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INTRODUCTION

This study deals with the four-composer Polish musical association, Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich (Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company, 1905-1912), which became commonly known as the group Młoda Polska w Muzyce ("Young Poland in Music"). "Young Poland in Music" is considered by Polish and non-Polish music historians to be the signal inaugurator of modernism in Polish music. However, despite this most important attribution, the past eighty-odd years have witnessed considerable confusion over the perceptions of: 1) exactly who constituted Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich, 2) why it was founded, 3) what the intentions of its members were, and 4) the general reception its members' music received. This paper addresses and resolves this multiple confusion. The author intends that the information contained in this study benefit two audiences—the Polish and non-Polish (Western)—because in the first audience are found the origins and perpetuation of the confusions cited above, and in the second is found little or no information about the group in any non-Polish language.

A complete understanding of the significance of Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich to the history of Polish music requires an assessment of the
political, social, and cultural incidents and philosophies that preceded the group, engendered its birth, encompassed its existence, and supported, opposed or destroyed its reason for being. Chapter I, therefore, presents a compact survey of the political developments of Poland between 1772 and c1900, the period of the Polish Partitions through the beginnings of the "Young Poland" era. It also highlights the occupation and destruction of the country by the Three Foreign Powers—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—thus presenting the background to which all subsequent discussions will be related. The chapter also presents an overview of Poland's socio/cultural development during the same period. Finally, the chapter addresses Poland's musical stagnation during the nineteenth century. This information is particularly important because most Western knowledge of Poland's musical development during this period revolves around Frederick Chopin, a fact that has caused a distortion of the musical historiography of nineteenth-century Poland.

Chapter II presents a discussion of the facts surrounding the founding of Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich, as well as a discussion of the eighty-odd years of historical misinterpretations that have developed about the composers' association and its relationship to "Young Poland in Music." These discussions, and those that follow in later chapters, return to the
primary Polish sources in order to rectify the misinterpretations resulting from the overuse of secondary sources.

Chapter III discusses the interpersonal relationships of the composers and other persons directly involved with them and their association, as well as the impact that these relationships had on the publishing association. Additionally, the chapter brings into focus the specific relationship between the musicologist, Adolf Chybiński, the most ardent supporter of the association, and its individual members. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the actual publishing activities of Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich.

Chapter IV examines the three concerts of Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich and their critical receptions in Warsaw and Berlin through the surviving reviews and comments of leading contemporary music critics, the participants in the concerts, the composers' close colleagues, and the composers themselves. Finally, Chapter V contains a brief discussion of the music presented on the three concerts, characterizing the works within the context of their initial critical reception, all the while keeping in mind that the individual perceptions, biases, and acceptances of the early twentieth-century critics were the result of particular socio/cultural circumstances that were far different from ours today.
CHAPTER I

POLITICAL AND CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS 1772-1900

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

The internal decline of the Polish nation during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries caused it to fall prey to the expansionism of three feuding European powers: Prussia, Austria, and Russia. Political intrigues within Poland and among these foreign powers reached a crisis point in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Poland's political, social, and economic problems stemmed largely from the resistance to the transformation of its agrarian system of serfdom and the attendant class structures. And a decentralized regime was unable to cope effectively with the nation's economic problems. A noted historian of the period summarized the state of the country as follows:

Devastated by wars and invasions, the country registered a decline in . . . production, a diminishing productivity of agriculture, a rise in prices, and a general economic regression . . . . [Furthermore,] while most European powers had adopted absolutism, Poland had been moving in the opposite direction. At a time when other monarchs were creating bureaucracies, effective systems of taxation, and large armies, the kings of Poland had no bureaucracy, an inadequate budget, and a small army.1

By the mid-1760s, weakened by internal strife and political intrigue, the Polish nation was imminently susceptible
to the machinations of its jealous and distrustful neighbors.

Furthermore, against the background of the Russo-Turkish war, the Austro-French alliance, the Russo-Prussian alliance, and the Austro-Prussian antagonisms, Frederick II of Prussia, as early as February, 1769, presented to St. Petersburg his "Count Lynars Plan," which provided for the reconciliation between Austria, Russia, and Prussia by means of a joint partition of Poland. Recognizing the advantage of Poland as a buffer state established for mutual self-protection, the Three Powers eventually concluded an armistice in 1772 in Vienna. Through this treaty Poland lost almost 30 percent of its territory and 35 percent of its population to its neighbors through annexation, though still remaining one of the largest states in Europe. But the treaty had set the precedent for official partition.

Between 1772 and 1791, Poland experienced further economic decline, being cut-off from its old trading routes as the result of the partitions. During this period the 1772 armistice of the Three Powers began to crumble as a result of the Austro-Prussian War (1789-91) and the ever-present danger of Russia's entry as Austria's ally. However, it was not until May 3, 1791, with the adoption of the new and historically important Polish Constitution and the end of the Russo-Turkish War, that the
Three Powers began to fear a resurgence of Polish power. At that time the Prussian minister Hertzberg, wrote:

The Poles have given the 'coup de grace' to the Prussian monarchy by voting a Constitution much better than the English. I think that Poland will regain sooner or later West Prussia, and perhaps East Prussia also. How can we defend our State, open from Memel to Cieszyn, against a numerous and well governed nation?

Prussia, therefore, claimed that the original alliance of 1772 was no longer valid because of Poland's new constitutional government. This claim gave Russia a free hand to move on Poland. The pretext for intervention was furnished by the Act of Confederation signed in St. Petersburg on April 27, 1792, in which two important Polish nobles, Szczesny Potocki from the Ukraine and Ksawery Branicki, condemned the new democratic government and requested Russian military aid in restoring the old order. The resultant Russo-Polish War began on May 18, 1792. Potocki and Branicki had acted totally on their own, albeit with Russian complicity.

Prussia, recognizing a favorable opportunity to gain additional Polish lands, also moved against Poland while the Polish armies were fighting the Russians. Austria declared its disinterest in this Polish problem. Unable to withstand a two-front assault, Poland was defeated in 1793 and signed formal treaties with Prussia and Russia. Prussia was granted additional Polish territory by Russia, while Russia seized additional lands, abolished the Polish
Constitution, and returned Poland to its pre-1791 status. Nevertheless, Russia allowed Poland to remain a sovereign nation, though greatly reduced, because it

... was to remain a buffer state, 'a barrier between the Powers,' with the executive power centralized to an extent sufficient to allow the Russian ambassador to be the actual ruler of the country.⁷

Although the Polish king, Stanisław Augustus, received assurances from Russia that it would check further annexationist aims of Prussia and Austria if the Poles remained quiet, an insurrection led by Tadeusz Kościuszko broke out six months after the ratification of the 1793 treaties.⁸ Unable to withstand the overwhelming might of the Three Powers, the Kościuszko Insurrection was defeated easily, resulting in the final partition of Poland on October 24, 1795.

As a result of this final and total partition Russia ceded Warsaw to Prussia and Kraków to Austria. A student of Polish history reflects on this historical event:

... the neighbors at last appointed an instrument for the final demolition of the Polish State. Till then, no nation had been deprived of its political existence by the Christian powers... the partition of Poland was an act of wanton violence, committed in open defiance not only of popular feeling but of public law. For the first time in modern history, a great State was suppressed, and a whole nation divided among its enemies.⁹

Under terms of their partition agreement, the Three Powers, as the "Holy Alliance," agreed to eradicate the name of Poland from the vocabulary of international law:
Poland as a coherent state had ceased to exist and had become a number of territories held together only by language, literature, and sensibility. In this respect, a Polish nation did exist; but it existed in minds, not as geography.\textsuperscript{10}

This situation formed the context of the political, social, and cultural attitudes of the post-partition generations, both abroad and at home, while shaping the future of the Polish nation for the next 130 years, a period of continued insurrection, rebellion, and revolution.

\textbf{Poland Under Partition to 1830}

All Three Powers attempted to assimilate their Polish territories as quickly as possible, setting up governmental structures similar to their own and staffed by their own people. They also encouraged the settlement of their own peoples on Polish soil and banned Polish as the official language of government and judicial courts. Prussia eventually went a step further by banning Polish as the language of instruction in schools. Further assimilation was achieved through the confiscation of land from the Polish landowners. Only those nobility and magnates who bribed officials or openly fraternized with their oppressors had a chance of maintaining their holdings. The peasants, in effect, remained under the system of serfdom. Because of the loss of any financial stability, the Polish middle class, lesser gentry, and lower bourgeoisie were most affected by the partitions.
These groups, along with the intelligentsia, would come to cause the most unrest for the occupying powers in the ensuing years. Furthermore, the partitions destroyed the cultural life of the late 18th-century Polish Enlightenment. As one writer put it:

The splendid cultural revival, especially striking in the educational sphere, suffered a setback. The intellectual milieu of Warsaw disintegrated. The network of schools . . . the lively press, and artistic and scholarly activities deprived of royal and magnate patronage were among the first victims. The great Załuski library with its 160,000 volumes and 5,000 manuscripts went to St. Petersburg to become the nucleus of the university library there. Despite these setbacks, new hope arose in Polish society with the eruption of the Napoleonic Wars in 1806. Recognizing an opportunity for liberation, many Poles were only too happy to offer their services to Napoleon, and with Napoleon's drive across Europe to Russia, Warsaw was liberated from the Prussians and the areas surrounding it became a vassalage of France named "The Duchy of Warsaw." The Duchy, however, did not survive the continental defeat of Napoleon in 1814.

Although the Duchy of Warsaw was abolished and the new Congress Kingdom was now established under Russian authority by the Treaty of Vienna in 1815, certain benefits had been derived from the French regime. A new bourgeois society had arisen, the Code of Napoleon had introduced a modern administration, and, for a while, serfdom had been abolished. Nevertheless, the difficulties for
the Polish nation continued to grow as the Three Powers reasserted the assimilation process of the Polish people.

Austrian Poland to 1830

The period between 1793 and 1830 produced different conditions in each of the partitioner's area. In the Austrian-held territory of Poland were found the more important industrial sectors of Polish society which should have provided excellent markets for Austrian textiles, agricultural implements, and investments; however, Austria failed to develop these markets. Instead, with the imposition of high taxes, neglect of factories, and the conscription of Poles into its army, Austria quickly reduced its Polish territory to the poorest and most backward area of Poland. The one exception was the city of Kraków, situated at the conjunction of the borders of the major Powers. It remained a free, independent, and neutral city, the result of a compromise among the Three Powers, thus avoiding conflict since all had desired to acquire it. The Kraków Republic had its own constitution, an elected senate, independent courts, a free-trade classification, and, most important, Jagiellonian University. The city had large numbers of intelligentsia, as well as an urban oligarchy, and with the destruction of the Polish Enlightenment centered at the court in Warsaw, Kraków's renaissance as the leading cultural center of Poland was
assured. The University became the center of political conflicts as the Prussian, Russian, Austrian, and Polish factions battled for hegemony over the city. Because of its destabilizing political activities, the University's autonomy was abolished by a joint agreement of the Three Powers in 1821.\textsuperscript{15}

Prussian Poland to 1830

Prussia's initial action in its Polish territory was to impose its legal and administrative systems through the Allgemeines Landrecht of 1797, which brought the territory totally under Prussian bureaucratic administration and organized a political system devoid of any elected Polish officials. And, in order to dominate its territory even more effectively, Berlin instituted a program of Germanization: German was imposed as the official, administrative language; high taxes were levied; conscription into the Prussian army was mandated; many of the existing Polish schools were closed, and German was instituted as the language of instruction in those that remained open. Polish students desiring a university degree were compelled to attend Prussian and German universities.\textsuperscript{16}

Russian Poland to 1830

The Russian area of Poland was by far the largest of the three territories, representing over half of Poland's land and about half of its population.\textsuperscript{17} Russian Poland
contained a population that was primarily Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Lithuanian, with Poles, mainly of peasant class, comprising only a minor part of the gentry and urban middle class. By maintaining class privileges, seeking support of the aristocracy and wealthy gentry, and forging an alliance of the Orthodox Church with the Polish Catholic hierarchy, Russia was able to retard social reforms, continue the feudal system, and discriminate against the Polish middle class and lesser gentry. Consequently, Russia easily controlled its newly acquired Polish lands. Tzarina Catherine II justified her acquisition of the Polish lands by invoking the disingenuous historical claim that she had merely recovered lands of the Kievian patrimony that had been torn away.

During the early years of partition under Tzar Paul I (1796-1801), the Russian attitude toward its Polish acquisitions remained fairly liberal in contrast to that of its other two partners. Within the provincial administrative system, some existing Polish institutions remained intact: the Lithuanian Statute and the old Code of Laws of Lithuania and Ukrainia, the local judicial courts and their elected officials were retained, and Polish continued to be the language of the courts. Alexander I (1801-25) continued the liberal policies of Paul, and his Polish lands fared well, educationally and culturally. Prior to the Napoleonic Wars, the Polish Prince Adam
Czartoryski, a close friend and confidant of the Tzar was appointed Russia's Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and eventually Minister of Foreign Affairs. With this appointment Czartoryski also became the curator of the Wilno Educational District, where, in 1802, he succeeded in reopening the University of Wilno. Under his control a system of primary and secondary schools was developed throughout all of Russian Poland that brought education to many of its people.

