

Symphony in the 20th Century

In my article I would like to touch upon a few general issues concerning the condition of the symphony in the 20th century. Why is it still composed, why is it so diverse? And at what angles do the theorists tend to look on it notwithstanding this multitude? Hopefully, by arising these concerns some new light will be shed on the holistic image of this cycle in the 20th century and new perspectives will be established in reference to the development of the genre in the 20th century.

Is there any place for her? or Is symphony dead?

The dramatically changing reality of the 20th century left its marks on composers and their choice of composed genres. While adapting to the new situation (resulting from such events as two world wars, globalisation effect, etc.) composers either consciously or subconsciously tended to prefer some genres and neglect others. Roger Sessions once remarked that "We often hear the query, for instance, whether this or that category of music is still 'alive' or 'dead' or 'dying' – *the opera, for instance, the symphony, the concerto, or chamber music*"¹. That the symphony appears on that list is not a matter of coincidence. At the beginning of the 20th century Claude Debussy kept asking "Must we conclude that the symphony, in spite of so many attempted transformations, belongs to the past by virtue of its studied elegance, its formal elaboration and the philosophical and artificial attitude of its audience?"². The "problem" of the condition of symphony in the 20th century perhaps to the best extend is illustrated by the specific situation of the purely instrumental music, which drew a lot of contemporary composers' attention.

As commonly known it was the 19th century European cultural tendency to assign a place of honour to instrumental music. Already in the novel "Herzensegießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders" published in 1797 and in the article "Symphonien" dated two years later early Romantic intellectuals, namely Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder and Ludwig Tieck asserted the instrumental music its high status, contributing at the same time much to the promotion of 'Absolute' music, though the actual term was coined half a century later³. The ascribed 'purity' of instrumental music was hailed as its divine quality – the sacrum aspect of music was mirrored in viewing it in almost religious terms. Wackenroder–Tieck way of thinking and writing about music was adopted by other authors, to mention Johann Gottfried von Herder, who as early as in 1793 already demanded the sacral contemplation of music⁴. In 1844 in the second volume of his monumental work "The World as Will and Representation" Arthur Schopenhauer concluded a special relation between music and will "because music does not, like all the other arts, exhibit the Ideas or grades of the will's objectification, but directly the will itself", the reason enough for the philosopher to proclaim music "a certainly independent art; in fact, it is the most powerful of all the arts, and therefore attains its ends entirely from its own resources"⁵.

So pompously defined role of the instrumental music began, however, to be questioned in the early 20th century. The composer Hans Eisler proclaimed in 1935 that purely instrumental music lost its impact and "...modern composers are of the opinion that 'absolute music' <...> cannot express anything definite at all, and certainly nothing about 'the urgent issues of our day'. Music without words, they say, cannot achieve this nor is it the purpose of music"⁶. Eisler criticism rests entirely on his philosophical bias. He argues that "by 1933 there were no longer any achievements of significance in this sphere and it is quite impossible to define the purpose of a symphony. So a really progressive composer will have to realize that this is a completely archaic art form, which should no longer be employed"⁷. By direct reference to the well established forms of musical life, whose rituals were aimed at the majority of wealthy city dwellers wishing to indicate and sustain their position within the society, Eisler suggests that "instrumental music and the concert <...> arose and developed within capitalist society and they enter a crisis when capitalist society enters a crisis"⁸. As a consequence 99 percent of listeners in the 20th century would say "Give us more entertainment music and less symphonies"⁹. This line of thinking was supported by American

composer Roger Sessions, who nearly 30 years later wrote a smashing diagnosis observing that "a good piece of popular music has a far better chance for what we call 'immortality' than a bad symphony"¹⁰. Both composers, although in different words, pinpointed two important issues:

- 1) in the 20th century popular music slowly, but consequently was overtaking the place of old genres including symphony;
- 2) old genres used to serve different social purposes, and consequently in the 20th century either they transformed in the process of adaptation or seemed doomed to die out.

Eisler sees symphony as the genre belonging to old predominance of instrumental music: the symphony embodied the expression of philosophical or religious aspirations, whereas 20th century symphony was merely a type of testing material and/or serving strictly utilitarian function as understood and defined by *Gebrauchsmusik* postulates¹¹.

