

## LEOŠ JANÁČEK (1854–1928) , 224

*Paul Wingfield*

Leoš Janáček (b. On July 3, 1854, in Hukvaldy, Moravia) was the tenth child of a poor village schoolmaster and musician (Jiří) and his musical wife (Amálie, née Grulichová). At the age of eleven, Janáček became a choirboy at the Augustinian “Queen’s” Monastery in Brno, where his musical education was overseen by Moravia’s then leading composer Pavel Křížkovský. On leaving school, Janáček followed family tradition by training as a teacher. This lengthy process, lasting from 1869 to 1880, was punctuated by several periods of leave to study music elsewhere, most notably at the Prague Organ School (1874–1875), the Leipzig conservatory (October 1879 to March 1880), and the Vienna Conservatory (April to June 1880). (Plans to study in St. Petersburg with Anton Rubinstein and in Paris with Saint-Saëns fell through.) In Prague, Janáček encountered his most influential teacher: František Skuherský, author of two books about harmony arguing that recent music must be understood in terms of a chromatic system and stressing the importance of recent research in physics and physiology by Hermann Helmholtz and others. Skuherský’s interdisciplinary inclinations inspired Janáček to read widely, and he rapidly developed a single-minded devotion to the pursuit of knowledge in general (in later life he studied subjects as varied as Russian literature, aesthetics, acoustics, psychology, phonetics, and sociology).

During his teacher training, Janáček immersed himself in Brno’s musical life: as deputy choirmaster at the monastery, and as conductor of Svatopluk, the working men’s choir that was then the middle-class Beseda choral society. After he had been made “a full teacher of music” at the Brno Teachers’ Institute in 1880, he resided in Brno until he died. His professional career up until the end of World War I was centered on music teaching: at the institute until 1904, at the Old Brno Gymnasium from 1886 to 1902, and, most importantly, at the Brno Organ School, which he helped to found, and of which he was director

Page 225

from 1882 until 1919. Even after he retired from regular employment, he gave composition masterclasses in Brno for the Prague Conservatory (1920–1925).

Janáček continued to direct the Beseda choir until 1890, but he gradually gave up conducting as he turned to writing about music. From 1884 to 1888, he contributed opera reviews and theoretical pieces to the music journal *Hudební listy*, and from 1890 to 1892 he served as an opera critic for *Moravské listy*. A series of theoretical and analytical articles for various journals followed, culminating in his most important and substantial theoretical work: the *Complete Theory of Harmony* (1912–1913). From 1893, he started a twenty-seven-year association with the Brno daily *Lidové noviny*, writing aphoristic, populist feuilletons.

In 1888, Janáček’s colleague František Bartoš invited him on a folk-song collecting expedition to northern Moravia. This fired a lifelong interest in folk music: in addition to coediting several volumes of Moravian folk-songs and making folk-music arrangements, he wrote regularly on this topic until his death (see Vysloužil and Racek 1955). Closely related to these activities is his

work on “speech melodies” (napěvky mluvy). From around 1897, he began to reproduce in musical notation stylized versions of everyday speech, analyzing speed of delivery, register, rhythm, and intonation, and noting the influence of the mood of the utterer and environmental factors such as place, time, temperature, and the light. He wrote up his results in numerous printed articles and unpublished sources. Although he considered this study essential for an opera composer, he rejected the notion that he employed his speech-melody jottings in actual works. Rather, he saw his speech-melody research as vital preparation for writing vocal music.

Up to the age of sixty-two Janáček was a part-time composer. His earliest works are unambitious and derivative: short choral pieces in a stilted modal style reminiscent of Křivkovský, and modest instrumental compositions influenced by Antonín Dvořák, Gustav Schumann, Bedřich Smetana, and Richard Wagner. Thus, his first opera, *Šárka* (1887–1888), is heavily reliant on both Smetana and Wagner’s *Lohengrin* and *Tannhäuser*. Janáček’s 1888 trip to northern Moravia initiated an abrupt change of direction, inspiring a group of works—such as the one-act opera *Počátek románu* (The Beginning of a Romance) (1891)—that comprise little more than a string of orchestrated folk songs and/or folk dances. Slowly, he developed a more individual style. The first work embodying a “distinctive idiom” is generally thought to be the cantata *Amarus* (Tyrrell 1985, 9). But a much more significant achievement is his third opera, *Jenůfa* (Her Stepdaughter), which occupied him for nearly a decade (1894–1903). This work was a huge success in Brno, partly owing to its Moravian setting, but it was turned down for performance by the prestigious Prague National Theatre. Janáček’s next two operas are very different: *Osud* (Fate) (1903–1906 rev. 1907) has quasi-autobiographical subject matter; and the fantastic *Výlet pána Broučka do měsíce* (Mr. Brouček’s Excursion to the Moon)