With the defeat of Napoleon in 1814 the Congress Kingdom of Poland was established, with Tzar Alexander taking the title of "King of Poland." Surprisingly, he continued his liberal policies despite the Polish support of Napoleon during the war. For the next seven years art and scholarship flourished in Warsaw, and two important institutions were founded: the University of Warsaw in 1817 and the Warsaw Music Conservatory in 1821. Theater, concert, and literary life thus flourished.

However, Alexander soon came into conflict with his conservative opponents at court over his liberal policy both at home and in the Polish territories. By 1819 the growing threat of revolution in Western Europe that could spill into Russia and most assuredly into Poland, and the spread from the West into Russia and Poland of secret societies, in particular Freemasonry and subversive student groups that were promoting nationalism and opposition to
autocratic rule, caused Alexander to withdraw many of the liberties earlier granted to the Polish and Russian peoples. The Russian, Nikolai Novosil'tsov, the then special representative to the Tsar in Warsaw, launched an attack on the secret societies, daily increasing the surveillance activities of his secret police and often sidestepping the judicial processes with his special investigations. He introduced censorship in late 1819 and totally closed down the opposition press.23

Harassment and many arrests notwithstanding, the Polish groups managed to survive and eventually to unite with their European and Russian counterparts. By 1825 they had reached general agreement on joint revolutionary actions, although close political cooperation between them was not yet firmly established. Thus, when Alexander I died unexpectedly in 1825 and the Russian "Decembrists" attempted a coup d'état, the Poles were caught totally unprepared for action. After the unsuccessful coup, major investigations were initiated, the Polish connection was eventually discovered and arrests were made. Novosil'tsov demanded trials under the Russian criminal system, but Czartoryski was able to convince the new Tsar, Nicholas I (1825-55), to try the Poles under Polish constitutional procedures by the Sejm Tribunal, which ultimately imposed light sentences on the defendants because no treasonous acts had actually been committed. Nicholas was furious at
this outcome but was unable to take action because of his country's involvement in the Turko-Russian War and the possible problems the war might generate with Austria. By 1829, however, the Polish people had become so opposed to the existing regime that revolutionary action was inevitable.

The 1830 Uprising

The first major eruption in partitioned Poland occurred in Warsaw in November, 1830. The 1830 Uprising failed due to lack of full support from the Polish peasants, lack of crucial material support from the European governments sympathetic to the Polish cause (France, Austria, and Britain), and the overwhelming might of the Russian army. But it left a lasting imprint on the future by fanning the nationalistic fervor of the Poles, triggering other revolutionary ferment elsewhere, most notably in Galicia (Austrian Poland) in 1846-48 and Poznania (Prussian Poland) in 1848. The immediate consequences of the 1830 Uprising were reprisals in all occupied sectors of Poland.

Aftermath of the 1830 Uprising

Russian Poland

The reprisals came immediately to Russian Poland, as Nicholas vented the rage that had been seething within him since the Decembrid Revolt of 1825. He suspended the
Polish Constitution of 1815, abolished the Sejm (Polish Parliament), and disbanded the Russian-commanded Polish army. He named General Ivan Paskevich, the conqueror of Warsaw, Viceroy of Poland. Paskevich firmly and harshly ruled the country through the puppet State Administrative Council, which existed until the Russian Senate assumed control in 1841. Additionally, Polish civil authorities throughout the country were placed under Russian military control. All high administrative posts were given over to Russians. Nicholas introduced the Russian Criminal Code and even Russian currency into Poland. In 1839, the Education Ministry was abolished and the universities of Warsaw and Wilno were closed, as well as most elementary and secondary schools. Henceforth, university students were required to attend St. Petersburg and Kiev Universities. Collections from museums, science faculties, art treasuries, and libraries were moved to Russia. Although the Polish language was not totally restricted, its formal use in education and government fell to the enforced use of Russian. For the next three decades Russification of Poland was the aim.

Prussian Poland

Many of the reprisals taking place in Russian Poland were paralleled in the other two parts of partitioned Poland. Both the Prussian and Austrian authorities viewed
the material and military support given to the Kingdom by their areas as criminal activities to be dealt with before future problems arose. The Berlin government, therefore, quickly withdrew many human rights from its Polish lands. German became the official language of the provinces and was mandatory in all schools and administrative offices.\textsuperscript{27}

As his ultimate goal, the new governor of Poznania, Edward Flottwell

... strove to destroy all that could prevent a total merger of the Grand Duchy of Posen with the rest of the monarchy. This implied a policy of weakening the position of the leading Polish groups: the nobility ... and the clergy ... . As for the masses, they were educated in the Prussian spirit through the army and schools ... .\textsuperscript{28}

In 1840, however, a new liberal government came to power in Prussia with the coronation of King Frederick William IV; this resulted in years of a relaxation of censorship, language concessions, and the general improvement of the lives of the population.\textsuperscript{29}

Austrian Poland

After the defeat of the 1830 Uprising, Vienna imposed its own brand of censorship, language restriction, and continued repression with enough success that all revolutionary tendencies were suppressed for most of the next twenty years. Additionally, Vienna was able to curtail many of the liberties in Kraków until, under a Russian-Austrian agreement of 1836, the city was occupied
by the Austrian army and fully incorporated into Austria.\textsuperscript{30}

The repression succeeded so easily that a report issued in 1838 stated that

\ldots the aristocracy preferred foreign rule to a native radical regime; the Polish peasantry manipulated by Austrian authorities hardly considered itself Polish \ldots . Only the gentry, the poorer groups of the middle class, and the youth were willing to participate in patriotic and socially progressive movements.\textsuperscript{31}

Mistakenly, the Austrian regime did not at that time consider these groups as threats.

The consequence of all the repressive actions taken by the Three Powers was that, within a few short years following the 1830 Uprising, these Powers were able to gain full operational control over their Polish territories. For Poland, the consequences were thoroughly devastating.

\textbf{The Great Emigration}

In the aftermath of the failed uprising, the Polish nation suffered vast cultural consequences due to "The Great Emigration of 1831." Thousands of Poland's elite left the country because of official or self-imposed exile. Over seventy-five percent of the emigres came from the gentry while others "represented an elite of the nation and counted among its members some of the greatest names in Polish literature, history, music and political
thought. The political, ideological, and cultural life of Poland ostensibly moved abroad.

For the next seven decades, the Poles in exile would assume important influence on the political and cultural developments and activities in Poland. They would inspire the nation ideologically through their association with nationalistic freedom movements in Western Europe. But, from the outside, they could give little concrete help to the motherland. National and personal liberation would have to come from within the country itself, and this realization by the Polish people led to further violent protests against their foreign oppressors.

The Spring of Nations and New Uprisings

Two major uprisings took place in Poland in the late 1840s during the period of European history known as the "Spring of Nations." The first happened in Galicia in 1846, and the second in Poznania in 1848-49. Both, however, ended in defeat, leading to the abolition of the Free State of Kraków and a fervid continuation of the harsh reprisals of 1831. These uprisings failed because they were begun without confirmed support from the international community, they lacked good organization from within and without, and, probably most important, they lacked proper armaments. Nevertheless, the 1848 uprising, which coincided with the social revolutions in France,
Austria, Germany, Italy, and Hungary, saw feudalism in Poznania and Galicia totally abolished in its wake. Also, it witnessed, for the first time, the landowners and peasants united against a common enemy.

Russian Poland did not participate in the revolutionary events of the 1840s because Russia's control had become overpowering. The events of 1846 and 1848-49 did not go unnoticed, however, and furthermore, the Crimean War of 1854-56, in which Russia fought the Western Powers, revealed the "inner weakness of Russia and emphasized her backwardness," characteristics which eventually forced a relaxation of many of its measures in its occupied territories. However, the unstable international situation, the visible weakness of the Russian Empire, and the political activity of student and other groups, both in Russian and Poland, created conditions for another revolutionary surge.

The 1863 Uprising and Its Aftermath

After two years of open demonstrations, various revolutionary groups in Poland began to unite for a central thrust. The major coalition to form was in Warsaw—the National Central Committee consisting of the more radical revolutionary groups. The Committee had an enormous underground network that reached as far as Poznania and Galicia. Although extremely secret, the Committee
received widespread support for its opposition to the Polish puppet government in Warsaw. On September 1, 1862, the Committee proclaimed itself the Temporary National Government. On January 22, 1863, the call for a new revolution went out when the Committee issued its Manifesto.

The 1863 Uprising, which began in Warsaw and was fought primarily in Russian Poland, quickly gained support from all areas of partitioned Poland. The Uprising was doomed to failure from the start, however, because of forceful action taken by Prussia within one month of its beginning. Bismarck, the new Prussian chancellor, realized that the new alliance between Russia and France was upsetting the balance of power in Europe. Desiring a dissolution of this alliance and a rapprochement with Russia, he unhesitatingly offered the Tzar military assistance to quell the Polish insurrection. On February 8, the two powers signed the Alvensleben Convention of mutual aid. The action effectively blocked any international aid that the Poles might have received, because neither France, England, nor Austria wanted to risk war with a Russia firmly supported by Prussia. With only international sympathy as their support, the Poles fought alone and after two years lost their battle for freedom. As a result:

The failure and suppression of the rising of 1863 hung like a cloud over Poland for the next half-century. . . The quality of government varied greatly between
the three states among which Poland was divided. Austrian rule, at one time the most heavy-handed, had now become the most easy-going. Prussia, which had at one time verged on liberalism, now became most reactionary, and did the most to uproot Polish culture and destroy the use of the Polish language. . . . Russian policy was similar in its ends . . . A brutal policy of Russification was adopted. The name of Poland disappeared from Russian maps. Government officials were Russian . . . A vigorous censorship was enforced until only a short time before the First World War. The Polish language was treated as if it were only a dialect of Russian . . . .

After the crushing of the 1863 Uprising Poland changed its philosophical course dramatically. It abandoned its romantic notions of armed revolt and entered a period of self-improvement from within. This period was witness to the philosophical shift to Positivism.

Austrian Poland

The political climate in Austrian Poland after the collapse of the 1863 Uprising turned from the liberal-revolutionary one to that of a conservative-compromising one. The Polish conservatives, mostly landowners and gentry, uneasy supporters of the Uprising, now went out of their way to condemn this last insurrection, as well as the whole tradition of armed revolt. They had reached the belief that

. . . Vienna could always keep Galicia in check by wielding the peasant . . . weapon. Only loyal cooperation could bring concessions. Furthermore, given the latent Austro-Russian antagonism, the interests of Vienna and of the Poles could coincide.
To that end, one major spokesman for the conservatives, Stanisław Kozman, specifically argued that

... the Poles could only recover independence when aided by a great power, and ... such a power was Austria. But this was a distant goal, and ... while independence was the most perfect form of national existence it was not the only one. As for hopeless insurrectionary attempts to achieve independence, they were, in fact, endangering national existence.40

Another factor the conservatives considered was the deterioration of the Austrian empire at the time of the 1863 Uprising. Because of its defeat in Italy in 1859, the continuing Hungarian constitutional struggle, and the ever-present Polish demands for Galician autonomy, Austria eventually was forced to make concessions to its occupied peoples. Recognizing this fact, the Polish conservative leaders in Galicia deftly exploited the situation, obtaining three important Austrian concessions.

The first, which came in 1861, was the Emperor's February Patent which "finally established a constitutional system for Austria, [and] also made provision for Galicia's separate legal and administrative institutions."41 The second, which came in 1867, was the Emperor's Fundamental Law which granted "governmental changes in Galicia ... . Both an elective legislature, the Sejm KraJowy, and the provincial executive body, the WydziaJ' KraJowy, were created."42 The third, which came in 1869, was the general easing of oppressive sanctions which resulted in the Polish language being made co-equal
with German in all official business. In the areas of education, the Jagiellonian and Lwów Universities again were Polonized in 1870 and 1871, the Academy of Science and Letters was opened in Kraków in 1873, and the official School Board was established in 1873 to provide a system of full-time primary education in the Polish language. Yet, despite these improvements, problems persisted in the Polish society of Galicia, because it still was very much divided along class lines, primarily between the gentry and peasant classes. The resultant class struggle that was waged had important ramifications for Galicia and for Polish nationalism in general because in the eyes of the peasantry Polish nationality was represented by the gentry and for this reason the overwhelming majority of the peasantry did not wish for generations to admit to a solidarity with Polish national aspirations... the peasantry for many years, up to the end of the nineteenth century, did not consider themselves Poles. Looking on the peasants as troublemakers, the gentry did not want a complete settlement of the agrarian problem, nor did it feel bound to educate the former serfs. The result of this lack of concern was that for the next three decades various peasant movements arose, so that By the last decade of the nineteenth century there could be no doubt in the minds of the propertied classes in Galicia that their position was being challenged by the people. These movements were the initial stirrings of the socialist movements in Poland. Despite all these
shortcomings, however, "Galicia did become the freest area of partitioned Poland, and signally contributed to Polish civilization and twentieth-century statehood."46

**Prussian Poland**

After Prussia's final unification into the state of Germany was achieved under Bismarck, the Polish provinces were seen as a dangerous foreign element in what ought to be a wholly German state.47 Bismarck's contempt for the Polish people was never masked: in 1862, just before the 1863 Uprising, he had written:

> Personally, I sympathize with their opposition but if we want to exist, we cannot do other than extirpate them. A wolf is not to blame that God made him as he is: which does not mean that we shouldn't shoot him to death whenever possible.48

