attention than Janáček’s early works for violin and piano. Thorough traditional analysis of the sonata can be found in such sources as the dissertation by Danijela Zezelj-Gualdi.\textsuperscript{230} Less comprehensive descriptions exist in the literature by the foremost Czech musical scholars to whom I have made reference many times in the course of this study. As my intention is to approach this repertoire from a

\textsuperscript{229} Němcová quotes Janáček’s remark to O. Nebuška of January 21, 1922; ‘In a Tale for Cello and Piano a gleam of sharp steel flashed through my mind; In the Sonata for Violin and Piano of 1914 I almost heard its clanging in my troubled mind’. Němcová, “Introduction to the Complete Critical Edition of the Works of Leoš Janáček; Compositions for Violin and Piano.”, xiv.
\textsuperscript{230} Zezelj-Gualdi, "Leoš Janacek's Violin Sonata and How It Compares to the Violin Sonatas of Brahms and Debussy".
phenomenological perspective and draw some comparison between the aesthetics of Dvořák and Janáček, I will refer principally to the sonatas second movement, the *Ballada*.

The second movement *Ballada* was composed first and published separately in 1915. Janáček heavily revised the sonata several times and the final version from 1921 is the most frequently performed today. The revision included swapping and replacing movements. The genesis of the sonata which occurred over a period of nearly seven years has been thoroughly researched and debated. There exists a separate and relevant performance piece in the *Allegro* of 1916 which was at one time a part of the second revision of the sonata.

---

231 Ibid. 16.
6.1 Dvořák’s *Ballade*

Dvořák’s *Ballade* for violin and piano was written in 1884 and intended for publication in the Christmas edition of the London Magazine of Music.\(^{232}\) This was a period where Dvořák’s international reputation was flourishing and he received several commissions from England. Like the early works of Janáček, the *Romance* and *Dúmka*, Dvořák’s *Ballade* explores the lower register of the violin in a stately and yet devastatingly dark mood. Smaczny identifies the tragic and passionate tone and the reflective opening as looking forward to the style of Janáček, although I cannot locate a source where he elaborates on this identification.\(^{233}\)

**Form and Harmony**

Dvořák’s *Ballade* is written entirely in D minor. The work has many features which combine to create the musical aesthetic in which the violin leads the voice-like expression and speaks clearly to the listener. The tonality adds to this affect by allowing the violin to play in a key where sympathetic resonance and all four open strings are available to add to the timbral palette of the performer. The raised pitches of melodic minor allow extra opportunities for expressive intonation.\(^{234}\)

Two *Lento* sections are contrasted with a short central *Allegro agitato* in which both instruments play more virtuosic and turbulent music. The *Lento* marking is complemented by the violin and piano both walking slowly in crotchets, the piano chords simply colouring the melodic statements of the violin. The slow harmonic

---

\(^{232}\) Smaczny, “Program Notes for Recording of Dvorak Ballade by Marwood and Tomes.”

\(^{233}\) Ibid.

development and unchanging harmonic rhythm helps to evoke the mournful atmosphere.

The contrast in character between the Lento and Allegro agitato sections is heightened in several ways by the instrumental writing. The range for both instruments is significantly increased with sweeping arpeggio figurations which create an energy and sheer volume of sound not yet reached in the Ballade. This is by far the most virtuosic writing for both instruments in the piece and creates a great contrast of energy and pace. The contracted use of the accented mordent figures leads to a climax of ascending and descending octaves in the violin from bar 47. Energy is drained from the music in the space of only two and a half bars and we return again to the primary material in a mournful repetition with very slight rhythmic variation and dynamic gradation.

Rhythmic Features

The opening four-bar phrase begins with two bars of slurred scalar melody, the second bar a slight variation of the first as the melody seems to retread the first statement but with the addition of an expressive dynamic swell. The second two bars of this opening phrase feature rhetorical and rhythmic figures where an identical descending slur is repeated three times, each time with a sfz (fp in the piano) marking. The stress on the beginning of these figures is emphasised by upper mordents which seem to create a sort of musical ‘sigh’. (Fig 15.) Combined with the significant repetition, dynamic and expressive markings, this figure seems to express profound regret or loss, as if the ‘singer’ mourns the story they are telling even as it is being told. These sets of three accented mordent figures are also used, with shorter note
lengths, in the central *Allegro agitato* section and help connect the new material with the expression of the *Lento* statements.