Page 226

(1908–1917) is based on a satirical novel by Svatopluk Čech. Both operas had tortuous geneses, punctuated by the composition of shorter works. Many of the latter are piano pieces—*On an Overgrown Path* (1900–1911); *I. X. 1905 (Z ulice dne 1. října 1905) (I. X. 1905* [From the Street, 1 October 1905]) (1905), a sonata for piano; and *V mlhách* (In the Mists) (1912)—and chamber works written for the Brno Friends of Art Club (whose music section Janáček established in 1904): a piano trio based on Leo Tolstoy’s *The Kreutzer Sonata* (1908–1909; later reused as the basis for his first string quartet) and *Pohádka* (Fairy Tale) (1910), for cello and piano. Some of his most striking compositions from this period are the three patriotic male-voice choruses *Kantor Halfar* (1906), *Maryčka Magdónova* (1906), and *70.000 (Sedmdesát tisíc)* (70,000 [The Seventy Thousand]) (1909). In 1912–1913, he also composed his first major orchestral work, the symphonic poem *The Fiddler’s Child*.

At the outbreak of World War I, Janáček was still barely known outside Moravia. This situation was transformed by the decision in 1915 of the Prague National Opera to produce *Jenůfa*, whose Prague premiere on May 26, 1916, catapulted Janáček to prominence. Universal Edition took over the rights to the work abroad and arranged performances in Vienna, Berlin, and elsewhere. The writer Max Brod translated the text into German, becoming Janáček’s regular translator and an indefatigable advocate of his music. Janáček’s sudden success inspired a burst of creativity. He rapidly completed *Mr. Brouček’s Excursion to the Moon*, adding a sequel set in the fifteenth century (1917). He began a song cycle, *Zápisník zmizelého* (The Diary of One Who Disappeared)

(1917–1920), and he composed an orchestral rhapsody based on Nikolay Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, as well as several pieces for the Moravian Women Teachers' Choir, including *Vlčí stopa* (The Wolf's Trail) and *Kašpar Rucký* (both 1916).

Janáček's impressive industry in 1915–1918 is, however, eclipsed by the stunning creative outpouring of his final decade. Having retired from the organ school and buoyed by international recognition, he composed with an intensity scarcely matched in the history of music. He produced four further operas: *Kát'a Kabanová* (1920–1921), *Příhody lišky Bystroušky* (The Adventures of the Vixen Bystrouška) (1922–1923), *Věc Makropulos* (The Makropulos Affair) (1923–1925), and *Z mrtvého domu* (From the House of the Dead) (1927–1928). Other vocal works include perhaps his finest chorus, *Potulný šílenec* (The Wandering Madman) (1922), the blazing *Glagolská mše* (Glagolitic Mass) (1926), and the more light-hearted *Řikadla* (Nursery Rhymes) (1925–1926). He was equally active in the sphere of chamber music: he finished his violin sonata (1914–1920), and he wrote two string quartets (1923 and 1928), a wind sextet (*Mláďi*[Youth] [1924]), and two pieces for piano and chamber ensemble—the *Concertino* (1925), for piano, two violins, viola, clarinet, horn, and bassoon, and the *Capriccio* (1926), for piano left hand, flute/piccolo, two trumpets, three trombones, and tenor tuba. Moreover, having written the symphonic poem *Ballada blanická* (The Ballad of Blaník) (1919), ostensibly to celebrate Czechoslovak indepen-

Page 227

dence, he embarked on two more large-scale orchestral works: the *Sinfonietta* (1926) and the unfinished *Dunaj* (The Danube) (1923–1925?).