Now beginning in 1871 and lasting until around 1885, Bismarck initiated a new wave of suppression known as the Kulturkampf policy. The results of this policy were the following: the Polish language was eliminated from the school system and administrative offices; the teaching of Polish as a foreign language was abolished; teachers were forbidden to join Catholic or Polish societies; and the clergy and other religious appointed to church offices were subject to governmental approval. With these measures the Catholic Church lost its historical control over education.49 Bismarck also established his Ansiedlungs Kommission für Westpreussen und Posen in 1886 which he
endowed with one hundred million marks for the purpose of assisting "the operation of buying land in Poznania and Pomerania and parceling it out among German settlers." The main idea behind this measure was to set up a German peasant class in Prussian Poland as a bastion of Germanization, thus averting any possible Polonization of the German upper class living in the Polish provinces. In the end, Bismarck's Kulturkampf and the resultant Kommission stimulated the very feelings they were supposed to suppress:

From the Polish point of view, they were the best things that could have happened. Without them, there might have been no Polish movement in Prussia at all. Until German officialdom chose to harass the Poles, Germanization was widely thought to be the natural destiny of all the Hohenzollerns' non-German subjects, . . . the Germanization policy in Prussian Poland . . . was broadly conversant with similar programmes of social modernization all over Europe . . . . What was remarkable perhaps was the thoroughness and inflexibility of its application, and in consequence, the vehemence of the Polish response.51

When Bismarck fell from power in 1890, the Prussian government, now headed by Chancellor, Count Leo von Caprivi, found it useful to grant concessions to Poznania. In addition to a relaxation in Germanization policies, the Polish language again was allowed in schools and in religious classes, as well as an elective subject in elementary schools, and Poles were granted access to state credits for the reacquisition of their lands. This last concession lasted only until 1894 when the Germans became
fearful that the Poles were gaining advantage in land ownership.52

But Caprivi was replaced as chancellor in 1894 in part because of his concession to the Poles, and with his fall, anti-Polish activities resurfaced in the German administration. In the same year a new society for the promotion of German national interests in the Prussian Polish territory was formed: Deutscher Ostmark Verein better known as Hakata. The aim of Hakata was "to agitate for a renewed effort to conquer the Polish districts of the east . . . [and] the seeking to dispossess the Poles and submit them to all manner of harassment . . . ."53

With the government's support of such organizations and activities, Polish street names, town names, official signs, and surnames were Germanized, German teachers and officials were paid bonuses to serve in the eastern provinces, and as a result German settlers, officials, and bureaucrats flooded Prussian Poland. The Polish language was once again banned in religious services and, eventually, in schools. Through the institution of Ausnahmegesetze, exceptional laws concerning Prussian legalism, Poles were relegated to second class citizenship in their own country. These measures continued until the conclusion of the First World War.54

In their desire to Germanize Poznania completely, however, certain Prussian measures actually resulted in
benefiting the Polish population. For example, the
Prussian state invested heavily in its Polish provinces.
It built additional schools, railroads, libraries, and
museums. Industrialization proceeded at an ever-
increasing rate, efficient bureaucratic and governmental
systems were established, agricultural reform was con-
tinued, and the general population was educated, albeit in
the German system but, nevertheless, educated.55

By the turn of the twentieth century, however,
Berlin's anti-Polish policies resulted in an active Polish
post-romantic, nationalistic movement that spread to all
classes of people, many of whom had never before really
considered themselves Polish. Polish political action
parties, especially the various developing socialist
movements, began overt anti-German and pro-Polish activ-
ities. At the same time, against the wishes of the con-
servative Polish leadership, the

... younger members of the intelligentsia and the
landowning class ... were searching for new policies
that would benefit the Polish nation. Rejecting the
idea of an armed uprising and critical of Poznanian
parochialism they sought a common platform with their
countrymen who lived under Russian and Austrian rule.
Eventually they found it in the Polish League and the
nascent National Democratic movement, both of which
were all-Polish in character.56

Russian Poland

Generally, the Russian policy in Poland after the
1863 Uprising was one of violent repression,
Russification, and the elimination of any and all social forces resistant to Russian rule. For the people directly involved in the Uprising, Russian justice produced over four hundred executions, thousands of Siberian deportations, over 3,400 confiscated estates, the name "Kingdom of Poland" being replaced by "Vistula Land," Polish town names Russified, civilians tried by military courts, deportations without court ruling, and the elimination of separate administrative institutions. Additionally, Russian Poland was divided into ten guberniias (districts) administered by Russians who allowed only Russian as the official language. The Polish bank was made a branch of the Imperial Bank. The judiciary was Russified, thus denying the Polish population elected justices and trial by jury.57

Education and the Catholic Church experienced some of the most brutal Russification policies: Russian again became the official language of instruction; the Polish language was totally banned from use and considered a foreign language; books in Polish were not published and could only be purchased abroad and smuggled in at much personal risk; and by 1869, schools and their curricula were completely Russified and the Main School (University) of Warsaw was replaced by the Russian University of Warsaw. These educational policies eventually resulted in
a whole generation of Poles that literally could not speak nor read in its native language.  

In other measures, the Polish Church was forced to break with Rome and was placed under the Spiritual College in St. Petersburg. Many bishops opposing these moves were exiled. Most monasteries were closed and Church property was confiscated. The entire clergy was paid by the State, forcing it to become completely dependent materially on the Russian government. All sermons, publications, schools, and seminaries had either to be approved or inspected by the Tzarist police. The attempt to require Russian for sermons, prayers, and singing, however, did not succeed but only exacerbated the growing nationalistic confrontations between the two peoples. In the end, despite the harsh policies, the Church, through perseverance, proved to be one of the main vehicles which secured the survival of Poland's language and much of her culture.

Through its abolition of serfdom (1864), Russia created another unexpected problem, that of large numbers of freed peasants not being absorbed by the available land. At the same time the lesser gentry, who most ardently supported the 1863 Uprising, suffered considerably from the overall repressive policies and land reform acts because it was not financially strong enough to make the transition to the new forms of management imposed.
Consequently, there resulted a great influx of gentry and peasants into the cities seeking work.  

A result of the increased influx of the gentry to the cities was the cultural transformation of urban life. The towns, hitherto largely populated by German and Jewish inhabitants, as was true for all this part of Europe, now became more closely connected with a Polish culture of specifically gentry character. This affected, above all, the rapidly growing intelligentsia. This group, the most active culturally, now transmitted gentry traditions to broader sections of the community, which were only, at this time awakening to a full cultural life. Thus, both the urban proletariat and the entire Polish bourgeoisie took on many of the Polish gentry traditions. Here we have a distinct feature of Polish culture, which gives it its uniqueness among European nations. The nineteenth century saw the triumph of bourgeois culture in all of Europe, but in Poland the picture was different.  

Accordingly, the Russian policies of de-nationalization, repression, land reform, and industrialization produced few positive but many negative results. In its almost fanatical desire to de-Polonize its Polish lands, the Tsarist government actually produced in its Polish subjects an awareness of their Polishness, and engendered the cultural feelings that it was trying so hard to destroy. 

Hence, no matter how each of the Three Powers tried to assimilate its conquered people, the final result was always a further alienation of the population and the intensification of nationalistic feelings, all of which came to a head during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Furthermore, despite all the repressive measures undertaken by the Three Powers during the partitions,
certain elements of Polish society and culture remained intact. The first was the importance of the Church and its inseparable relationship to Polish nationalism. The second was the Polish language, because the Polish people believed that as long as they were able to maintain a part of their language, whether in Church, at home or through their literature, they were able to maintain their national identity. The Three Powers inevitably brought about a third element—retention by the Poles of their politico-cultural heritage—through an increase in the literacy rate. This occurred through the mistaken belief that the introduction of their own education systems would disinherit the people. The repressive measures of the Three Powers throughout the nineteenth century, therefore, had a boomerang effect in Poland, so much so that, by the end of the nineteenth century, Poland was still a national entity where

... the working class became stronger ... The position of the landowning gentry was on the whole able to adapt itself to the new economic conditions ... All this gave the leading groups in Polish society a feeling of power and strengthened that faith in the future of the nation, which had been weakened by the disaster of the insurrection[s].

THE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Literary Development

Although it was easy for the Three Powers to erase the state of Poland from the map of Europe, it was not that
easy to eradicate the primary essence of the Polish nation—its cultural identity. Try as they might, the Three Powers never were fully successful in such attempts. This was due to the determination of the Polish people to keep their culture alive regardless of the immediate consequence.

In the study of nineteenth-century Polish socio-cultural history, several factors must be remembered: first, Polish culture stagnated when the nation was destroyed politically by the partitions; second, many of its cultural elite left the country during what is known as "The Great Emigration;" third, both cultural ferment (in literature) and stagnation (in music) occurred because of the political neutering of the nation; and fourth, the cultural heritage of the nation became acutely associated with the quest for national survival.

Socially and culturally, Poland at the time of the partitions was divided into two main groups "the educated minority, whose national consciousness was well developed, and the uneducated masses, whose awareness of national or political allegiances had still to be awakened." In the first group were the aristocracy, wealthy landowners (magnates), the gentry, and the urban middle-class. In the second group were the peasants who constituted the majority of the population. After 1863, to ensure their
national survival, the first group eventually recognized its duty to culturally educate the second group because

In the lives of those people who were conscious of their separate Polish identity, the struggle to safeguard and expand the nation's culture was unrelenting... it often constituted the last line of defense. It concentrated on two interrelated campaigns--on the nurturing of the Polish language, and on the education of children.54

Although personal or class survival often superseded national survival, resulting in the continuing conflict between the minority and majority groups, a continuous battle was, nevertheless, waged against their foreign oppressors in order to maintain the national cultural heritage. This battle was most successful in the arenas of literature and music. Poland's cultural development during the partition period can be divided into four major epochs: The Partitions to the 1830 Uprising (1772-1830), The Post-1830 Uprising to the 1863 Uprising, The Post-1863 Uprising to 1885, and 1885 to 1917. Each period is the product of particular socio-cultural conditions and distinguished mainly by its literary philosophy and output.

The Partitions to the 1830 Uprising

During Stanisław Augustus's reign (1764-95) a great cultural reformation of Poland had begun as the spread of foreign fashions and ways of life were favored by the court and Polish nobility. As a result much of Western
culture had entered Polish society. French, Italian, and English writers on politics, education, economics, and jurisprudence were translated into Polish in large numbers. Polish theater was a product of French and Italian adaptations. French and Italian architects, painters, and sculptors permanently settled in Poland, most enjoying royal patronage. Although the literary arts eventually became the domain of native born Polish writers, these writers imbued their works primarily with the intellectual ideals of the French Enlightenment.

Despite the destruction of the Polish Enlightenment by the partitions, the French influence of such writers as Diderot, Voltaire, d'Alembert, and Rousseau remained considerable, contributing to the May 3, 1791 Constitution, the Kościuszko Insurrection, and the Polish support of Napoleon during the 1806–14 war. After the partitions, as the matter of how to cope with the newly imposed foreign governments and cultures arose,

. . . the concept of "Polishness" gradually emerged as an ethereal entity requiring loyalty and existing even without embodiment of state . . . . An old tendency to idealize "golden freedom" which had distinguished Poland from her neighbors . . . underwent a mutation: enormous talents for self-pity were displayed, and Poland was presented as an innocent victim suffering for the sins of humanity. This new version contained the additives of Napoleonic myth and Utopian Socialism.

Although Poland's culture experienced a major disruption during the early years of the partitions, certain components of it continued, but on a much reduced scale.
Most important of these was the Society of Friends of Learning, created in 1800, composed of a broad, mixed group of people—scholars, dilettantes, aristocrats, burghers, priests, writers, journalists, and Jews. It was . . . a kind of academy of arts and sciences, was divided into scholarly sections and emphasized the Polish language and Polish history; it took an active interest in other disciplines. It sought to popularize learning and shape intellectual and artistic trends in the country. [And without royal patronage, it was] the first time scholarship emancipated itself from court patronage and operated through a 'republic of scholars' who shouldered the burden of national leadership in the intellectual sphere.67

The Society's independence and its belief in the role of language in preserving the national culture and, thus, national survival, were its most important assets. Also, the diversity of its membership brought about a broader battlefront against the attempted eradication of the national culture and traditions. As a result, when the period of liberalism appeared after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, a considerable amount of the nation's "Polishness" had survived and began to flourish again in the three major Polish cities of Warsaw, Kraków, and Wilno.

This period in the cultural history of Polish may be seen as one of transition. Neo-Classical ideas continued stressing aspects of the Enlightenment and also introduced a realization of national spirit, yet the period did not promote nationalistic ideals because of its inherent quality of reason and universality. But such classical
ideals could not endure the Polish population's growing demands for social change arising from the growing idealism of nationalism. Thus, "Under the Polish conditions in which notions of patriotic sacrifice and national tragedy were ever present, there was need for a more emotional type of expression."68

Post-1830 Uprising to the 1863 Uprising

The first stirrings of Polish Romanticism appeared in 1822 with the publication of the first volume of the poems of Adam Mickiewicz. In these works the classical tradition was broken as Mickiewicz wrote about "popular motifs and interest in the fate of the common people."69 Also important were the first instances of political revolutionary undertones. For Poland, general ideals such as 1) the necessity to battle against political slavery while demanding the right of freedom to nations so deprived, 2) the concern for public life and the social struggle for the rights of oppressed peoples, and 3) the struggle against social prejudices which hindered the freedom of the individual70 produced a form of Romanticism different from that of the rest of Europe because

Contrary to the brand of Romanticism which in many countries was identified with a withdrawal of the individual into his own interior world, Romanticism in Poland acquired an extremely activist character . . . .71
This Polish Romanticism quickly became associated with nationalism. In an essay in his book *O literaturze polskiej w wieku XIX* of 1830, Maurycy Mochnacki (1804-34) proclaimed that "one of the main tasks of romanticism was the awakening of the national consciousness." 