Fig 15. Bars 1–4 of the *Ballade* in D minor by Dvořák.  

![Fig 15. Bars 1–4 of the Ballade in D minor by Dvořák.](image)

The material is then repeated with slight rhythmic variation and embellishment in the violin and altered chordal accompaniment. By specifying the slurring, slight dynamic swells, as well as the minim spacings of the *sfz* accents, Dvořák has established the larger pulse of two in a bar which helps keep the material moving forward even within the slow tempo. As so many features of the writing suggest *Lento* and slow consistent movement, it is interesting to experiment with tempo variation and rubato to intensify expression. The sparse rhythmic variation in the piano persists for the entire work, excepting a syncopated/triplet figure at bar 68 and the contrasting *Allegro agitato*. The melodic material, though varied throughout the work, is primarily the same and can become somewhat monotonous with strict metronomic playing. Hurrying and slowing can heighten the expression of the melody and the underlying harmonies.

---

Instrumentation

The violin writing in both *Lento* sections stays clearly within the vocal range with few intervallic steps larger than a fifth. When Dvořák employs larger intervallic leaps, for example the fourth beat of bar 8, it plays a clear expressive role and helps to launch the violin into the first forte material. These dramatic contrasts in dynamics, which occur within almost every phrase, intensify the impassioned and unsettled emotional expression of the *Ballade*.

The frequent use of tenuto markings underneath a slur helps to create expressive variety within the rhythmic consistency of the writing. This could also be assumed provide extra inflection in the meaning and expression of the melody line. Variation in bow pressure, speed and contact point can help to use the full expressive possibilities of these markings.

Each section of the *Lento* material is brought to a halt by expressive declamatory violin writing which, although not marked differently, is almost unaccompanied and seemingly crying out for expressive rhythmic inflection. After this ‘cadenza-like’ passage in the return of the original material, Dvořák ends with a ghostly coda of only five bars. The *morendo* marking is matched with long, languid rising notes in the violin climb towards the heavens as the piano accompaniment descends and then dwindles to nothing.
6.2 Janáček’s Ballada

Form and Harmony

Janáček’s Ballada shares many features with Dvořák’s Ballade but it is a more formally and harmonically complex work. The movement is built from short, contrasting sections of melodic material in which the idiomatic possibilities of this instrumental combination are heightened in various ways. The first melodic statement shows Janáček’s typical brevity with a three-bar motive, which is then elongated and repeated to form the first two phrases. Zezelj-Gualdi identifies this predisposition for brief melodies in the main themes of every movement of the sonata.236

The frequent changes between E Major and Db Major create a similar contrast of timbre to that in the Dúmka. The opening E major con moto theme transforms quickly into Db major at bar 18. The aural contrast between E Major and Db Major is increased on the violin as the resonant open A and E strings, available for use in E Major, are muted in the new key. The instrumental colour of the violin writing in Db Major is more covered and colours the mood created by the meno mosso indication and the languid rolling chords of the melody in the piano. Again, the interpreter could choose to use particular fingerings as well as bow speed and pressure to heighten this effect.

Rhythmic Features

Janáček’s use of short, repetitive themes, ostinato patterns and motives based on three repeated notes strongly links the melodic and rhythmic material in the Ballada and shows the hallmarks of the composer’s mature style. The melodic material of the opening con moto statement is rhythmically very closely linked to the meno mosso

material, featuring a ‘Janáček’ rhythm identified by Beveridge and many other scholars. Beveridge identifies this rhythmic characteristic in the five principle themes of the *Idyll* and describes it thus:

As is well known, the asymmetrical rhythms of Janáček’s mature style stem in large part form his concern with imitating the rhythms of speech in the Czech language, and it would appear that this was already a factor (subconsciously?) in the composition of his *Idyll*. The Czech language has a rhythmic peculiarity ... which is well-illustrated by Janáček’s own name, in which the first syllable is the most accented but not the longest. (The čarka, which appears to Westerners as an accent mark, actually locates the syllable of greatest length and does not indicate stress).\(^{237}\)

In figure 16 we can observe Beveridge’s identification of five themes in which the first note is on the downbeat and is relatively short. This leads directly to a longer note at a less stressed point in the measure.