Each of Janáček's new operas was performed in Brno and Prague and published by Universal. *Jenůfa* was produced in Berlin and New York in 1924; *Kát'a* was given in Cologne under Otto Klemperer in 1922 and in Berlin in 1926; and Klemperer also conducted pioneering performances of the *Sinfonietta* in Berlin and New York in 1927. Janáček received a doctorate from Masaryk University in Brno in 1924, and was elected, together with Arnold Schoenberg and Paul Hindemith, to be a member of the Prussian Academy of Arts. Additionally, several of his works were performed at festivals run by the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM): Salzburg, 1923 (violin sonata); Prague, 1925 (the *Vixen* and several choral pieces); Venice, 1925 (first string quartet); and Frankfurt, 1927 (*Concertino*). Fame brought Janáček moderate wealth, and he was able to buy a cottage and part of a forest in his native village of Hukvaldy. In the summer of 1928, he retreated there to finish revising *From the House of the Dead*. He unexpectedly contracted pneumonia and died on August 12. His funeral in Brno three days later was a public event on a scale that would have been unimaginable only ten years previously.

## MUSIC

Janáček lived through a period of convulsive change in music: born in the year that Wagner finished *Das Rheingold*, he died shortly before Schoenberg completed his *Variations for Orchestra* (1926–1928). But his inclusion in a volume on the twentieth-century avant-garde might appear inappropriate. He predates Claude Debussy (1862–1918), Carl Nielsen (1865–

1931), and Richard Strauss (1864–1949) by about a decade; musical modernists such as Schoenberg (1874–1951), Béla Bartók (1881–1945), and Igor Stravinsky (1882–1971) postdate him by more than a generation. Indeed, Janáček’s closest contemporaries include Sir Edward Elgar (1857–1934) and Giacomo Puccini (1858–1924), with whom he shared a conviction that “tonality” is essential, asserting as late as 1927: “Without key there is no music” (Vysloužil and Racek 1955, 451). Arnold Whittall elaborates: “[Janáček’s music] continues the 19th-century practice of extending basic harmonic relations, not in order to force them to breaking point (Janáček was no atonalist) but to enhance their most fundamental properties, expressed most palpably...in the distinction, and indissoluble connection, between consonance and dissonance” (1985, 22).

Equally pertinently, Janáček espoused the nineteenth-century Russian realist belief that “art is a component of life and must remain ‘anchored’ by it, so that even the minutest technical detail may be validated by experience” (Beckerman and Samson 1993, 135). Indeed, the serious commitment of Russian literature to “morality, humanity and truth” was a defining influence right up to the end of his career, even if by the time he wrote *From the House of the Dead* his earlier predilection for Tolstoy’s “rationalist” outlook had given way to a pref-

age 228

erence for Fyodor Dostoyevsky’s “visionary,” “epiphanic” mode of self-expression (Chew and Vilain 1999, 58–59). Thus, in many ways, modernism passed Janáček by. Certainly, it is difficult to classify him as an avant-garde composer according to the conventional definition outlined by Paul Griffiths in the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*; “[A]rtists who adopt techniques or expressive aims radically different from those hallowed by tradition, with the implication that their work makes advances which will subsequently be widely accepted and adopted.” If Janáček had died at sixty-four, he would most likely now be viewed as a distinctive, “senior tonal” voice in turn-of-the-century music.

Nevertheless, Janáček’s later works have obvious affinities with the sound worlds of his younger contemporaries. Moreover, his mature style is entirely original and instantly recognizable. Commentators have tended to account for his individuality on the basis of two related sources: Moravian folk music and “speech melody.” The argument that Janáček’s exposure to folk music helped him “shape a new musical vocabulary and grammar” (Tyrrell 1988, 246) centers on *Jenůfa*, which Carl Dahlhaus describes as “a transition to twentieth-century be widely accepted and adopted.” If Janáček, living in provincial isolation, evolved step by tentative step with astonishing singleness of purpose” (1989, 358). According to Tyrrell, in *Jenůfa* Janáček allows “the distinctive melodic intervals, the rhythms and metrical structures of Moravian folk music to permeate his style as a whole” (1988, 248). By the time he wrote *Fate*, so the traditional argument continues, “the elements of Moravian folk-song had penetrated Janáček’s music to such a profound level that it becomes difficult to disentangle personal style from folk input” (248).

Continuing this line of reasoning, Michael Beckerman and Jim Samson align Janáček with his younger east European contemporaries Bartók, Karol Szymanowski (1882–1937), and George Enescu (1881–1955): “for all four a nationalist commitment was the trigger for a more radical,

authentically modernist musical language” (1993, 134). It might thus be tempting to apply Theodor W. Adorno’s assessment of Bartók’s modernist credentials to Janáček: “the folk material, and the ‘natural community’ it signifies, are brought into confrontation with the ‘dead forms,’ so to speak, of an increasingly fragmented Western art music. The resulting fusion does not conceal alienation under the mask of a false reconciliation of the epic and the modern. Rather, in using the folk material as a critique of the used-up forms of Western art music, it throws alienation into relief” (137).