Pondering on the topic whether it is worthwhile to compose a symphony Ernst Křenek deliberated over such a dilemma: perhaps there is no need, whatsoever, to conceive new pieces of music because old ones are still well functioning and being played by orchestras. The composer – quite honestly, even abruptly – says that "According to strict business standards, the manufacture of new symphonies, for instance, can be justified only, if the old ones are worn out beyond repair and if new ones can be made faster and cheaper and sold to more people than old ones"¹².

Harsh as it may sound the issue of the market demand for new symphonies proved a real obstacle for most modern composers. Most professional and semi-professional orchestras preferred to perform well established repertoire comprising of popular, widely recognized symphonies. Especially Beethoven's place had been long asserted and unshaken: his compositions had been performed most commonly since the 19th century. For example, the Vienna Society of the Friends of Music put almost all Beethoven's symphonies in the programmes of their concerts held between 1817 and the year of Beethoven's death – 1827. In fact these concerts mostly featured Beethoven's works (total number twenty seven), preceded by Mozart's (total number seventeen)¹³. Conductors and musical directors of most philharmonic halls of the 20th century remained interested mainly in Romantic symphonies, also because of the inherited from the previous epochs standardised grouping of instruments within an orchestra. Elliott Carter wrote: "Developed to play romantic music based on a common practice of standardized harmony, rhythm and counterpoint, of singing themes, of widening sonority by octave doubling, the orchestra seems to require this kind of music to justify its existence"¹⁴. Consequently orchestras and their leaders were interested only in such new symphonies, in which the instruments followed the late 19th century image of what the orchestra should sound like. Carter complained that "Because it is difficult to get multiple performances with American symphony orchestra, <...> composers do not write for this medium unless they are commissioned or have the stimulus of a prize contest"¹⁵. Because many composers of the 20th century felt that the orchestra as a medium "is dying"¹⁶ they seriously considered not writing symphonic pieces any more. Even Lutosławski pondered whether or not to compose for large orchestras. "Is the symphony orchestra as such no more than a museum piece, a relic bequeathed to us by the generations that came before us? Or is it perhaps a living organism, showing no signs of age, with years of development still lying ahead of it?"¹⁷. That was a serious question to be answered as the efforts of composers trying to compose symphonies in the 20th century were often heavily criticised by other composers. Hans Henze said: "Between Stravinsky and Webern everything which still passes for symphony seems to be rejoinder, obituary, or echo"¹⁸.

Is she still alive?

or Why composers wanted to write symphonies in the 20th century?

Despite all these difficulties it seems that symphony survived: in the beginning of the 20th century as a continuation of Romantic tradition and later the genre indeed managed to adapt to the new reality and find its place as the result of the process of re-establishing its status.

Performance opportunities

One of the modes the symphony as a genre sustained throughout the whole 20th century was the post Romantic tradition. Carter concluded in 1939 that "the magniloquent and grandiose symphonic style is the popular, prestige style of today"¹⁹. In fact in order to meet the demand coming from the philharmonic halls interested in that kind of repertoire composers, as Carter says

usually "European composers still feel the need, <...> to write for large orchestras and can get their works played because of state subsidies – the Stalinist symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich and quite a few recent Polish and German works"²⁰. However, composers of such symphonies (including already mentioned Shostakovich and, for example, Sibelius) were accused, among others by Arthur Berger, of "being celebrated for the perpetuation of the nineteenth-century Romantic symphonic approach"²¹, and sustaining the status of the icons of the "pro-Romantic propaganda"²². In "*Monsieur Croche the Dilettante Hater*" Debussy wrote that this type of the composer "is engaged in listening modestly to the voice of tradition which prevents him, it seems to me, from hearing the voice that speaks within him"²³.