---

**Example 1. Janáček *Idyll***

1. Third mvt., m. 1
2. Fifth mvt., m. 41
3. Sixth mvt., m. 41
4. Seventh mvt., m. 1
5. Seventh mvt., m. 60

---

\(^{237}\) Beveridge, "Janáček and Czech Music.", 264.
\(^{238}\) Ibid. 265.
In the opening theme of Janáček’s *Ballada* we can observe the same rhythmic characteristic, an understanding of which may help inform the performer about the direction and emphasis within the opening phrase. (Fig 17.)

Fig 17. Bars 1–3 from Janáček’s *Ballada* from the Violin Sonata.²³⁹

Zezelj-Gualdi discusses the same opening motive, describing it as an altered version of the ‘hook-motive’ identified by Skoumal.²⁴⁰ In *Structure in the Late Instrumental Music of Leoš Janáček*, Skoumal describes “the three-note ‘hook-motive’ [which] combines two intervals, one relatively small, one relatively large. The smaller interval is a minor or a major second, while the larger interval typically does not exceed a sixth.”²⁴¹ In the *Ballada*, Zezelj-Gualdi identifies that the ‘hook-motive’ is “changed from the initial prototype since a minor third is the smaller interval. The answer to the motive is its own inversion in [bar 2] in the violin. This transforms a minor third into a minor second, as one would expect in the ‘hook-motive’.”²⁴²

Although this observation about the nature of Janáček’s motivic construction may be interesting and help to connect this work with Janáček’s output, it provides

²⁴⁰ Zezelj-Gualdi, "Leoš Janacek's Violin Sonata and How It Compares to the Violin Sonatas of Brahms and Debussy", 22.
²⁴² Zezelj-Gualdi, "Leoš Janacek's Violin Sonata and How It Compares to the Violin Sonatas of Brahms and Debussy". 23.
little information that would help or even influence the performance of the relevant material in performance. Literature of this sort may inform the performer of the theoretical understanding of Janáček’s style but in a manner which is almost entirely disengaged from the act of realisation of a work in performance. For this reason I will not expand upon the identification of similar thematic devises, including ‘mirror’ rhythms and polyrhythms, which do not necessarily lead to understanding of the sort pursued in this project.  

Instrumentation

It is again pertinent to discuss Janáček’s use of doubling in this later work. The Ballada has the violin double the melody in the piano from bar 82. The violin is written at the highest pitch yet used in the movement with the markings pianissimo and dolcissimo to perhaps indicate to the performer the use of an ethereal sound. This effect creates a sound world where the violin is used to colour and brighten the sound of the piano, adding to the creation of sparkling colour in the movement.

Another feature which heightens this effect occurs from bar 78 when the piano begins the melodic material in this phrase first while the violin floats upwards to the pitch at which it joins the piano’s melodic material from bar 82. In this way the doubling differs from that used in the Romance as the added elements of a higher register and dynamic and expressive markings change the interplay of the instruments. Again, this effect brings to mind earlier sonata instrumentation styles where the violin is used as a secondary instrument to colour the principal material in the piano.

243 Zezely-Gualdi discusses the concept of ‘mirror themes’ which is seemingly at odds with the frequent identification of Janáček’s asymmetrical melodic writing. Ibid. 29.
Fig 18. Bars 78–89 from Janáček’s *Ballade* from the Violin Sonata.\(^{244}\)

\(^{244}\) Krejčí, ed. *Leoš Janáček Compositions for Violin and Piano; Complete Critical Edition*. 31–32.
Aesthetic Observations
Janáček’s fascination with nature is seemingly reflected in the Ballada. The evocative use of colour created by Janáček’s instrumentation creates the arresting sound world of the Ballada from the very first bar. The violin and piano launch into the first soaring melody together with the piano’s octaves in the anacrusis providing depth and weight to the violins melody. The violin is placed firmly within the vocal range while the fluttering piano ostinato sits an octave higher. This creates an effect which perhaps suggests light shimmering and reflecting across water and evokes pastoral and natural associations. Janáček included a vivid description with his Lachian Dances of a “rapid current…with its waters capped with foam” in his introduction entitled My Lachian Country.²⁴⁵

In his Violin Sonata, Janáček shows a masterful understanding of the instrumental and musical possibilities of writing for violin and piano. Janáček’s use of contrast in key and the resulting change of timbre in his Ballade is also observable in the Dúmka and show the performer that these early works cannot simply be dismissed as unworthy because they do not yet demonstrate a mature personal style. Janáček’s interesting use of doubling the melody in the Ballada also draws connections to the aesthetic of the Romance as well as perhaps indicating Janáček’s understanding and immersion in other styles besides that of his homeland.