And since Janáček is the eldest of the east European quartet, one might contend that he is an avant-garde pioneer after all.

The main problem with this argument is that only Janáček’s compositions from the period 1890–1903 are obviously beholden to folk music, and even in *Jenůfa* folk-music characteristics can only convincingly be attributed to a few set-piece numbers, such as the Act 1 “Recruits” scene. After *Jenůfa*, his works become increasingly “international” in both subject matter and technical vocabulary. As a result, folk-music oriented “analysis” of Janáček’s output is vague

Page 229

and simplistic. Tyrrell, for example, is unable to muster more than a few folk-music elements: alleged modal inflection, mirror rhythms, the occasional reference to a folk-dance type, the use of “strophic or quasi-strophic songs,” the “tension between foreground tune (*primo*) and disruptive background (*kontráš*)” and so on (1988, 248–251).

The widespread muddled thinking on this issue is no better exemplified than by the universal description of the fox cubs’ “nursery rhyme” in Act 3, Scene 1, of the *Vixen* as “Lydian.” This song forms part of a 133-bar “scena,” more than half of which is referable to the (0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10) whole-tone collection. The introduction to the song circumscribes a diatonic hexachord (Ab-Bb-C-D-Eb-F), the tune itself outlining the same hexachord transposed up a tone (Bb-C-D-E-F-G). The resulting eight-note collection (Bb-C-D-Eb-E-F-G-Ab,) contains five pitch classes of the whole-tone scale on C, and it conflates the dominant-quality (0, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10) “acoustic” scale on Bb and the Eb diatonic collection. Hence, the tritone Bb-E underpins a type of early twentieth-century extended tonal structure, combining various traditional linear resources with quasi-functional progressions, which are common in the music of two early twentieth-century composers whom Janáček admired: Debussy and Alban Berg (see Wingfield 1999, 246–257; Pople 1991, 65–90). The Lydian mode is absent.

More awkwardly still, *Jenůfa* itself is a surprisingly conventional work, a dark counterpart to Smetana’s *The Bartered Bride*. As Robin Holloway observes, the “crucial leap” occurs between *Jenůfa* and *Fate*, “a Confession, of the utmost artistic oddity, an apparently unworkable maverick which... prognosticates his late flowering into total idiosyncrasy” (1999, 6–7). In *Fate*, the prevailing dance type is the waltz, as it is in *Brouček*, and the pitch materials draw on established art-music resources: chromatic tonality, the acoustic, whole-tone and (0, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10) octatonic collections, and so on.

If there is little clear-cut “folk material” in Janáček’s mature output, “dead forms” are also sparse. As Geoffrey Chew and Robert Vilain point out with reference to *From the House of the Dead*, Janáček’s music largely “feigns an absence of formal artifice.” Abrupt juxtapositions of different types of material give rise to structures often described as “cinematic.” Layered textures made up of terse motives are kept in constant flux through rapid shifts of priority between strata and the persistent dove-tailing of sectional boundaries. Momentum is created by large-scale patterns of accumulation and dissolution, crisis and calm, frequently culminating in blazing diatonic perorations. Such procedures operate independently of the “used-up forms of Western art music.”

The speech-melody approach to Janáček’s operas is just as unenlightening. Early generations of Janáček scholars take the composer’s writings literally and propose a straightforward relationship between theory and practice as the source of his individuality (see Štědroň 1999, 80). Tyrrell is more skeptical, arguing that Janáček’s manuscripts show that he very frequently derived the vocal parts from existing orchestral material (1970), although he still considers speech-melody the “catalyst” for a modern operatic texture in which the voices and

Page 230

orchestra are rhythmically and melodically detached from one another (1985, 42–46). Dahlhaus goes much further, bizarrely proposing that Janáček is the realist composer par excellence because he seeks “to mediate between the different layers in the musical fabric by constructing his orchestral melody from speech melodies too” and is thus “able to draw form-building consequences from the speech melodies themselves” (1985, 104). In truth, surprisingly little of Janáček’s vocal writing in his operas attempts to stylize spoken Czech. He employs a wide range of vocal styles, ranging from the quasi-realistic to the expansive and lyrical. Quasi-realistic writing is often reserved for points where narration switches to dialog (Wingfield 1992b, 292–298) or for passages of direct discourse (Štědroň 1999). The musical argument in Janáček’s operas is largely unfolded by the orchestra in what Schoenberg terms “musical prose”: that is, units of unequal length; the voice parts are in a sense all but superfluous, in that they rarely contribute to the motivic and harmonic content of these units. It was Janáček’s adoption of musical prose that allowed him to put his speech-melody theory into limited practice. Furthermore, *arioso* declamation against an essentially continuous accompaniment of asymmetrical phrases is actually a common feature of all post-Wagnerian opera.