Publishing opportunities

Honegger decided that monumental operas were not to be written but instead "All that remains are symphonies, sonatas, and other trifles"²⁴ especially in the vogue but still existent possibility of publishing these works. Apparently, Honegger says, publishers are prone to consider publishing "the works of great composers of genius who still amuse themselves by writing sonatas and symphonies"²⁵. Although composers would still write symphonies, some of them, though, would call them differently. Tippet says that "In the present period many older composers find the traditional titles for instrumental forms confusing. It is no wonder that the younger composers mostly eschew such titles altogether, because in *avant-garde* oriented time, all received remains must be excluded if possible. Also the received titles such as 'symphony', 'concert', 'sonata', and 'suite' really are, at present, imprecise and confusing"²⁶. Whether the name 'symphony' is really confusing or not is one thing, the other would be to what lengths composers went and what they did in order to have their symphonies published. Sessions mentions the situation in which "a very distinguished European composer <...> told me that his publisher had refused to publish any more symphonies. His comment was, 'So I just call them something else'"²⁷.

The final test of the composing skills/instrumentation

If a composer could prove(s) he is able to handle the orchestra(s), he could be nominated by other composers or pass in their eyes as a 'real' composer. In order to prove to conservatoire professors and the musical society that an aspiring composer perfected the art of composing producing a large piece of music began to be required, and symphony was often considered as a coronation of the conservatoire studies, especially in the light of the growing role of the art of instrumentation. Both, achievements of some composers in that field and the influential treatises on that subject (by H. Berlioz and N. Rimsky-Korsakov) made a lasting impact on composers in the early 20th century.

And indeed writing a symphony in the 20th century for most composers still remained the proof of their *métier*. Not only for traditionalists but also *avant-garde* composers because as Hindemith observed "the most radical inventors adhere to the traditional forms of the sonata and the symphony"²⁸. That was perhaps the reason composers often confessed how much they wanted to compose a symphony. Suffice quote one of them, Henri Dutilleaux, who said "To put it more simply, without reference to anyone else I wanted to attempt this kind of work – to write a symphony – and I was happy trying"²⁹.

What does a *symphony* mean for 20th century composers?

As mentioned before the genre of symphony, in order to survive, needed to conform to new expectations posed on it. Consequently the understanding of what the symphony is in the 20th century changed among composers. Although they never abandoned the genre, quite often they transformed the meaning of the term *symphony*. Michael Tippett said that there are two possibilities of looking at the symphony: "The two contrasting conceptions or ideas of what is meant by a symphony are: a historical archetype <...> and a notional archetype"³⁰. As a historical archetype Tippett understands, for example, the middle symphonies of Beethoven, this type of symphonies reached their peak in the past. As a notional archetype Tippett names, for example, Mahler's symphonies that permit "endless variations to the end of time"³¹.

Completely different definition of a symphony – based on literary associations – was provided by Arthur Honegger, who compared a symphony "with a novel in which the themes are the

characters"³². An attempt to reflect on the symphony from a philosophical point of view was suggested by Roberto Gerhard, who in a rather pessimistic tone noted that "A symphony has perhaps no objective existence in reality"³³.

How to write about the 20th century symphony?

In the light of such an abundance of different ways of understanding what a symphony represents even among the 20th century composers writing about symphonies in the 20th century is never an easy task. Various approaches exist: for example, Stephen Walsh in the article on symphony in the *New Grove Dictionary* proposes to look at the 20th century symphony through the prism of geographical regions. He characterizes the development of the symphony after the year 1918 in France and Germany together, in the USA, Britain, in the USSR, later in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe as well as Germany after WWII³⁴. Additionally Walsh singles out some composers whose input in the development of the genre in the 20th century (according to his opinion) justifies separate entries. These are: before 1918 Mahler, Sibelius and Nielsen, and after 1918 Stravinsky, Hindemith and in the USSR Shostakovich. This approach, celebrating the individuality of each composer writing symphonies in the 20th century was adopted by Preston Stedman³⁵ who in his book on the symphony's development from the Baroque to modern times devoted three out of eight chapters to the 20th century symphony. In his studies he wrote about Sibelius, Vaughan Williams, Prokofiev, Schostakovich, Stravinsky and Hindemith. Additionally, he characterized the symphony in America presenting examples from Harris, Schumann, Copland and Riegger compositions. In the section "Other 20th century symphonists" Stedman presented a list of other composers writing symphonies stemming from the USA, Britain, Poland, Russia, Germany and Austria, Scandinavia, and France as well as Latin America.