This brand of Polish idealism was noted by the Austrian statesman, Prince Metternich, in a memorandum to Tzar Alexander I in 1820, in which he discussed the Polish question:

> The real aim of the idealist . . . is religious and political fusion, and this being analyzed is nothing else but creating in favor of each individual an existence entirely independent of all authority, or any other will than his own, an idea absurd and contrary to the nature of man, and incompatible with the need of human society . . . . It is principally the middle classes of society which this moral gangrene has affected . . . .

What Metternich praised as the redeeming quality of society—authority—was for the Poles an authority that oppressed their national identification.

Especially important to Polish Romanticism was Johann Gottfried von Herder's thesis that literature should "express the national character of the people." When this concept was combined with the idea that national and cultural preservation was the task of the writer, it is no wonder that the Polish Romantic writer was hailed as a "charismatic leader, [and] incarnation of the collective strivings of the peoples . . . ." Tracing the different origins of nationalisms, Hans Kohn has written:
In Western Europe, modern nationalism was the work of statesmen and political leaders. In Central and Eastern Europe it was the poet, the philologist, and the historian who created the nationalities.

With the Great Emigration, Poland lost the majority of her most active intellectuals to Germany and most importantly to France. Paris, the center of international ideologies, brought the exiled Poles into the sphere of influence of the most radical and conservative tendencies of thought. Out of these was born Polish Messianism which followed the general ideological European program of action for regaining national freedoms. As a result "All Polish writings of the period abound in mystical appeals to the Napoleonic myth as a force which would abolish the reactionary order oppressing Europe." Paris became the European center of Polish cultural and political life in exile; and it was the individual writer, most particularly, who became

... the universal and consistent spokesman of the revolutionary watchwords proclaimed by a large number of secret organizations of a national or--more rarely--international character, and the sowers of the seed were the poets; many of them soldiers, social leaders and patriots, large numbers of whom died on battlefields, while others spent hungry years in the casements of fortresses and in the notorious political prisons of those times.

Because of the impact of their writers, Poles who had not been able to cast off the yoke of foreign slavery...
Although several Polish writers gained respectable acclaim at home, three in particular became the spokesmen of the national consciousness, culture, and society: Adam Mickiewicz (1798-1855), Juliusz Słowacki (1809-1849), and Zygmunt Krasiński (1812-1859). Known as the "national bards" of Poland, all three became expatriates during the Great Emigration. Although the majority of their works were written abroad, they were greatly feared by the Three Powers. At times censored and most times banned in Poland, their works, nonetheless, strongly affected their countrymen of all social and economic classes. Writing in their native tongue, heavily imbuing their works with folklore and nationalistic fervor, they fueled and fanned the fires of revolutionary ideas in Poland that led to the uprisings of 1830, 1846-49, and 1863. At the same time they helped preserve the nation's cultural heritage in the battle against the Germanization and Russification policies of the Three Powers. The bards

. . . looked upon themselves as the leaders of a nation deprived of its freedom of expression and fettered in its cultural development. Theirs was a mission to continue the struggle that began on that November night in Warsaw, but through other means . . . The artists' mission was to give spiritual leadership to the nation . . . . [Thus,] the Romantic heritage became an insoluble part of Poland's national inheritance, which although negated and contested many a time never completely disappeared. It shaped the outlook of the 1863 insurgents and was visible in the national and social struggles of the early twentieth century.
Post-1863 Uprising to 1885

The suppression of the 1863 Uprising left divided Poland ever more closely tied to each of the dividing Powers. By their imposition of strict censorship, the Three Powers were able to limit severely cultural freedom, bringing about the demise of the nobility as a social class and the end of the ideology known as "political Romanticism." In its wake a new philosophical ideology, Positivism, was introduced.

Simply put, Positivists believed that nature evolved through natural progression and that the same laws were applicable to society. The values of "real," "certain," "utilitarian," "relative," and "positive" became all important, the romantic ideals of the past period were dismissed. Although the basic philosophy of Positivism was developed by the French philosopher August Comte, the Poles looked more to the philosophical writings of the English utilitarians, Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill, and to science and economic progress as the vehicles of improving their divided and ravaged country, thus rejecting their woeful nationalistic past. The strict censorship imposed by the Three Powers prohibited normal public debate of political and national issues. This forced the Polish Positivists to express their ideas through allusions in literary writings. Thus, Polish Positivism became
... less a philosophical school and more of a literary, social and political trend. Rejecting the romantic myth of the chosen nation, it postulated the view that the nation was an organism. It wished to strengthen this organism so that it could withstand the pressures of the occupying powers.  

Poland, therefore, continued to rely on literature as its means of political and cultural debate. Despite political censorship, the Polish press published quantities of writings in which class barriers, obscurantism and clericalism were attacked, while the rights of the unfortunate were advanced. Also, the increase of literacy and the spreading of scientific knowledge were seen as the only way to lift the moral level of the masses.  

As in the Romantic period three literary figures, in particular, stand out: Eliza Orzeszkowa (1841-1910), Aleksander Głowacki, better known by his pen-name, Bolesław Prus (1847-1912), and Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846-1916). As Positivist writers they condemned the evils done to the peasants and, at times, provided remedies for their plight by showing that the peasant's life and mentality were of intrinsic value to the country. This was accomplished through the subject matter of their literary and theatrical works, thus giving the Polish peasant a place in national life. These writers also addressed the changing aspect of town life, viewing towns as social melting pots generating new groups of people, new social phenomena, and new economic conditions. Additionally, they condemned
discrimination against the Jews. Finally, they addressed the negative aspects of the existing educational systems, thus encouraging unofficial Polish educational societies to organize throughout Poland. As long as the writers did not directly enter the realm of politics or mention Polish independence in their works, the Three Powers did not interfere with the circulation of their works throughout the divided country as they had done so savagely during the Romantic period. Therefore, literature more than ever before became the communicating link, disseminating views important to the whole nation. In the end

Positivist literature, like its Romantic predecessor, played a social and national role, building up the public spirit of the society, recommending work as an essential instrument in putting right the errors of the past and in building a new and better future. In principle this literature, based on a rationalistic view of the world and confidence in the strength of man, was optimistic and if it proclaimed the cult of light it was because the dogma of this trend was the conviction of the final victory of light over darkness.

Despite the successes of Positivism, in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, new waves of thought began to pervade European intellectual circles. Variously labeled as art nouveau, impressionism, decadentism, symbolism, neo-romanticism, modernism, and so forth, these new waves or movements arose simultaneously in many European countries despite varying social and economic
systems, becoming the leading socio-cultural forces in Europe. In Poland, the general modernistic movement became known as the "Young Poland" period, the crux of which is explained in part in the following:

One can say that the approximate date of 1885 (usually given as the beginning of the crisis of nineteenth-century scientism in France) marked a return to the Romantic revolt after a hiatus of several decades of naive confidence in unlimited bourgeois progress. At first, the new movement was represented only by small groups of Bohemians. These rebels against the Establishment had no programs except negation. They combated regular art and literature, proclaimed the end of Parnasian poetry and of naturalism in prose, made alliances with anarchists in politics, and saw Western civilization as having reached a stage of decadence.

With this change in thinking, the Western world had taken a sharp philosophical turn away from the concept of the "masses" to that of the "self." The philosophical writings of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Fredrich von Schelling, and Kierkegaard became most influential.

What happened in Europe at this time was what one writer identified as

\[... a true crisis of the scientific Weltanschauung, lived through by those who had been imbued with it and who were searching for a way out in philosophies that offered some hope to the individual.\]

Consequently, the younger generation of Polish intellectuals found a variety of philosophical influences available to it. Besides those ideas expressed by the writers mentioned above, the thoughts of Feuerbach, Marx, Engels, Loisy, and Vladimir Solovyev were also prominent, yet those of Schopenhauer were dominant at first. To this
younger generation, the Positivists were seen more and more as having accepted the capitulation of the national heritage. This generation, as a result, began to challenge philosophically the generation of the 1863 Uprising. For them, Positivism was mute because it was void of the essence of the Polish character.

The Young Poland period is a complex period to characterize. Although it was a revolt against Positivism and called for a modernization of thought, it had no clear-cut official program at its beginning, but it went through two very different phases. In the beginning, the period saw a reaction

... against objective realism, social utilitarianism, and the cult of science, the adherents of this movement at first took up the then current slogan Art for Art's Sake. Rejecting the "philistine-bourgeois" outlook, they stressed aestheticism, pure form, and art as an absolute. In search of the inner being, the "naked soul," the artist regarded himself as standing above materialistically inclined mortals.90

These ideals, in the early literary works of the period, produced "... a wave of lyrical, verbose poetry, enamoured of eroticism and complicated symbolism, and consciously harking back to Romanticism."91 (It is important to note that many of these writers' poetic works were set to music by the composers officially known as Young Poland in Music, composers who rebelled against the old-fashioned status quo of music in Poland.) The established artistic community in Poland, quite naturally, considered the
modernists as decadents who were crushing underfoot the great traditions of the past. In defense of the new generation, Artur Górski (1882-1959), an influential author writing under the pseudonym Quasimodo, published a series of articles in the Kraków journal Życia (1897-1900). These articles were titled "Young Poland," hence the eventual name of the period. Górski defended the lack of a specific program stating:

We leave the formulating of programmes to people who want activity. This is not our intention. Indeed it is precisely because we do not want to act that we write. . . . Individualism and philosophical reflection are features of the youngest literature, and we shall not deal here with the whys and wherefores of the process which caused what is to some extent a withdrawal from reality, from the idea of action, of acting together, for it is a manifestation justified both by our political evolution during the most recent years and by the trends in European literature, which reflect the spirit of the times.92

Górski was not only defending the new movement's principles, he was also supporting the tenets laid down by the movement's founder, the author Stanisław Przybyszewski (1868-1927), who had come into contact with the leading European representatives of the modernistic movement, particularly the "Young Germany" and "Young Scandinavia" groups. Eventually, to support the words of Górski and to establish formally his philosophical-literary movement, Przybyszewski published his "Confiteor" in Życia on January 1, 1899. This was his manifesto that openly spurned the tenets of Positivism and introduced
Przybyszewskian ideals, familiar to the West as the Schopenhauerian doctrine of "Art for Art's Sake." However, such ideals could not be sustained for any length of time because they were too lacking in social commitment to achieve popularity. What support there was began to wane as the ideas of Schopenhauer were replaced by those of Nietzsche. As one student of the times has written:

"Art for art's sake" was virtually impossible to cultivate in a partitioned country whose intellectual elite had always been in the forefront of the national struggle. While "art for art's sake" broadened the horizons of Polish literature and visual arts by bringing in Scandinavian or even Japanese elements, it was bound to succumb to a preoccupation with national and social themes. ... [And] since most of the representatives of the movement used a variety of artistic media, the impact of "Young Poland" was evident in prose, poetry, literary criticism, visual arts, and music.93

By 1900 the Young Poland movement had switched to the tenets of neo-romanticism. Nationalism resurfaced strongly with this re-advocation of romantic ideals. Mickiewicz, and particularly, Słowacki became literary oracles once again. Poetry, unimportant to the Positivists, again found equal status with and eventually greater status than prose. Mythical, heroic characters began to appear and symbolism, a product of French literature, as well as the idea of "the fantastic" re-entered Polish works. The overriding result of these changes was that by around 1900 "the national and social current became so strong in the works of the Neo-Romantics that it
completely overshadowed the watchword 'art for art's sake'. . . ."94 Stanisław Szczepanowski, a journalist of the times, expressed this change when he wrote:

I am not interested in literature as art. Perhaps, there are happier nations that can indulge in such luxury. We, who are fighting for our life and national existence, should always remember to ask whether the things that are happening strengthen us and help us in our struggle. And therefore, literature . . . is important only if it revitalizes the nation's spirit.95

Despite a lack of unity as to the means of achieving their objectives, the Young Poland writers "expressed dissatisfaction with aspects of Poland's insularity, advocating an understanding of what was occurring in the rest of Europe."96 Cultural revitalization in order to bring Poland up to par culturally with the rest of Europe transcended all individual ideologies.

The Young Poland period produced many unique literary and artistic personalities, far too many to discuss here. Nevertheless, Przybyszewski and Górski were joined by Zenon Przesmycki (1861-1944), known as Miriam, the editor of the Warsaw journal Chimera which presented literary works, translations of contemporary European authors, reproductions of drawings and painting that followed the tenets of decadentism as expressed by his two contemporaries. This journal was the Warszawian equivalent to Kraków's Życia. When the emphasis moved toward nationalistic and neo-romantic ideals, Przybyszewski in particular, and also Miriam lost much of their influence.
Górski, however, adopted the new directions and remained a modestly important writer, as seen by his prose poem Mon-salvant (1908) in which he portrays Mickiewicz as the "spiritual leader of the new times." Przybyszewski also had his imitators and one in particular--Tadeusz Miciński (1873-1918)--even surpassed him as a literary figure. Miciński, one of the most unusual writers in Polish literature, tended to deal with the symbolic or fantastic ideals of the struggle between Good and Evil--the two ultimate polarities of life. Although Miciński's mysticism was highly personal and had no social significance, his poems proved to be popular sources for texts to musical compositions of the times.