Another line of argument, favored by Miloš Štědroň (1998, 113–156, 225–235), is that Janáček did in fact keep up with international musical developments, and that his compositional career exhibits a progression from “young conservative” to “old avant-gardist.” The widely disseminated notion that Janáček lived (in Dahlhaus’s words) “in provincial isolation” is misleading. Early twentieth-century Brno was not the cultural backwater it is usually thought to be. Janáček heard there major works by Bartók, Debussy, Stravinsky and others, often played by first-rate performers (e.g., the Berlin Philharmonic under Adolf Furtwängler). In addition, he regularly attended the concerts and lectures devoted to modern music run by the Moravian Composers’ Club, and even encountered Henry Cowell at one of these events in 1926 (Štědroň 1998, 123–124). Frequent trips to Prague afforded Janáček further opportunities to hear New Music: an inveterate opera- and concert-goer, he attended Prague performances of, for instance,

Strauss's *Salome* and *Elektra*, Debussy's *Pelléas et Mélisande* and *La Mer*, Bartók's *Dance Suite* and first piano concerto, and Berg's *Wozzeck*. That at least some of these works aroused his interest and admiration is attested by, for example, his in-depth analysis of "Jeux de vagues" from *La Mer* (see Wingfield 1999) and his impassioned defense of *Wozzeck* after its disastrous Prague premiere: "Wrong, wrong! Wrong is done to *Wozzeck*, wrong was seriously done to Berg. He is a dramatist of astonishing consequence, of deep truth. Have his say! Let him have his say! Today he is torn to pieces. He suffers. As if he had been cut short. Not a note. And every note of his was soaked in blood!" (quoted in Zemanová 1989, 123).

Similarly, Janáček's writings display a detailed knowledge of both the modern repertory and contemporary (especially Viennese) music theory, his extant personal library includes works by Debussy, Strauss (e.g., *Elektra*), and Stravinsky

Page 231

(e.g., *The Rite of Spring*), and he is known habitually to have borrowed scores of new works from friends (particularly Max Brod). If one further considers that his visits in the 1920s to ISCM festivals abroad permitted him to hear numerous works by contemporary composers such as Hindemith (*Kammermusik no. 2*), Schoenberg (*Serenade*, op. 24), and Stravinsky (*Piano Sonata*), and that over the years he met Bartók, Hindemith, Gustav Mahler, Strauss, Vladimir Rebikov, and Schoenberg, then the traditional picture of him as an isolated eccentric begins to seem extremely misguided.

Pinpointing superficial modern influences on Janáček's later music is relatively straightforward. Štědroň highlights the impact on Janáček of the 1920s' preference for chamber music and chamber-like instrumentation in orchestral compositions. Other obvious examples are extreme juxtapositions of style and matter reminiscent of Stravinsky and Olivier Messiaen, as well as the even greater technical daring of his 1920s orchestration, which sometimes involves spatial separation of groups of instruments (notably the three off-stage clarinets in the *Glagolitic Mass*). More generally, the dissonance threshold is increased substantially in the late works: key-signatures are abandoned, and bitriadic sonorities, that is, chords built from fourths and minor ninths, abound. In short, "extended tonality" becomes the prevailing harmonic language, and hence established modernist linear resources are abundant: chromatic gap-filling; the whole-tone, acoustic and octatonic collections; the (0, 1, 4, 5, 8, 9) hexachord (pitch class set 6 to 20) described by Allen Forte as the ultimate "atonal" sonority; and so forth. In the sketches for *The Danube*, Janáček even employs Alois Hába's microtonal notation (Stedron 1999, 144–145). But despite Janáček's late absorption of the music of Bartók, Berg, Debussy, Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and so on, "there is clearly no question of his personal idiom being in any way sacrificed" (Samson 1993, 73). As with Janáček's earlier influences, the elements he chooses to extract are so transformed that their origins seem irrelevant. His modernist qualities must be much more fundamental.