In the diversity of symphonies composed in the 20th century there can be distinguished, however, some common features. Not only are they present in the scores of symphonies, but composers themselves talked much about them. Most modern composers were very eager to write analysis and comments concerning their own works. They would often write in details about their own particular symphonies, as if proud of their achievements. After investigating a number of such analysis I established a few common themes most composers picked up in their texts, apparently important to all 20th century composers writing symphonies.

Form

Length

Symphony has always been considered a large form, despite the tendency of shortening its length (the appearance of *sinfonietta* in the 1880s). Aware of this fact Chavez noted that "actual size has a lot to do with the problem of form"³⁶. The big size of a symphony called for a number of various musical solutions. "The large symphonic form demands, along with other things, themes and thematic complexes which permit themselves to be elaborated and worked together in closed movements and in various ways: contrasting sectional conceptions, dynamic crescendos and climaxes, and differing activities in typified and discrete movements"³⁷.

Closeness

Lutosławski observed that "the term 'symphony', in the same manner as the terms 'sonata', 'variations', and others, refers to the concept of a closed form"³⁸. Having stated that he continues: "Composing closed forms, we also take large advantage of the fact that music is a form of art which does take place in time. Consequently, one of the reasons why we compose music is to evoke in the listener a series of specific reactions whose sequence and development in time is of essential importance to the final result, that is to the perception of the composition as a whole"³⁹. In this continuum Lutosławski sees "a psychological aspect to the creation of musical forms"⁴⁰. But the closeness of the form of a symphony can be also seen as a disadvantage and Lutosławski himself preferred opened forms.

Structure

The most important issue about the symphony remained the concept of its cyclic structure as such. Debussy adhered to the old tradition and wrote the following paragraph about structuring

the symphony: "A symphony is usually built upon a chant heard by the composer as a child. The first section is the customary presentation of the theme on which the composer proposes to work; then begins the necessary dismemberment; the second section seems to take place in an experimental laboratory; the third section cheers up a little in a quite childish way interspersed with deeply sentimental phrases which chant withdraws as is more seemly; but it reappears and the dismemberment goes on"⁴¹. Modern composers, although willing to challenge this old principle of the cycle were aware of the difficulties awaiting them in accomplishing such a task. Carlos Chavez observed that "It goes without saying that musical forms in our day are more elaborate and developed than in the early days, but they remain essentially A, A, A, etc., AB, AC, AD, etc., ABC, ABC, etc.; that is to say, prototype forms became archetype forms: ballade, rondo, sonata, etc."⁴². Consequently composers stayed faithful to them as the basic forms for music composition are relatively few. Especially because – as rightly pointed in 1978 by Gunther Schuller – the chance to create a new, good form "is given very few composers to achieve in any significant way"⁴³.

Coherence

What preoccupied composers, then, throughout the 20th century was the unity of the form called symphony and ways of achieving the coherence within a given piece of music. In 1961 Sessions wrote that first of all every composer will find himself preoccupied with such issues as "unity, coherence, rhythmic balance and balance of contrast, consistency of idiom"⁴⁴. How are these achieved in the symphony? Or to repeat Furtwängler's question "How can we create an entity, a whole?"⁴⁵. Furthermore, how can this be fulfilled without an effect of over-doing in such a large form as a symphony without so criticised abundance? Pierre Boulez commenting on the form in Webern's *Symphony* complained that it "is so rich that <...> canonic and mirror structures can be totally lost in ambiguity"⁴⁶.

Logics

It seems that in cyclic form of a symphony composers longed for "Simplification, logic, economy!"⁴⁷ as postulated by Honegger. He explained "...a symphonic work must be built logically, without the possibility of interjecting the slightest element between its different parts"⁴⁸. Honegger advocated the logics, almost mathematical precision: "It has been said that architecture is frozen music, I should rather say that it is geometry in time. Here, as elsewhere, one must be very exacting, so as to achieve an absolute equilibrium"⁴⁹. Hindemith agreed with him totally saying that "balance, evenness, and conscious proportionality – ideals which for the past hundred and fifty years or more have scarcely ever been postulated"⁵⁰.