Of the many representatives of the Young Poland period, that is, of its nationalistic phase, the most notable were Kazimierz Tetmajer (1865-1940), Jan Kasprowicz (1860-1926), Stefan Zeromski (1864-1925), Władysław Reymont (1867-1925), Tadeusz (Boy) Zelenski (1874-1941), Stanisław Witkiewicz (1885-1939), Wracław Berent (1873-1940), Julian Tuwim (1894-1953), and Stanisław Wyspiański (1869-1907). Throughout all their works one can feel the great pain for occupied Poland. There is an undeniable sense of melancholy, sadness, yearning, and sensuousness. At the same time the ideal of nationalism resurfaced through them, based now more on Polish folklore and the beauty of nature. With their emphasis on the simplicity
and traditions of rural life they found in the mountain areas around Zakopane, they glorified the peasant for the first time. At the same time, however, they could be critical of all classes of Polish society and speak strongly about their various responsibilities for Poland's national plight. In the end, each of these writers could be characterized as once was Zeromski; a writer who

...engaged in agonizing national soul searching. Fearing for the future of his nation, he insisted that 'its wounds be kept open lest they heal in ignomy.' He spoke of his country as being caught between two millstones (Germany and Russia) and said that Poland had to harden to granite in order to escape destruction.

Musical Development: 1795 to the Appearance of Chopin

With the final partition of the nation in 1795, Poland, as we have seen above, took on an historically peculiar characteristic: its society and culture were forced to accept the imposition of foreign features. As a result, in the most popular and visible musical genre of the early-Romantic period, opera, the development of the national idiom was interrupted. Despite this situation, nationalistic tendencies were upheld in the genres of song, piano, and chamber music. This is explained, to a great extent, by the less visible and more private performance mediums of these genres as opposed to that of opera.
Additionally, Polish music during this period is often considered an anomaly in the context of the general music history of Europe. Throughout the rest of Europe, numerous first-rank composers appeared and gained international recognition in the early-Romantic period. In Poland it was quite the opposite. Only one composer, Chopin, attained this status, and a second composer, Stanisław Moniuszko, reached it only partially. To understand this situation, it must be remembered that Polish composers had to live and create in a partitioned country in which Romanticism

... developed in specific historic and economic conditions; romantic art was maturing in a country deprived of statehood, which could not produce a uniform and economically sound bourgeois, the class which in other countries was mainly responsible for the advancement of the culture of that time. Musical life, including publishing, was incomparably poorer than in other European countries, and conditions were definitely not conducive to the development of art and the flowering of great talents.100

Within Poland two musicians were of particular importance during the first three decades of the nineteenth century: the German-born Józef Elsner (1769-1854) and the native Pole Karol Kurpiński (1785-1857). Elsner's most important musical contributions were his operas because they dared to present strong Polish historical themes as subjects and were infused with motifs of Polish dances and adaptations of Polish folksongs. It was through his operas and, additionally, his songs and religious works in
the Polish language that Eisner most strongly sustained the progression of Polish national musical development.

An often overlooked aspect of Eisner's contributions to Polish musical life, however, are his roles as teacher and promoter. As a teacher, Eisner was responsible for the founding of the Church Music Lovers Society in 1814 and the School of Elementary Music and Art in 1818 which produced many fine singers and instrumentalists. As a promoter, his most important achievements were the founding of the first Warsaw Music Conservatory in 1821 and the Main School of Music in 1826. In cooperation with E.T.A. Hoffmann, he administered the Warsaw Music Club which introduced to Poland works of eminent European composers.101

Karol Kurpiński, as a colleague of Eisner, is often considered the more creative composer of the two, even though he was a self-taught musician. His operatic style showed considerably more infusion of nativistic traits, particularly folk rhythms and melodies, than Eisner's. However, unlike Eisner's operas, Kurpiński's "... did not last for more than a few performances mainly because of the doubtful value of their occasional texts."102 Nevertheless, they were influential in continuing the nationalistic tendencies found in Polish music. Additionally, like Eisner, Kurpiński was important as a music promoter and teacher. In 1820 he founded the first Polish
musical periodical, Tygodnik Muzyczny (The Musical Weekly). Kurpiński’s musical talent and teaching enabled him to become, with Elsner, one of the two most prominent music teachers at the Warsaw Conservatory, and, thereby, in all of Poland.

In sum, the period beginning with the last partition of Poland and lasting to the 1830 Uprising was one in which nationalism began and prospered in Polish music. The music written during this time was characterized by the strong influence of folk music and folk song. However, it also manifested the assimilation of the Viennese classical style. Thus, European compositional techniques and devices were blended... with the elements of national and folk music into an organic whole. [Eventually], this tendency --not always happily fulfilled by composers of no genuine talent--found its perfect expression in the music of Chopin and Moniuszko.

Chopin and the Inter-Uprising Period: 1830-63

The career of Chopin, Poland’s most distinguished musical personality, is too well known to review here. Suffice it to recall that his most renowned teacher was Józef Elsner who instructed him in composition from 1826 to 1829. When in mid-1830 Chopin left for Vienna on his second European tour, his immediate return was prevented by the Uprising. Chopin found his way to Paris where he
was to remain the rest of his life. Chopin, the Polish musician, became Chopin, the international musician.

Almost immediately upon his arrival in Paris in September of 1831, Chopin came into contact with the Polish emigre community, particularly that surrounding the writers Mickiewicz and Słowacki. It must be pointed out, however, that despite his association with the Polish emigres and Robert Schumann's perceptions that the nativistic elements in his music were "'guns hidden in flowers','"105 Chopin's French years revolved around and among the elite of European society and culture, not the Polish circle as one might expect.

Consequently, as a Polish composer by birth and ethnicity, but an international composer by circumstance, Chopin's impact on music was widespread in Europe but little felt in his own country. Though an immediate loss to Poland in the short run, his legacy became universal because his music, in the view of the Polish musicologist Zofia Lissa,

... sublimated the bourgeois musical culture (waltzes) into which he breathed the fresh air of the Polish village, and folklore later proved to be an inexhaustible source of inspiration not only for the development of Chopin's harmonic language, but for his entire musical style. He synthesized, as it were, the musical culture of all classes of Polish society. The most radical innovator among the European composers of his generation, Chopin was to them the symbol of the Polish national style..."106
The failure of the 1830 Uprising changed Poland's musical life rather radically, as Warsaw, the recognized cultural capital of the nation, experienced sharp reprisals. When the Russian occupiers closed the Central Music School, the Warsaw Music Conservatory, and the Wielki Teatr, the country immediately lost its three most important musical institutions. The end result was that a period of musical stagnation settled upon the country, a stagnation that lasted for the next seven decades.

Henceforth, Polish musical instruction had to be undertaken either privately or through music societies consisting of amateur musicians. With the exception of musicians such as the composers Ignacy Dobrzyński (1807-1867) and Albrecht Freyer (1803-1883) (Moniuszko's teacher) who had taught at or graduated from Eisner's Conservatory, contemporary music teachers represented a low level of competence for the next thirty years. Music instruction became haphazard. Similar conditions prevailed in Poland's two other cultural centers, Krakow and Lwów. In essence, professional instruction in composition in Poland ceased.107

Józef Eisner, who had played a most significant role in Polish music during the first three decades of the nineteenth century, continued to predominate beyond the 1830 Uprising until his death. And, because Eisner had taught the greater majority of Poland's composers between 1820-54, he, in essence, created the only school of
composition thought in Poland. It was a school that was continued for decades, and remained firmly rooted in the aesthetic ideals of the Viennese Classical tradition.

Stanisław Moniuszko (1818-72) was the only major Polish composer of the Inter-Uprising period in Poland. Moniuszko, only nine years junior to Chopin, once admitted his musical limitations by expressing wonderment over comparisons made of him and Chopin, writing: "It is not my fault that anybody could be silly enough to want to find consolation in me after the loss of Chopin . . . ."108 In due time the consolation of the nation was found in Moniuszko, however, because his music, particularly his operas, eventually

. . . served above all national musical needs, and though it was no less Polish in flavour, it was less European in style. Chopin carried his 'Polishness' with him and infused it into European music; Moniuszko brought back home from his stay abroad only a few ideas, remaining faithful to the musical requirements of his entourage.109

Moniuszko decided to concentrate his efforts in the genres of vocal music and opera because of Chopin's hegemony at the keyboard and because during his Russian travels, he had come into contact with Glinka, Dargomyski, Cui, and Sarov and, thus, had come to understand fully their ideas of promoting nationalism in Russian music, particularly through song and opera. (It is interesting to note that Cui was a student of Moniuszko.) Despite his success as an opera composer in Poland, Moniuszko never
aroused much interest abroad. There were two reasons for this: first, his librettos were too national in character and in subject and second his was an outdated, conservative musical style which lacked the influences of Beethoven, Wagner, Berlioz, Schumann, Liszt and others who already had moved music far beyond the Mozart-Haydn tradition. Unlike Chopin, Moniuszko, who lived and worked in Poland, was very much aware that he was writing for an audience to which he felt he could be of service and an audience that was losing its musical sophistication. Consequently, Moniuszko, the most influential figure of mid-century, eschewed innovations and, to the detriment of Poland's musical development, cemented a

... tradition for succeeding generations of composers lacking the ability to marry it to the achievements of European music, [and therefore] it degenerated into an epigonism that was not overcome until the beginning of the 20th century.110

Of final import during the Inter-Uprising Period was the formation of a commission to study the possibility of opening a new music conservatory in Warsaw. Eventually, the project was realized by Apolinary Kątski (1825-79), the eminent Polish violinist who had been a pupil of Paganini, when the Warsaw Music Institute officially opened on January 26, 1861, with Kątski himself as director.111 The Institute, in existence until its nationalization in 1919, brought to Poland renewed hope for professional musical instruction and development.
Post-Moniuszko to Young Poland in Music

The founding of the Warsaw Music Institute brought order to musical instruction. It concentrated on two major areas of musical instruction: the first was the certification of music instructors; the second was pedagogical instruction which covered the main divisions of music. Thus, through the Institute, a professional system of musical instruction was re-established in Poland.

In addition to instruction, the Institute organized public concerts by amateur choral, chamber, and orchestral groups, as well as recitals of the Institute's students, although it readily abandoned these activities when the Warsaw Music Society was founded in 1871 for that purpose. Thus, the Society's main activity during its first twelve years was organizing and sponsoring musical events in the capital, but by 1883 it had started its own school of music, offering instruction in singing, piano and orchestral instrument playing, solfege, theory, harmony, counterpoint, and most importantly, in composition, all under the leadership of the composer-teacher, Zygmunt Noskowski. Yet, despite these major advances in musical education, the Polish musical situation remained conservative:

Music had a raison d'être only in so far as it could be an oblique political demonstration aimed at reinforcing the sense of national identity and preserving the Polish language. . . . the composers who succeeded Stanisław Moniuszko cannot [sic] compete with their German, Russian, French or Italian contemporaries. At a time when European music was enjoying
one of its heydays, Polish music was stricken by the hardest period of its history.\textsuperscript{112}

Nevertheless, two composers-teachers played significant roles in Polish musical development during this period: Władysław Żeleński and Zygmunt Noskowski, who represent the final links of the continuum of the Elsner-Freyer-Moniuszko school.

Władysław Żeleński (1837-1921) became first instructor of composition at the Warsaw Music Institute when he returned to Poland after studies in Prague and Paris. He remained at the Institute until 1878 when he was named director of the Warsaw Music Society. At the Society, Żeleński was active in organizing and directing conservative concerts, including the works of Haydn, Mozart, Mendelssohn, and early Beethoven. Żeleński resigned the post of director in 1881 and returned to Kraków, where in 1887 he took the post of director of the Kraków Music Society's music school, eventually reorganizing it into a full-fledged conservatory by the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{113}

As a composer Żeleński was considered the most talented and most thoroughly educated of his generation, yet "... he did not advance far beyond Mendelssohn and Schubert; and [as an] admirer of early Romanticism, he was a foe of Wagner and his followers, and cherished a cult for Chopin ... though he never caught up with Chopin's genius."\textsuperscript{114} This was an aesthetic outlook he forcefully
imparted to his students. Nevertheless, Żeleński's orchestral works played a most important role conditioning the Polish public to a genre not normally presented by its composers.

Zygmunt Noskowski (1846-1909) was the most prominent musical figure in Polish music in the late nineteenth century. His influence was far reaching upon the majority of early twentieth-century Polish composers, most of whom he taught. Upon the resignation of Żeleński as director of the Warsaw Music Society, Noskowski was offered and accepted the position which he held until 1902. At the same time he accepted the position of professor of composition and theory at the Warsaw Music Institute.115

As director of the Society, Noskowski organized an amateur symphony orchestra which, during the summer season, offered series of concerts at Dolina Szwajcarska on the outskirts of Warsaw. He also organized regular series of concerts and musical evenings in Warsaw that opened up avenues for performance long missing to Polish composers. These concerts became the cornerstones upon which the musical maturity of Poland would finally be developed in the early twentieth century. Noskowski's untiring activity was the major force behind this maturation.116 Additionally, Noskowski's renown as a teacher was so great that the conservatories in Moscow and
St. Petersburg sent numbers of their students to Warsaw for part of their training.117

As a composer Noskowski exhibited primarily conservative tendencies; he was, after all, a direct product and promulgator of the Elsner-Freyer-Moniuszko tradition. Consequently, all of his compositions revealed strict adherence to classical formal structures. Although he composed in all genres, Noskowski's symphonic works were his most influential because they reinvigorated symphonic music in Poland. Even more important was his organization of ensembles to perform such works, encouraging the rebirth of symphonic composition in Poland.