Perhaps then, it is more productive to use as a starting point for an evaluation of Janáček the radical Hans Eisler's famous pronouncement that he is this century's most innovative composer as regards musical "expression." To Janáček, even the humblest sonority has enormous effective power. For example, he compares the sixth-fourth chord to a swallow almost touching the

ground then soaring into the heights (Blažek 1974, 91), and he likens the trill (so pervasive in his later music) to “a flaming hoop that we bowl along” (Vogel 1981, 17). Janáček’s overriding concern with *Affekt* is coupled with a fierce will to devise his own methods: “It is as if burning sincerity *depended* on being peculiar” (Holloway 1999, 12). His music thus seeks to create a searing directness of expression through “defamiliarization” of basic materials and an eclectic combination of influences. Every structural parameter is conceived anew, resulting in unusual voicing and spacing, extremes of register, willfully unidiomatic instrumental writing, apparently unbalanced orchestration, unorthodox harmonic and structural procedures, way-out programs and plots, and—above all—an

Page 232

astonishing economy of means. As Ades demonstrates (1999), in Janáček’s hands the semiquaver rest can be elevated to the status of a “secondary tonic” and a simple enharmonic shift can become the most potent of signifiers.

For Janáček, the ideal genre for his brand of musical “expression” was opera. With *Fate*, he succeeded in deconventionalizing this genre sufficiently to accommodate his aims: recognizing that this work is partly influenced by Marc-Antoine Charpentier’s *Louise* and Pyotr Tchaikovsky’s *Eugene Onegin* only emphasizes its startling individuality. Janáček’s then began to recast other traditional genres. For example, his three “symphonic poems”—*The Fiddler’s Child*, *Taras Bulba*, and *The Ballad of Blanik*—defamiliarize this genre by undermining the expected basic correspondence between music and narrative: “All attempts to use the literary sources as guides lead to contradiction and confusion” (Macdonald 1999, 55). His misreadings of “concerto,” “song cycle,” “mass,” “symphony,” and “string quartet” are equally far reaching. Viewed in this way, Holloway argues, Janáček emerges as “the unlikely but perfect candidate in an epoch of fragmentative, alienating experiment, deliberate renunciation, even spurning, of liberal-humane themes, for music’s concern with and expression of them without recourse to the bankrupt debris of late-romantic *espressivo*. He is in his own freaky way a Modern, who retained pre-modernist values while driven to ‘make it new’ in idiosyncrasy and isolation” (1999, 11–12).

However, it is not only from a late twentieth-century perspective that a case for Janáček as avant-gardist can be made. The disparity between Janáček’s fundamentally nineteenth-century mode of thought and his quintessentially modernist achievement in works such as *From the House of the Dead* of “total dramatic conviction through the most intense exploitation of a highly personal idiom” (Whittall 1988, 104) can be seen in terms of a deeper duality at the heart of his creative personality. Just as his theoretical writings are both dogmatic and rebellious, so his musical originality is, to paraphrase some of Craig Ayrey’s remarks about Debussy (1994, 128), both conservative (Dvořák and Puccini) and innovative (Berg and Hába). Such a thoroughly subversive duality is the hallmark of all true radicals.

## SELECTED WORKS

*Šárka* (opera) (1887–1888)

*Počátek románu* (The Beginning of a Romance) (opera) (1891)



*Její pastorkyňa* (Her Stepdaughter; Jenůfa) (opera) (1894–1903; rev. 1906–1907)

*Amarus*, cantata for soloists, mixed chorus, and orchestra (c. 1897; rev. 1901, 1906)

*Po zarostlém chodníčku* (On an Overgrown Path), “Miniatures for piano”; Series I (ten pieces plus two discarded from the final version; 1900–1911); Series II (unfinished; three pieces; c. 1911)

*Osud* (Fate) (opera) (1903–1906; rev. 1907)

Page 233

*I. X. 1905 (Z ulice dne 1. října 1905) (I. X. 1905* [From the Street, 1 October 1905]), sonata for piano (1905)

*Kantor Halfar*, chorus for male voices (c. 1906; rev. 1917)

*Maryčka Magdónova*, chorus for male voices (1906; rev. 1907)