Symmetry and repetition appear as fundamental factors contributing to establishing the postulated logics. Chavez wrote about symmetry that "Atavism has rooted symmetric rhythmical patterns very deeply in our subconscious"⁵¹. He was also baffled by the phenomenon of repetition in music: "To what degree is repetition, so connatural to us, actually to our pleasure?"⁵². He actually listed three situations where using repetition seems worthwhile. "Repetition is a way of making oneself understood quickly and unmistakably as in incantation. <...> Repetition has been the expedient employed to achieve unity with just enough variety <...>. Repetition is the condition of symmetry"⁵³.

Instrumentation

Most 20th century composers who wrote symphonies and also wrote *about* symphonies pondered on the topic of instrumentation. The already mentioned art of instrumentation never lost its impact. However, the new times required new and changed policy towards it. Carter wrote "If there is still any point in composing for orchestra, it is to treat the medium with as much novelty of concept as one does harmony, rhythm or any of the older musical methods, so rethought in our time <...>"⁵⁴. The best solution it seemed to Carter was following: "To compose for the orchestra, as far as I am concerned, is to deal practically with the instruments, writing idiomatic passages for them, and, particularly, to compose music whose very structure and character are related to the instruments that play it. The combinations of instruments are as much a compositional consideration as the material they play even to determining the material, and all must reflect the over-all intention, the handling of the orchestra must have the same distinctiveness and character as the

other components of the work"⁵⁵. This opinion was backed up by others. Peter Racine Fricker said "In fact, many composers today have turned away from this 'traditional' grouping [of instruments within an orchestra – *A. G. P.*], and I know of some who have stated openly that they have no interest whatever in the idea of writing for full orchestra. The emphasis is very often on smaller groups of mixed instruments, or divided groups of instruments used antiphonally. <...> The composer, faced with these conditions [the ones Carter wrote about – *A. G. P.*], has very often preferred to write for a smaller select group: highly skilled individuals, especially gathered for a festival, or for a radio performance. <...> Unless the composer is rewarded by a commission, or at least is stimulated by the premise of an adequate series of performances, he is, on the face of it, unlikely to choose to write a piece for full orchestra"⁵⁶. Composers turned to various possibilities instruments of symphonic orchestra offered. Lutosławski observed that "One way out is simply to ignore the limitations of the instruments, to idealize them, to treat them abstractly, in a manner unrelated to actual practice. <...> not bound by the restrictions inherent in tradition"⁵⁷. But Lutosławski confessed also that scores conceived this way are "often difficult to compose" and he personally found "this method entirely impractical to my purpose"⁵⁸. Another possibility – according to Lutosławski – "Experimenting with new way of playing old instruments is still another way of trying to find a solution to the problem" but personally he found it "exceedingly unnatural"⁵⁹. He says, however, that "My critical remarks <...> are not meant as criticism of the composers who employ these methods"⁶⁰.

The exploitation of new instruments seemed to be favored by some composers. Wladimir Vogel observed "The expansion and introduction of new or previously little-used instruments, particularly of percussive and other distinctive timbres"⁶¹. He renounced in orchestral instrumentation "excessive effects of tone-color in favour of 'limited' classical instrumental sonority"⁶². On the other hand, many composer turned to smaller orchestras or even preferred the homogenous groupings of string instruments. Already in 1921 Bliss wrote that "the custom of the moderns to make the instruments function in the most independent way possible has given rise in late years to the growth of the chamber orchestra, an orchestra of 10 or 12 players, shall we say, all soloists, in the texture of whose ensemble the particular timbres stand out like coloured threads is a variegated carpet"⁶³.

To compose symphonies in the 20th century was never an easy task. Composers and their works were always the target of criticism. As Honegger remarked: "...the young modern composer's symphony has all the disadvantages as compared to a great classical symphony"⁶⁴. Despite all the difficulties the genre of symphony has survived. It managed to prove that its versatility is the secret source of survival of that genre.

Notes

¹ Roger Sessions, *Questions about Music*, Harvard University Press, 1970, p. 136.

² Claude Debussy, *Monsieur Croche the Dilettante Hater* in: *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music*, ed. Elliott Schwartz and Barney Childs, New York: Da Capo Press, 1978, p. 19.

³ See Daniel K. L. Chua, *Absolute Music And the Construction of Meaning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 3.