Despite Żeleński and Noskowski's efforts at reviving Polish music, the general state of affairs remained sterile at the end of the nineteenth century. This was the result of many decades of political, economic, and cultural upheaval which brought about a static and, at times, regressive situation in music. Unlike the writers of Polish literature, for generations Polish composers did not have the opportunity to experience the new, exciting trends coming from the West. They also did not have the opportunity to compose in one of the most important Romantic genre—the symphony—because no permanent orchestra existed in the country until 1901. Polish composers additionally fell prey to the suffocating requirements of patriotism in art imposed on them in the ongoing struggle for national
survival. In literature, on the contrary, these same re-
requirements pushed creativity to new heights of expression 
complementary to those found in Western Europe. For de-
cades musical instruction, particularly in composition,
was basically non-existent. The extant remained strangled 
by classical traditions. Polish musical life at the turn 
of the twentieth century was, therefore, still far behind 
the rest of Europe. A student of the period aptly de-
scribes the overall situation of Polish music at this 
time, writing:

Music life . . . still languished. The nation was im-
poverished and preoccupied with social and political 
affairs. There were no institutions capable of 
piloting it back on to the map, nor artists of suf-
cient stature. The heights scaled by European music 
through the creative talents of Mahler, Debussy, 
Strauss, Scriabin—and, shortly thereafter, Schönberg, 
Stravinsky and the whole generation of modernists 
seemed altogether beyond our reach. [Nevertheless] 
. . . a new generation, educated at the Warsaw Con-
servatory under Zygmunt Noskowski, was approaching 
maturity and was soon to usher in a great revival.118

Part of this new generation, educated under Noskowski, has 
come to be known as Young Poland in Music, and it is this 
group with which the present study is concerned.
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CHAPTER II

SPÓŁKA NAKŁADOWA MŁODYCH KOMPOZYTORÓW POLSKICH: ITS BEGINNINGS AND HISTORICAL MISINTERPRETATIONS

In 1908 the Polish critic, Wilhelm Feldman, wrote glowingly about the literary-artistic movement known as Young Poland:

Young Poland was a great revival. It was the revival of art, the revelation of the Spirit, and at the same time the prophecy of the safeguarding of independent Poland. It carried this independence to each of her sons. To the summits of Art, the leaders of this generation led Poland; in dreams and creations, they dreamt of a living Poland—and when in 1905 an historic tempest roared in the East [1905 Russian revolts] and with a hot breath also engulfed the largest section of Poland, to more than one dreamer it appeared that here and now the day of incarnation had arrived.¹

Feldman's words quoted above demonstrate a particular insight into the prevailing socio-artistic situation in Poland at the turn of the century. However, the import of these words for music has never been fully examined even though the express use of the Young Poland heading to identify a particular artistic phenomenon is found only in the musical arena. There are no specifically used designations such as Young Poland in Art, Young Poland in Painting, or Young Poland in Literature in these respective fields. The only designation used in these artistic areas is "the literature, the art, or the
painting of the Young Poland Period." Today, the term Young Poland in Music refers not only to a specific historical period and movement of Polish music, but also to an association of four composers working at the beginning of the twentieth century, specifically during the years 1905 to 1912. Consequently, Young Poland in Music has become an historical issue that is both a fact and a myth in Polish music.

The four composers, Karol Szymanowski, Ludomir Różycki, Grzegorz Fitelberg, and Apolinary Szeluto, founded a publishing company in Berlin in order to promote new Polish music, particularly their own, through publishing and concert arranging. In doing this they hoped to free themselves from the dependence on established music publishers and impresarios. They called their company and their association Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich (The Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company). Henceforth, it will be referred to as Spółka Nakładowa. Since that time, the association of these four composers has been widely commented upon, analyzed, interpreted, and defined, but in a variety of ways by Polish and non-Polish musicologists and writers on music. This variety of opinion, consequently, has led to a great deal of perceptual confusion lasting to the present time. To understand fully the Spółka Nakładowa issue and the scholarly tumult surrounding it created by the numerous mutations and
permutations of perceptions as to what was Spółka Nakładowa, it is essential first to clearly identify what exactly Spółka Nakładowa was, what were its reasons for existing, and who was involved with it and second to survey the progress of musical scholarship regarding this issue.

The Beginnings

At the end of the nineteenth century the influence of literature, with its new post-Romantic leanings, started the liberation of Polish music from its century-old tradition. The initial break appeared in the works of one composer, Mieczysław Karłowicz (1876-1909). He had been involved with the first phase of the literary Young Poland period which, as we have seen, was grounded upon the Schopenhauerean philosophy of "art for art's sake." As the first major Polish composer to reject the old-fashioned musical tradition, Karłowicz left his musically stagnant Poland for a few years of study in Berlin, where he found a more open, forward-looking atmosphere in which to create. Mature enough to realize the faults of the old school, yet young enough to participate in the immediacy of the Young Poland period, Karłowicz was an isolated phenomenon, neither professing a specific, new direction, nor representing the status quo of the contemporary musical generation. He was, nevertheless, extremely close to the
leading European writers and thinkers of the time, particularly those Polish, often incorporating their verses and ideals into his music. Additionally, he was involved with the composers of Spółka Nakładowa, although he was not part of their organization.2

Except for the work of Karłowicz, Polish music of the late nineteenth century was still locked in its German pseudo-classic and nationalistic stranglehold. But, the turn of the century would witness the activity of one of the last composition classes of Noskowski, the graduates of which would challenge this stranglehold. The composers of this class were born in the 1870s and 1880s and matured in the period of socio-political turmoil and artistic upheaval. They lived in a Poland revitalized with new hopes of independence brought about by the revolutionary winds blowing across Central Europe from Russia. They were aware also of the calls for modernism in literature and art which were an important part of the Young Poland period, and were witnesses to the emerging new musical ideas in the West being introduced into Poland through the activity of the first Polish musicologists trained abroad. Therefore, it was not unnatural for them to challenge and eventually reject the dated doctrines of their teacher and look to the West, specifically to musically active Berlin, for new inspirations and techniques. This special class of Noskowski included Różycki, Szymanowski, Fitelberg, and
Szeluto, the founders of Spółka Nakładowa, and who have become collectively known as Young Poland in Music.

Several individuals played important roles in the formation of Spółka Nakładowa. One was Szymanowski’s father, Stanisław; another was Prince Władysław Lubomirski. We also must include the conservatively minded group of individuals who controlled Poland’s musical life, as well as the ardent supporters of the composers, and, finally, the composers themselves.

Szymanowski’s father is important because he was the composer’s early confidant and mentor. Stanisław appears to have encouraged his son to continue to be musically innovative and to consider forming a publicational association with several colleagues to promote their work. As we shall see, contrary to most previous interpretations about the beginning of Spółka Nakładowa, Szymanowski discussed with his father as early as the end of 1904 or the beginning of 1905 the idea of establishing the publishing company, an idea first suggested to him by Fitelberg whom he had met several months before Stanisław’s death in 1905.3

Prince Lubomirski (1866-1934) was a wealthy Polish landowner and life-long supporter of the arts. He had a natural talent for music, composing and playing the violin and piano by ear. Although he had studied music at the Vienna Conservatory under Fuchs, his most important
musical contact was Fitelberg who accepted him as a violin and composition student. Through Fitelberg Lubomirski met the other members of the future publishing company, as well as numerous musicians within their orbit, such as the pianists Arthur Rubinstein and Pawel Kochański. Lubomirski became important to the careers of Fitelberg, Szymanowski, and Rubinstein because he sponsored them all financially. He also was instrumental in keeping the Warsaw Philharmonic solvent by coming to its rescue financially during the 1909-10 season when he reorganized the orchestra under his own name and hired Fitelberg as its artistic director.4 It was Lubomirski to whom Fitelberg went when trying to procure funding for the establishment of the publishing company. Through his financial backing of the composers' endeavor, Lubomirski ensured his place in Polish music history. Arthur Rubinstein recalled the entire situation in his autobiography, stating:

... Fitelberg, his [Lubomirski's] protege for years, suggested to him that he emulate the famous Russian "Five" by creating something similar in our country. The Prince liked the idea and founded, with a large sum of money, an association of young Polish composers, over which he presided. The first members were Fitelberg, Szymanowski, Ludomir Różycki... and Apolinary Szeluto.5

Rubinstein was basically correct in his description of the events, but, as will become evident shortly, his understanding of the reason for the association was misguided. Also, his statement that the "first members were
 those individuals later became members of this association.

Those men who controlled Poland’s musical life in the early years of the twentieth century also played a direct role in the formation of the publishing association and its eventual designation as Young Poland in Music. These old-guard, conservative impresarios, critics, and commentators on music had become highly infused with the revolutionary and post-romantic, nationalistic ideals prevailing in Poland by 1905. In control of the country’s music publishing, performance, and criticism, they viewed the new, modernistic approaches to music as undesirable and of potentially dangerous influence. Young, forward-looking composers virtually had no outlet for their creations, either in print or through performance, and had to look elsewhere, outside of Poland, for less biased, freer markets for their works. The founders of the Spółka Nakładowa accomplished their objectives in Berlin.

Those individuals who were the supporters of the composers’ endeavors (because they quickly realized that what was appearing was something totally new, exciting, and revolutionary for Polish music) also were important to the inception of Spółka Nakładowa. To counteract what turned out to be the Establishment’s highly negative criticisms of the composers’ works, they took to promoting their champions, often with excessive zeal.
Finally, the composers themselves founded and operated Spółka Nakładowa. Throughout the existence of their company, the four young men seemed to object selectively and opportunistically to the misunderstanding surrounding their intentions.

It has already been confirmed above that, sometime in late 1904 or early 1905, the idea of forming a new publishing company germinated in the minds of the four friends. From a letter of Ludomir Różycki sent from Zakopane, the Tatra Mountain resort and artistic haven in southern Poland, to Zdzisław Jachimecki in February, 1907, we learn that agreement for the founding of the publishing company was arrived at sometime in the spring of 1905.

About the particular establishment of the publishing company, the first compositions edited by the firm were mine. The capital for their editing was provided by Mr. Konstanty Sarnecki, cellist and inhabitant of Podola. The next work edited was Fitelberg's Sonata (for violin) paid for with the earnings of the first concert of the Publishing Company which was organized in the summer of 1905 in Zakopane. The performers were--Fitelberg (violin), Szelołt (piano)--Szeluto's, Fitelberg's, Szymanowski's and my compositions were performed. The concert, although not organized on a large scale, is of some importance in that the allied composers of the Company appeared for the first time officially as the group Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich. Additionally, this was the first time for the public performance of the compositions of Szymanowski and Szeluto; mine and Fitelberg's had already been performed by the Warsaw Philharmonic.6

In the much later unpublished memoirs of Szeluto is found a further, undated reference to the publishing company and its small, impromptu summer concert of 1905.
In Zakopane, we, the budding Polish composers, often visited the home of the known aesthetician and painter, Stanisław Witkiewicz, where the central idea of arranging the first composers’ concert was formulated. At that concert, which was given in Zakopane in the hall of the Hotel Stamar, I played for the first time the set of preludes by Karol Szymanowski. Katot [Szymanowski] was not personally in Zakopane. The entire income from that concert was devoted to the publishing of the works of the composers of “Young Poland in Music.”

This report of Széluto’s is most important because of his use of the title, Young Poland in Music. As far as can be ascertained, this is one of two extant or at least known instances of the use of this title by any of the four composers in describing their association; both were by Széluto. The understanding of the basis for its use is complicated by the fact that the report is undated. Nevertheless, it does substantiate that the agreement to found the publishing company was arrived at by the spring of 1905 and that a concert by the founders was deemed necessary to finance the initial publishing activities of the new company.