*Výlety páně Broučkovy* (The Excursions of Mr. Broucek) (opera): Part 1, *Výlet pána Broučka do měsíce* (Mr. Brouček’s Excursion to the Moon) (1908–1917);

*70,000 (Sedmdesát tisíc)* (70,000 [The Seventy Thousand]), chorus for male voices (1909; rev. 1912)

*Pohádka* (Fairy Tale), for cello and piano (1910; rev. 1912, 1913, 1923)

*V mlhách* (In the Mists) (1912)

*Šumařovo dítě* (The Fiddler’s Child), ballad for orchestra (1912–1913; rev. 1914)

*Sonata*, for violin and piano (1914–1915; rev, before 1920, 1922)

*Tarns Bulba*, rhapsody for orchestra (1915–1918)

*Kašpar Rucký*, chorus for female voices (1916)

*Vlčí stopa* (The Wolf’s Trail), chorus for female voices and piano (1916)

*Výlety páně Broučkovy*: Part 2, *Výlet pána Broučka do XV. století* (Mr. Brouček’s Excursion to the Fifteenth Century) (1917)

*Zápisník zmizelého* (The Diary of One Who Disappeared), song cycle for tenor, alto, three female voices, and piano (1917–1920)

*Ballada blanická* (The Ballad of Blaník) (1919)

*Kát'a Kabanová* (opera) (1920–1921)

*Potulný šílenec* (The Wandering Madman), chorus for male voices with solo soprano (1922)

*Příhody lišky Bystroušky* (The Adventures of the Vixen Bystrouška) (opera) (1922–1923)

*String Quartet no. 1* (after Leo Tolstoy's *The Kreutzer Sonata*) (1923) (based on an unpublished piano trio from 1908–1909)

*Dunaj* (The Danube), symphony/symphonic cycle for orchestra, unfinished (1923–1925?)

*Věc Makropulos* (The Makropulos Affair) (opera) (1923–1925)

*Mláďi* (Youth), suite for wind sextet (1924)

*Concertino*, for piano, two violins, viola, clarinet, horn, and bassoon (1925)

*Capriccio*, for piano left hand, flute/piccolo, two trumpets, three trombones, and tenor tuba (1926)

*Říkadla* (Nursery Rhymes), introduction and eighteen songs for nine voices and ten instruments (1926) (originally eight songs for one to three mezzo-sopranos, clarinet, and piano [1925])

*Sinfonietta* (1926)

*Glagolská mše* (Glagolitic Mass), for soloists, mixed chorus, organ, and orchestra (1926; rev. 1927)

*Z mrtvého domu* (From the House of the Dead) (opera) (1927–1928)

*String Quartet no. 2, "Listy důvěrné"* (Intimate Letters) (1928)

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Ades, Thomas. 1999. "Nothing but Pranks and Puns": Janáček's Solo Piano Music." In *Janáček Studies*, ed. Paul Wingfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ayrey, Craig. 1994. "Debussy's Significant Connections: Metaphor and Metonymy in

Page 234

Analytical Method." In *Theory, Analysis and Meaning in Music*, ed. Anthony Pople. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beckerman, Michael. 1994. *Janáček As Theorist*. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon.

Beckerman, Michael, and Glen Bauer, eds. 1995. *Janáček and Czech Music: Proceedings of the International Conference (St. Louis, 1988)*. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon.

Beckerman, Michael, and Jim Samson. 1993. "Eastern Europe, 1918–45." In *Modern Times: From World War I to the Present*, ed. Robert P. Morgan. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Blažek, Zdeněk. 1968. *Leoš Janáček: Hudebné teoretické dílo* (Leoš Janáček: Music Theory Works). Janáčkův archív, Second Series/Vol. 2: *Spisy, studie a dokumenty* (Writings, Studies and Documents). Prague: Supraphon.

———. 1974. *Leoš Janáček: Hudebné teoretické dílo*. Janáčkův archív, Second Series/ Vol. 3: *Studie, Úplná nauka o harmonii* (Studies, Complete Theory of Harmony). Prague: Supraphon.