⁴ See Carl Dahlhaus, *Idee der absoluten Musik*, Kassel–Basel–Tour–London: Bärenreiter-Verlag Vötterle, 1978, p. 87.

⁵ Arthur Schopenhauer, *The world as Will and Representation*, trans. E. F. J. Payne, New York: Dover Publications, 1966, p. 448.

⁶ Hanns Eisler, *Some Remarks on the Situation of the Modern Composer* (1935) in: Hanns Eisler, *A rebel in Music*, Berlin: Seven Seas Publishers, 1978, p. 108.

⁷ Hanns Eisler, *Some Remarks on the Situation of the Modern Composer* (1935) in: Hanns Eisler, *A rebel in Music*, op. cit., p. 108.

⁸ Hanns Eisler, *Some Remarks on the Situation of the Modern Composer* (1935) in: Hanns Eisler, *A rebel in Music*, op. cit., p. 108.

⁹ Hanns Eisler, *Labor, Labor Movement and Music* (1938) in: Hanns Eisler *A rebel in Music*, op. cit., p. 132.

¹⁰ Roger Sessions, *The Musical Experience of Composer, Performer, Listener*, New York: Atheneum, 1967, p. 41.

¹¹ Hanns Eisler, *The Crisis in Music* (1935) in: Hanns Eisler, *A rebel in Music*, op. cit., p. 117.

¹² Ernst Kr̩enek, *The Ivory Tower* in: *Exploring Music. Essays by Ernst Kr̩enek*, transl. Margaret Shenfield & Geoffrey Skelton, London: Calder and Boyars, 1966 (first published in 1958), p. 161–162.