As noted earlier, the cultural climate in Poland was not conducive to the flowering of composers who took a modernistic approach to their art. This stagnant creative atmosphere engendered the self-imposed artistic exile of the members of Spółka Nakładowa. After their summer concert in Zakopane, the four composers departed for Berlin for further musical endeavors. There, with the financial backing of Prince Lubomirski, the composers were able to.
realize their grand dream by establishing their publishing house on the premises of the Albert Stahl-Gebethner & Wolff Publishing Company. In four published notices from October and November of 1905, the announcements of Spółka Nakładowa's founding were given. The first is a short declaration published in the journal Lutnista, in which the composers stated their basic objectives:

Our aim is the promotion of new Polish music through concerts and the publication of the musical works of our members, forging our artistic future ourselves on a cooperative basis, free of the often burdensome dependence on music publishers and impresarios.8

On October 25, the following notice was published:

**Berlin.** Here, with the support of Prince Ladislaw Lubomirski is established the "Young Polish Composers' Publishing House." (Why not rather in Poland itself? --from the editor).9

On November 8, another notice appeared:

**Berlin.** The Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company. Under this name was created a publishing association whose aim is the publishing, in the center of European music, namely Berlin, the compositions of young Polish creators.10

This third notice was followed on November 9 by a longer, more descriptive announcement:

**Berlin.** Reporting to you that Prince Władysław Lubomirski supported with considerable beneficence the "Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company." The association will publish the valuable compositions of our young [composing] army. It begins by publishing and releasing to the world the works of Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różyczki, Karol Szymanowski, and Apolinary Szeluto. Independent of publishing, the association will endeavor to give the compositions of "Young Poland" the necessary fame by introducing their works to the directors of music institutions, and by
giving concerts in the most important cities—and before the widest possible audiences.11

The first, third, and fourth announcements are crucial to the understanding of Spółka Nakładowa because they clearly explicate the reasons for the formation of the publishing company and how it actually came into existence. It should be pointed out at this time that throughout its years of activity, Spółka Nakładowa did not hold a monopoly on the publishing rights to the works of its founders; this resulted in the composers' works eventually being published by a variety of individuals and publishing houses. The fourth announcement is of special importance because its author, most probably Adolf Chybiński who was the music reporter for the journal Przegląd Muzyczny, Teatralny i Artystyczny, employed the term Young Poland to describe the composers. As far as can be ascertained, this is the first public use of the term in reference to the composers' association and, consequently, the genesis of the confusion surrounding the company. As we will observe in the following discussion, it was the continual use and misuse of the term Young Poland in Music in conjunction with Spółka Nakładowa, as well as the misreading of the composers' basic goals that have caused the eighty-odd years of misunderstanding and misrepresentation, the raison d'être of this study.
The Historical Misinterpretations of Spółka Nakładowa

Despite the fact that the four composers clearly indicated at its founding what Spółka Nakładowa was and what they wanted it to accomplish, a great deal of confusion about the association quickly developed, a confusion which has lasted to the present day. This confusion has been perpetuated by simple misinterpretation or ignoring of available facts over the past eighty-odd years. To evaluate fully the history behind the confusion, it is required to survey the evolution of scholarship regarding this issue.

Our survey of the historical perceptions of Spółka Nakładowa begins in 1906, the nascent year for the public discussion of the company because it was in that year that the company presented a public concert of its members' works at the Warsaw Filharmonia. The composers billed their concert simply as a concert of the music of Spółka Nakładowa. Despite this fact, the authors of several of the announcements of the founding of the company, as well as the notices and reviews of the concerts, conferred upon the publishing association the new name of Young Poland in Music. This could have been the result of the language used in the November 9 announcement of the company's founding cited above.
Furthermore, 1906 is important because this was the year in which the young Polish musicologist, Adolf Chybiński, began his personal relationship with the four composers, as well as his quest to become their main musical champion. Chybiński wrote two important articles concerning Spółka Nakładowa that year. In the first article he correctly listed its membership as Różycki, Szymanowski, Fitelberg, and Szeluto. Of more immediate interest, however, is the fact that Chybiński referred to the composers' association as Young Poland in Music. By doing so he became one of the first Polish scholars to use this appellation publicly after it was introduced by the Warsaw reviewers. In his second article, recalling the events of his first introduction to the composers, Chybiński commented:

In Berlin I met for the first time Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, Apolinary Szeluto, and Karol Szymanowski... There is nothing to conceal—we became a clique in which [Mieczysław] Karłowicz was the best critical thinker and I was the most enthusiastic [supporter]. No one would be wrong in calling us a "mutual admiration society." Each of us knew the faults and inadequacies of the others, no one made a secret of these. In other areas, these artists... could not cooperate with each other because among them there were too many conflicts and too few agreements in their views of creating and direction... [However], the unfavorable music standards in our country, especially in Warsaw where the directors of the Filharmonia (A. Rajchman, et al) and some older musicians treated this group of composers with hostility..., forced the formation of this group of composers into a common goal and made them take up their individual positions against the rest of the Polish musicians...
This second article is of major import because Chybiński, for the first time, associated Mieczysław Karłowicz with Spółka Nakładowa, thus adding a fifth person to the membership.

Confusion persisted into 1907 with the company's second Warsaw concert and accompanying reviews, several of which again used the designation Young Poland in Music when referring to the composers' association. Additionally, several articles were published concerning their association and its activities, and these also added to the general state of confusion. In the first of the them, Zdzisław Jachimecki, another young Polish musicologist and an eventual close colleague of Chybiński, wrote the following succinct comments about Spółka Nakładowa:

With sincere admiration we observe these composers who, with courage, stepped forward to lead in the promotion of true art. As examples of their leadership, the young Polish composers, united in an Association for the publication of their works, presented several of their works to us. This Publishing Company has introduced us to several talents of solid strength and enthusiasm . . .

Significantly, throughout his article, Jachimecki referred to the composers' association only as Spółka Nakładowa. He identifies its members as Różycki, Szymanowski, Szeluto, and Fitelberg, excluding the membership of Karłowicz implied by Chybiński in the previous year. Despite Jachimecki's careful designation of Spółka Nakładowa, his young colleague, Henryk Opieński, chose not to follow his lead.
Instead, Opiński wrote that the composers' association, which he called Young Poland In Music,

... assumed a certain decided form from the time when these seekers of the new [foreign] paths joined together in an association which has as its aim the publishing of their works. That is when Fitelberg, Różyczki, Szeluto, and Szymangowski founded Społka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich in Berlin. At the time of the departure of "Young Poland" from Warsaw, the search for newer mediums of expression began to be seen clearly in their works.

The new paths which the members of "Społka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich" have broken were the result of reactions against earlier, antiquated directions of narrow-minded aesthetic formulas and the superficially understood Polishness [in music].

... We have a clear indication that the "foreign" art with which they clearly identify themselves and of which they are generally accepting, incites in them only the search for their own paths. This, of course, occurs among each of the various composers in different ways.

Herein Opiński added a new dimension to the issue by implying that Young Poland in Music existed prior to the founding of Społka Nakładowa. With this interpretation, Opiński also became one of the first Polish writers to elevate the composers' publishing association, now identified incorrectly as Young Poland in Music, to a musical movement, adding another element of confusion. However, he did not revise the membership of Społka Nakładowa as had Chybiński earlier.

Later in the year additional articles, primarily related to Polish concerts in Poland, discussed Społka Nakładowa from a number of interesting perspectives. The first review was by Jachimecki after an October concert of
Polish music in Kraków. In it we see Jachimecki coming under the influence of those referring to the composers' association as Young Poland in Music, at least in so far as what he now called the association. However, his views on its membership did not change.

... "Young Poland": What can be understood by this name? According to my conception, these young—in age—musicians assembling here are also young in the spirit of their art: the clear thing to us is that among them are different artistic temperaments, different aspirations, and different musico-aesthetic aims... ...

... The spirit of "Young Poland in Music" is guaranteed in the compositions of the few yet strong talents of the Publishing Company [Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg, and Szeluto]...

In November another concert of Polish music was given in Krakow and two very significant reviews, germane to this problem, were written. Both reviews were titled, "A Concert of Young Poland" and both showed how confusing the situation had become after only two years from the founding of Spółka Nakładowa. The first unsigned review dealing with an upcoming "Young Poland" concert, stated that it would include not only the works of Szymanowski and Różycki, but also those of Felicjan Szopski, Bronisław Wolfstahl, Michał Świerzyński, Bolesław Raczyński, Bronisław Wolewski, Marian Szopski, and others. The concert itself was not sponsored by Spółka Nakładowa. Next, Teofil Trzciński wrote the second review, claiming:

The aim of "Young Poland" remains so tantamount to the struggle for and striking-out on new paths that when a handful of young musicians under this "standard"
attempt to accomplish this, one can come to understand fully their clearly defined aims. However, in the list of names mentioned on yesterday's program one should distinguish a certain category. Above all, Szymanowski and Różycki are from the Berlin "Young Poland" . . . .

It is evident from these two reviews that the confusion surrounding Spółka Nakładowa was deepening as time passed.

1908 witnessed the second and third attempts by Jachimecki to correct what was becoming a most troublesome confusion surrounding Spółka Nakładowa. To this end he penned two long articles in which he once again clearly delineated the raison d'être and musical character of the publishing company. Also, he returned to the practice of identifying the composers' association by its correct name, Spółka Nakładowa. In the first article, which presents a general survey of Polish music to date, Jachimecki particularly discussed the solo song, piano, and symphonic contributions of the members of Spółka Nakładowa: Szymanowski, Fitelberg, Różycki, and Szeluto. He also clearly assigned Karłowicz to the previous generation of composers, considering him a colleague and not a member of Spółka Nakładowa. In the second article Jachimecki discussed specifics of the composers' association:

Three years ago several young Polish composers, students at the Warsaw Conservatory, formed "Spółka Nakładowa" with the aim of publishing the compositions of its members . . . . The four members of "Spółka"— Karol Szymanowski, Szymon Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, and Apolinary Szeluto were introduced by a series of works performed in concerts in Warsaw and Berlin. These works also appeared in print. The
emergence of these composers created much interest and lively discussion—the discussion asked many fundamental questions such as: do they have talent or have they gone mad? Does the production of their music bear the stamp of Polishness or is it generally just music? Do they as Poles have the right to write as Poles, etc.? Serious men understand immediately the magnitude of the importance inherent in the works of these bold youths. They see how thoroughly these youths are prepared for work as they embrace all compositional techniques; that they are related to the Western masters, that they do not fall prey to the dwarfing expectations of different local authorities—these serious men do not resent such aspirations. But many common accusations fell on the composers. Different reviewers of the Warsaw journals hammered out spiteful criticisms in order to defame their art in the eyes of society. . . . Today, there is still no open-mindedness, there is exaggeration completely without reason, and it is yet possible to say that the art of these composers finds acceptance only from a small part of our musical public, a part which is duly prepared for its understanding and embrace. Thus, because this music is only for a few, we must expect that such high art cannot be nor will ever be popular among the broad masses. . . .

The statement that the date of the founding of "Społka" will be epochal in the history of Polish music is perhaps premature today; it was, in any case, necessitated by the spirit of the time. . . . [Nevertheless, the composers] are four powerful individuals; four differing artistic temperaments. . . .

Despite Jachimecki's carefully written articles, three years later his colleague, Chybiński, would completely re-write the definition and aims of, the reasons for, and the original membership of the composers' association in his very influential article of 1911 befittingly entitled, "Young Poland in Music." In this work Chybiński made a number of intriguing comments about the association which he now simply called Young Poland in Music and
which he now contended consisted of Szymanowski, Fitelberg, Różycki, and Karłowicz (Szeluto had disappeared from view):

Quicker than expected, "Young Poland in Music" took over the helm of the management [of the Warsaw Filharmonia] with Grzegorz Fitelberg as the first director and conductor (c1909).

... In this way "Young Poland in Music" arose; its most eminent contribution is the creation of a new symphonic school in Poland, a school completely distinct and not at all similar to that which had been created up to that time. . . .

They [Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg and Karłowicz] create a group of separate personages. This, of course, is the feature of "Young Poland in Music" that, as it somehow rests on a common ground, it is, nevertheless, a group of separate individuals existing at a time when the older generation [of composers] could not delineate strong differences in individual styles. . . . "Young Poland in Music," therefore, is indebted to itself alone. . . . With an iron logic it moves ahead to lead Polish music not only into an equality with Western music, but also to give it the basic right of citizenship in European music— that is, to free the fatherland's art from parochialism in aspirations, intentions, and performance.24

The examples of confusion in the early 1900s can be compounded with a reference to one more author's opinion of Społka Nakładowa. Commenting on the Berlin concert of the composers' music in 1908, the music critic for the journal Ateneum, known as Alastor, suggested that the association included Fitelberg, Szymanowski, Różycki, and Karłowicz, not Szeluto.25

This confusion persisted into the following decade. An example of it is an article written in 1914 by Adolf Chybiński. Although dealing with Polish piano music, Chybiński writes once again of the composers' important
relationship with symphonic music. Having eliminated Szeluto from the ranks of the association, Chybiński proclaimed

... the younger generation had another assigned goal--namely to bring about the renaissance of orchestral music in Poland. It [the generation] also possessed ... the talent for this great [musical] coup d'état. We are thinking here of Mieczysław Karłowicz, Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, and Karol Szymanowski.26

In reviewing the above interpretations, we find that in less than a decade from its inception, perceptions of Spółka Nakładowa changed from a music publishing-promotion company to a modernistic musical movement and, additionally, to a new Polish symphonic school. Its membership saw Szeluto expunged and Karłowicz added. It must be pointed out that these changes in perception occurred primarily through the influential writings of one man, Adolf Chybiński. Finally, because of the lack of a concrete concept of what Spółka Nakładowa was, some quarters of the Polish musical society felt obligated to distinguish the group specifically as the "Berlin Young Poland," thus suggesting that there may have been other individuals involved elsewhere with other musical Young Poland movements.