Chew, Geoffrey, and Robert Vilain. 1999. "Evasive Realism: Narrative Construction in Dostoyevsky's and Janáček's *From the House of the Dead*." In *Janáček Studies*, ed. Paul Wingfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahlhaus, Carl. 1985. *Realism in Nineteenth-Century Music*. Trans. Mary Whittall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1989. *Nineteenth-Century Music*. Trans. J. Bradford Robinson. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Holloway, Robin. 1999. "Expressive Sources and Resources in Janáček's Musical Language." In *Janáček Studies*, ed. Paul Wingfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janáček, Leoš. 1896. *O skladbě souzvukův a jejich spojův* (The Composition of Chords and Their Connections). Brno: n.p. Reprint, Zdeněk Blažek, *Leoš Janáček: Hudebné teoretické dílo* (Leoš Janáček: Music Theory Works), Janáčkův archív, Second Series/Vol. 2: *Spisy, studie a dokumenty* (Writings, Studies and Documents), Prague: Supraphon 1968.

———. 1907. "Můj názor o sčasování (rytmu)" (My Opinion about Sčasování [Rhythm]). *Hlídky* 24:416–425, 520–533, 598–616, 677–687, 757–762. Reprint, Zdeněk Blažek, *Leoš Janáček: Hudebné teoretické dílo*, Janáčkův archív, Second Series/Vol. 3: *Studie, Úplná nauka o harmonii* (Studies, Complete Theory of Harmony), Prague: Supraphon 1974.

———. 1912–1913. *Úplná nauka o harmonii* (Complete Theory of Harmony). Brno: n.p. Reprint, Zdeněk Blažek, *Leoš Janáček: Hudebné teoretické dílo*, Janáčkův archív, Second Series/Vol. 3: *Studie, Úplná nauka o harmonii* (Studies, Complete Theory of Harmony), Prague: Supraphon 1974.

———. 1921. Unfinished manuscript analysis of Claude Debussy's *La mer*. Reproduced in Miloš Štedron, *Leoš Janáček a hudba 20. století* (Leoš Janáček and Music of the Twentieth Century) (Brno: Masarykova Uni. 1998). Transcribed and translated in Paul Wingfield, "Janáček, Musical Analysis and Debussy's 'Jeux de vagues,'" in *Janáček Studies*, ed. Paul Wingfield. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Macdonald, Hugh. 1999. "Narrative in Janáček's Symphonic Poems." In *Janáček Studies*, ed. Paul Wingfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pople, Anthony. 1991. *Berg: Violin Concerto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Page 235

Samson, Jim. 1993. *Music in Transition: Study of Tonal Expansion and Atonality*. 2nd ed. London: Dent.

Simeone, Nigel, John Tyrrell, and Alena Němcová. 1997. *Janáček's Works: A Catalogue of the Music and Writings of Leoš Janáček*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Štědroň, Milos. 1998. *Leoš Janáček a hudba 20. století* (Leoš Janáček and Music of the Twentieth Century). Brno: Masarykova University.

———. 1999. "Direct Discourse and Speech Melody in Janáček's Operas." In *Janáček Studies*, ed. Paul Wingfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tyrrell, John. 1970. "Janáček and the Speech-Melody Myth." *The Musical Times* 111: 793–196

———. 1985. "Janáček." In *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians: Turn of the Century Masters*, ed. Stanley Sadie. London: Macmillan.

———. 1988. *Czech Opera*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vogel, Jaroslav. 1981. *Leoš Janáček: A Biography*. Trans. Geraldine Thomsen-Muchova. 2nd ed. London: Orbis.

Vysloužil, Jifí, and Jan Racek, eds. 1955. *Leoš Janáček: O lidové písni a lidové hudbě: dokumenty a studie* (Leoš Janáček: On Folk-Song and Folk Music: Documents and Studies). Janáčekův archiv, Second Series/Vol. 1. Prague: Supraphon.

Whittall, Arnold. 1985. "The Challenge from Within: Janáček's Musico-Dramatic Mastery." In *Janáček: Jenůfa, Katya Kabanova*, ed. Nicholas John. London: John Calder.

———. 1988. *Music since the First World War*. 2nd ed. London: Dent.

Wingfield, Paul. 1992a. *Janáček: Glagolitic Mass*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1992b. "Janáček's Speech-Melody Theory in Concept and Practice." *Cambridge Opera Journal* 4:281-301.

———. 1994. "Unlocking a Janáček Enigma: The Harmonic Origins of Kudrjáš's 'Waiting' Song." *Music and Letters* 75:561-575.

———. 1999. “Janáček, Musical Analysis and Debussy’s ‘Jeux de vagues.’” In *Janáček Studies* , ed. Paul Wingfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zemanová, Mirka, ed. and trans. 1989. *Janáček's Uncollected Essays on Music*. London: Boyars.