- ¹³ See Kurt Blaukopf, *Musical Life in a Changing Society*, Portland: Amadeus Press, 1982, p. 66.
- ¹⁴ Elliott Carter in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, ed. Robert Stephen Hines, Norman University of Oklahoma Press, 1970, p. 47.
- ¹⁵ Elliott Carter, *The Writings of Elliot Carter. An American Composer Looks at Modern Music*, ed. Else Stone and Kurt Stone, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977, p. 284.
- ¹⁶ Elliott Carter, *The Writings of Elliot Carter. An American Composer Looks at Modern Music*, op. cit., p. 286.
- ¹⁷ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, ed. Robert Stephen Hines, Norman University of Oklahoma Press, 1970, p. 129.
- ¹⁸ Hans Werner Henze in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 104.
- ¹⁹ Elliott Carter, *The Writings of Elliot Carter. An American Composer Looks at Modern Music*, op. cit., p. 65.
- ²⁰ Elliott Carter, *The Writings of Elliot Carter. An American Composer Looks at Modern Music*, op. cit., p. 289.
- ²¹ Arthur Berger, *Reflections of an American Composer*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, p. 37.
- ²² Arthur Berger, *Reflections of an American Composer*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, p. 37.
- ²³ Claude Debussy, *Monsieur Croche the Dilettante Hater* in: *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music*, op. cit., p. 19–20.
- ²⁴ Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer*, transl. Wilson O. Clough, London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1966, p. 36.
- ²⁵ Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer*, op. cit., p. 44.
- ²⁶ Michael Tippett in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 203–204.
- ²⁷ Roger Sessions, *Questions about Music*, op. cit., p. 136.
- ²⁸ Paul Hindemith, *A Composer's World. Horizons and Limitations*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952, p. 119.
- ²⁹ Henri Dutilleux, *Music-Mystery and Memory*, Hants: Ashgate, 2003, p. 36.
- ³⁰ Michael Tippett in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 204.
- ³¹ Michael Tippett in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 204.
- ³² Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer*, op. cit., p. 74.
- ³³ Roberto Gerhard, *The contemporary musical situation* (1956) in: *Roberto Gerhard Gerhard on Music*, Ashgate, 2000, p. 24.
- ³⁴ Stephen Walsh, "Symphony" (part III "20th century") in: Sadie S. (ed.), *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, MacMillan Publishers, Ltd, 2001, pp. 841–847.
- ³⁵ See Preston Stedman, "The Symphony", Prentice Hall, Inc., 1979.
- ³⁶ Carlos Chavez, *Musical Thought*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961, p. 53.
- ³⁷ Wladimir Vogel in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 221.
- ³⁸ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 133.
- ³⁹ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 133.
- ⁴⁰ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 134.
- ⁴¹ Claude Debussy, *Monsieur Croche the Dilettante Hater* in: *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music*, op. cit., p. 19–20.
- ⁴² Carlos Chavez, *Musical Thought*, op. cit., p. 50.
- ⁴³ Gunther Schuller, *Toward New Classicism? in: Musings. The Musical Worlds of Gunther Schuller*, OUP, 1986, p. 180.
- ⁴⁴ Roger Sessions, *Style and "Styles in Music* (1961) in: *Roger Sessions on Music*, Princeton University Press, 1979, p. 89.
- ⁴⁵ Wilhelm Furtwängler, *Observations of a Composer* in: Wilhelm Furtwängler, *Furtwängler on Music* (ed. and transl. Ronald Taylor) London: Scolar Press, 1991, p. 24.
- ⁴⁶ Pierre Boulez, *Boulez Conversations with C. Deliege*, London: Eulenburg Books, 1976, p. 101.
- ⁴⁷ Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer* (transl. Wilson O. Clough), London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1966, p. 52.
- ⁴⁸ Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer*, op. cit., p. 79.
- ⁴⁹ Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer*, op. cit., p. 79.
- ⁵⁰ Paul Hindemith, *A Composer's World. Horizons and Limitations*, op. cit., p. 118.
- ⁵¹ Carlos Chavez, *Musical Thought*, op. cit., p. 51.
- ⁵² Carlos Chavez, *Musical Thought*, op. cit., p. 54.
- ⁵³ Carlos Chavez, *Musical Thought*, op. cit., p. 77.
- ⁵⁴ Elliott Carter in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 49.
- ⁵⁵ Elliott Carter, *The Writings of Elliot Carter. An American Composer Looks at Modern Music*, op. cit., p. 290.
- ⁵⁶ Peter Racine Fricker in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 77.
- ⁵⁷ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 130.
- ⁵⁸ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 130.
- ⁵⁹ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 131.
- ⁶⁰ Witold Lutosławski in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 131.
- ⁶¹ Wladimir Vogel in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 222.
- ⁶² Wladimir Vogel in: *The Orchestral Composer's Point of View*, op. cit., p. 222.
- ⁶³ Arthur Bliss, *What Modern Composition Is Aiming At* in: *As I remember*, London: Faber and Faber, 1970, p. 253.
- ⁶⁴ Arthur Honegger, *I am a Composer*, op. cit., p. 29.

Santrauka

Simfonija XX amžiuje

Pranešimas yra skirtas XX a. simfonijos žanrui. Nors šiame žanre amžiaus pradžioje įvyko daug revoliucingų pokyčių, jis išliko beveik visų šiuolaikinių kompozitorių kūryboje, tačiau patyrė ir nemažai transformacijų. Tarp jų galima paminėti ir formą, kuri buvo naujai traktuojama, atsižvelgiant į vyraujančius postulatus. Vis dėlto kompozitoriams šis žanras išliko labai svarbus kaip jų kūrybinės veiklos simbolis.

XX a. išryškėjo kelios raidos kryptys: nuo vėlyvojo romantizmo pasiekimų tęstinumo per išlikusias klasikinės ir net barokinės tradicijas iki visiškai naujų technikų įsisavinimo. Pranešime nagrinėjamos XX a. simfonijos problemos, mėginama pristatyti naują šio žanro tipologiją ir atkreipti dėmesį į naujas alternatyvas.

Analitinė pranešimo dalis pagrįsta daugiausia XX a. pirmos pusės Europos ir Amerikos (taip pat ir Lotynų Amerikos) kompozitorių simfonijomis. Be abejo, bendros XX a. simfonijų tendencijos, būdingos vis labiau globalėjančio pasaulio muzikai, reikalauja sisteminės sintezės, kadangi dauguma literatūros apie simfonijos žanrą nagrinėja klasikinį ir romantinį laikotarpį ir/arba greičiau pateikia atskirų simfonijų interpretacijos galimybes, o ne nušviečia bendrą XX a. simfonijos žanro situaciją.