Comparative Aesthetic Observations

There are several obvious similarities in the aesthetic writing for violin and piano Dvořák’s Ballade and Janáček’s Ballada. “Cadenza-like,” declamatory passages are written for the violin and serve a climactic structural purpose as well as being an aurally arresting interruption. (Fig 19.) Dvořák’s cadenza-like writing frames the twin sections of Lento material and provides the transition in the central section and into the coda which ends the short piece.

The writing in these Lento sections immediately captures the listener as the piano fails to provide the walking, rhythmic accompaniment which has been omnipresent in the work so far. The violin traverses the entire range so far explored in the piece and descends to the very deepest register of the instrument pausing on the last and deepest notes to signal the transition into the new material

Fig 19. Bars 26–31 from Dvořák’s Ballade in D Minor. 246

Similarly, Janáček employs dramatic rhetorical writing in the *senza rigore* sections which bring the *Ballada* to a structural and emotional climax. (Fig 20.) A single *semplice* repetition of the first theme separates this virtuosic section from the coda which ends the work. Unlike in the Dvořák *Ballade*, Janáček keeps the piano involved, creating a dramatic backdrop for the violin. The piano’s ostinato is marked *colla parte* and notated with repeat signs and an accelerando to help the pianist to support and follow the building energy and rapidity in the violin’s “cadenza-like” writing.

Fig 20. Bars 115–118 from Janáček’s *Ballade* from the Violin Sonata.\(^{247}\)

Both composers end their Ballade with a coda that has strikingly similar writing for the violin and piano. In both works the emotional and passionate musical content seems to have been already spent with a calmer mood indicated by the dynamics, tempo marking and the simplicity of the figurations. In both works the

---

violin seems to float upwards into the highest register as if drifting into the distance, away from the earthly concerns expressed in the piece.

The way the piano conveys this ‘drifting off’ effect in the coda is slightly different. Dvořák’s *Ballade* sees the piano in contrary motion to the violin, descending downwards with material which suggests the piece’s opening melody, now written in the major. (Fig 21.) This melodic material is repeated three times in descent before three repeated chords which end the work.

![Fig 21. Bars 82–87 from Dvořák’s Ballade.](image)

Janáček’s coda seems to ‘drift off’ by having the ostinato seemingly lose energy and evaporate. By alternating bars of ostinato with bars of silence Janáček is changing what is perhaps the most overriding aural constant of the work. The ostinato

---

underpins almost every phrase of the *Ballada*, excepting the Db Major material first present in bar 18.

Though inexact and inconsistent notation is a common challenge in deciphering Janáček’s works, here it provides an interesting consideration for performance. Between the single bars of ostinato in the coda (bb130-139), there is no indication for the pianist to release the pedal and therefore it is an aesthetic choice left to the performer. If the pianist does not release the pedal, the shimmering resonance of the single ostinato bars floats through the empty ones providing a very different effect underneath the floating notes of the violin. It could be considered to be very much a part of the musical aesthetic of the writing in this coda.
Fig 22. Bars 128–139 of Janáček’s *Ballada* from the Violin Sonata.²⁴⁹

And so, with performative study of these pieces and consideration of the elements which help to form an effective performance, certain differences and commonalities are instantly recognisable. While the works for violin and piano are perhaps modest in relation to the outputs of Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček, the works are significant and worthy of further study and performance. The elements of each composer’s aesthetics which are identifiable in these works can be heightened by the performers in the choices made to facilitate both performance and emotional

expression. The inescapable association of these works with Czech culture is coloured by an understanding of each composer’s interaction with the people, philosophies and cultures which most influenced their compositional aesthetic.
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