In continuing the survey of scholarly writings during the next seven decades, one cannot overestimate Chybiński's influence on other scholars' interpretations of the Spółka Nakładowa issue. For example, in 1926, Mateusz Gliński,
an eminent musicologist of the next generation, totally
ignored Jachimecki's interpretation of the composers' as-
sociation and completely agreed with the assessment
promoted by Chybiński in 1911. Consequently, while dis-
cussing the influence of this group that he calls Young
Poland rather than Spółka Nakładowa, and listed the members
as Karłowicz, Szymanowski, Fitelberg, and Rożycki, Gliński
wrote:

"Young Poland in Music" with its splendid leader,
Mieczysław Karłowicz, immediately rose to the center
of musical interest in the entire country. The
[musical] rehabilitation [of Poland] began with known
Polish talents (Szymanowski and Rożycki) who began to
develop more and more richly . . . . And Fitelberg
placed a special stress on the works of the present
day.27

The imbroglio surrounding Spółka Nakładowa continued
unabated into the 1930s and was particularly evident in
four articles written about the ceremonies of the 25th
Anniversary Jubilee of Young Poland in Music in 1931. It
is interesting to note that this anniversary celebrated
the misinterpreted perception of the composers' associ-
ation that had developed over the decades and not of the
actual founding of the publishing company Spółka Nakładowa
as one would have expected. Thus, in the first unsigned
review the author spoke briefly about the geniuses of
Young Poland in Music, not Spółka Nakładowa--Rożycki, Szy-
manowski, Fitelberg, and Karłowicz--but made no mention of
Szeluto at all.
The jubilee of "Young Poland in Music" is not only the culmination of the two living celebrities, the most eminent of our contemporary composers—Karol Szymanowski and Ludomir Różycki—but also of their excellent interpreter, Grzegorz Fitelberg. This jubilee is the triumph of truth and progress. They stand here after 25 years of hard and exhausting struggles for the most beautiful of all ideas—the freedom of the [artistic] spirit. They stand now not as youths but as mature men on the beautiful day of harvest of their creative lives.

Here also, not in body but in spirit, is Mieczysław Karłowicz.28

The author of the second review, Władysław Fabry, wrote:

This ceremony took place not in the Filharmonia but in the Opera although this group of composers, who one should mention as the creators of modern Polish symphonic music, is connected more closely to the Filharmonia than with the Opera . . . . We speak about four names: Mieczysław Karłowicz, Karol Szymanowski, Ludomir Różycki, and Grzegorz Fitelberg.29

In his own review, appropriately entitled "Young Poland in Music (The 25th-Year Anniversary)," Gliński erroneously wrote that Fitelberg and Różycki began "Young Poland in Music" in 1905 and that several months later, when everything was established, Szeluto joined the association. He also wrongly contended that Szymanowski joined only in 1906 and Karłowicz somewhat later. Thus, in apparent contradiction to his earlier published comments of 1926, Gliński now included Szeluto in the membership.30

Finally, in the fourth review, the critic, Karol Stromenger, alludes to the general confusion of the situation when he wrote the following passage of queries:

We know about the composers Szymanowski and Różycki, we know about the conductor Fitelberg. But, what about the Young Poland in Music of 25 years ago?
Was it an artistic movement or a publishing venture? What role in the group did Karłowicz, Szeluto, [the pianist] Brzeziński, and Opieński play, they who were, after all, connected with this movement and of whose names—except Karłowicz's—the jubilee did not include in any way?

Unfortunately for future scholarship, the ongoing confusion over the composers' association exhibited in 1931 would not be limited to these four articles covering the anniversary celebrations. The same year also witnessed the publication of two major histories of Polish music by the Polish musicologists, Zdzisław Jachimecki and Józef Reiss, respectively, and a biography of Szymanowski by Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz. Jachimecki, writing in his *Polska, jej dzieje i kultura*, apparently decided to abandon for good his correct designation of the composers' association as Spółka Nakładowa. Obviously, because the title of Young Poland in Music had become so commonly accepted in Polish musical circles, he must have found that title less confusing to use than the more correct Spółka Nakładowa. Nevertheless, he did indicate that both titles belonged to the same association. Also, he did not abandon his original interpretations of the membership of the association, its reason for being, and its character:

Not belonging directly to the publishing organization of the young Polish composers... Karłowicz, because of his ideological affinity with "Young Poland in Music," was permanently ranked among this group from the moment of its origin and, together with Szymanowski, Różycki, and Fitelberg, represented in this country and abroad the artistic tendencies—at the
beginning of the 20th century--of the young generation of Polish musicians.32

Reiss, on the other hand, in his Historia muzyki w zarysie did not write about a publishing association of composers known as Spółka Nakładowa, but about a musical association of composers known as Young Poland in Music that included Różycki, Szymanowski, Fitelberg, and Karszowicz. Like many of his colleagues before him, Reiss totally excluded Szelluto from his discussion33 and, because of the importance of his history, consequently erased Szelluto's name from further discussion for many years. And, Iwaszkiewicz, a close, life-long friend of Szymanowski, indicated in his biography of Szymanowski that the composers--Szymanowski, Fitelberg, Różycki, and Szelluto--first appeared in public as a group in 1904 with the support of Prince Władysław Lubomirski. As we have seen, he miscalculated the group's first appearance by one year.

The 1940s and 1950s witnessed the issuance of several important articles and publications that continued the debate over who and what was the musical association of young composers now known only as Young Poland in Music. In the 1940s, for example, the aging Opieński published his short history of Polish music, and his eminent, younger, colleague, Stefania Łobaczewska, published her annotated music history outline. In discussing Polish music from 1860 to 1920, Opieński surprisingly did not
mention Young Poland in Music at all, but stated that "The youngest representative of the 'old school' is Ludomir Różycki." On the other hand, in her more substantive work, Łobaczewska wrote the following comments about the composers' association, Young Poland in Music, which, according to her, included Karłowicz, Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg, and Szeluto:

Contrary to "Les Six" in France, this group was founded upon a common ideology. The updating of Polish musical creativity was its motto; also involved were the bringing about of a close affinity with the West and the returning of Polish music to the high position it held in the 16th and 17th centuries. The composers of "Young Poland" began this strong link and close affinity with the West by going to Berlin and Vienna which were at that time the famous centers of progress.

It is interesting to note that neither Opieński nor Łobaczewska mentioned the composers' publishing company or its resultant publishing activities in their respective works.

In the 1950s, with the deaths of Fitelberg and Różycki, numerous articles appeared commemorating these two composers' lives and contributions to Polish music. They also revealed a variety of interpretations as to what and who was associated with Young Poland in Music. Four such articles honoring Fitelberg and one honoring Różycki are of particular interest. In the first Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, writing about Fitelberg, stated:

His beginnings were not easy, just as the beginnings of the entire group known as "Young Poland in Music" were not easy. In the great fallow
[period] of our music, great talents began to appear before 1915: Karłowicz, Różycki, and Szymanowski.36

In his article about Fitelberg, the renowned Polish composer, Witold Lutosławski, wrote that:

The wall separating our music from current European influences was suddenly punctured as if by a battering ram at the moment a group of remarkably talented and vivacious persons, with as great ambitions as any musician, appeared on our horizon under the general name of "Young Poland" . . . .37

The third article, unsigned, about Fitelberg stated:

1905: With the initiative of Grzegorz Fitelberg . . . and the twenty-two-year-old Ludomir Różycki, an association of five composers known as "Young Poland in Music" began. To this association also belonged the other initiators: Mieczysław Karłowicz, Karol Szymanowski, and Apolinary Szeluto.38

And, Aleksander Kraus, in his article about Fitelberg, stated that Fitelberg was "one of the founders of Young Poland in Music with Karłowicz, Szymanowski, Różycki, and Szeluto."39 Finally, in an article about Różycki, Lucyna Bartnikowska gave the following description of the composers' association:

Polish musical culture represented a state of lamentable neglect in the first years of the 20th century when a group of young and very talented and carefully developed composers appeared on the scene. This group, in an analogy to its contemporary "literary school", took the name "Young Poland."

One of the most outstanding representatives of this group, along with Karol Szymanowski, Mieczysław Karłowicz, Grzegorz Fitelberg, and Apolinary Szeluto, was Ludomir Różycki.40

Of more lasting significance to this decade's discussions of the composers' association was the publication in 1958 of Józef Reiss' second survey of Polish music
entitled Najpiekniejsza ze wszystkich jest muzyka polska.

In this important work, which was re-issued unchanged in 1984, Reiss made the following statements concerning the composers' association:

Those composers known as Young Poland are as highly significant in our music as are F. Smetena and A. Dvorák in Czech music and as the celebrated five innovators in early Russian music. They represent the radical-progressive direction in relation to the [generally accepted] conservative-moderate style of Polish music. However, contrary to the Czech and Russian composers who promoted their national music through opera and folksong, the composers of Young Poland did not often address these living sources of creativity. They, on the other hand, transplanted onto the Polish musical terrain the technical achievements of Western-European music, particularly those of symphonic music... Therefore, suddenly, the rich literature of symphonic music appeared, which, in a short time, the four leading representatives of Young Poland were mass producing: [these were] Mieczysław Karłowicz, Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, and Karol Szymanowski.

Again, as did many of their predecessors and colleagues, these authors, especially Reiss, completely ignored the publishing house issue and Szeluto's charter membership and contributions. These authors deferred to the dominant influence of Adolf Chybiński. Because Reiss' work was to become a major Polish music text for the next generation of music students, his comments on the nativistic and symphonic contributions of Young Poland in Music would affect most future interpretations.

Publications during the 1960s did not bring any resolution of the controversy surrounding the composers' association. In discussions contained in several of the
more important works, a number of interpretations were presented. For example, in 1963 Stefan Spiess and Wanda Bacewicz published their short book, *Ze wspomnien melomana*, in which they wrote that:

In the spring of 1906, in the small hall of Bechstein in Berlin, a concert of Young Poland was given under the direction of Grzegorz Fitelberg. The program consisted of the Overture of Karol Szymanowski as well as works by Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, Apolinary Szeluto, and Mieczysław Karłowicz.

In an article reviewing a book entitled *Polish Music*, C. R. Halski criticized the renowned Polish musicologist, Zofia Lissa's, interpretations of Young Poland in Music:

Mme. Zofia Lissa has included Mieczysław Karłowicz (p. 161) among the group called "Young Poland in Music". . . . Karlowicz himself did not belong to it. The group was formed by Karol Szymanowski, Apolinary Szeluto, Ludomir Różycki, and Grzegorz Fitelberg under the patronage of Prince Lubomirski.

The Polish musicologist, Józef Kański, in an article dedicated to Szeluto upon the composer's death, presented the following interesting comments about Spółka Nakładowa, an association which now included Szeluto:

. . . [in Berlin] of course not without the kind support and financial help of Prince Władysław Lubomirski of Rajca, the "Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company" was formed . . . and after the first concert at the Warsaw Filharmonia they [the composers] became christened under the general title of "Young Poland in Music." The rampant tumult surrounding the composers' association also reached the non-Polish speaking world as witnessed by the biographical sketches of Różycki, Szymanowski,
and Fitelberg (Szeluto has no entry) in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart which, surprisingly, do not mention Spółka Nakładowa at all.45 Another example of erroneous information is found in the biographical entry on Szymanowski in The International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians of 1964, where the author indicates only the founding of a composers' group known as Young Poland, not Spółka Nakładowa. More specifically, the author stated that

In Berlin Szymanowski met three other young Polish composers, Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, and Apollinary Szeluto, who were similarly in reaction against academic restrictions and hoped to find salvation in modern German music. Together they formed a society under the title of "Young Poland in Music." Prince Władysław Lubomirski was interested in this movement and became their patron . . . .46

This basic misinterpretation would be accepted and repeated in a vast array of other English language publications, thus leading to the beginning of similar confusions about the composers' association in contemporary English-language scholarship.

Finally, of all the publications concerning Spółka Nakładowa released in the 1960s, Stefania Łobaczewska's contribution to the seminal, monograph, Z dziejów Polskiej Kultury Muzycznej, which discusses the Young Poland in Music issue, is the most important to the present discourse. In it Łobaczewska identified two reasons for the emergence of Young Poland in Music: one, the overall
conservative musical situation in early twentieth-century Poland and two, Poland's lack of a permanent orchestra until 1901. Thus, she wrote:

[One may ask:] To what degree were Polish music culture and Polish creativity conditioned by the status quo of the field before the founding of the Warsaw Filharmonia? To what degree did the circumstances of its founding which occurred simultaneously with the group of young composers known as "Young Poland" . . . also condition Polish music culture and creativity?! Some consequences included the realization of a new Polish national style . . . . The established group of four young composers—Fitelberg, Różycki, Szeluto, and Szymanowski (Karłowicz joined the group somewhat later)—was accompanied by the overt sign of their ideological bond, the foundation in 1905 of a music publishing house under the name of "Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company," centered not in this country but in Germany. [With it] Young Poland sought not only the possibilities of an outlet into broader arenas but also the first stimuli for the realization of their artistic theses . . . . History assigns the composers of "Young Poland" to the generation which represented the handful of revolutionaries who not only brought about the advancement of Polish musical creativity, but also the re-evaluation of all aesthetic and social criteria of their contemporaries concerning judgments about music.47

When comparing Tobaczewska's perceptions with those of earlier decades it becomes obvious that she was very much influenced by Chybiński, Opieński, and Reiss. Accordingly, she claims that the composers' association, Young Poland in Music, existed before the founding of Spółka Nakładowa and that it initiated the development of a new Polish national style and was, therefore, analogous to the "Mighty Five" of Russia.

The current generation of Polish and non-Polish musicologists also has advanced a variety of contradictory
interpretations concerning the composers' association. For example, in 1970 the Polish musicologist, Elżbieta Dziewbowska, argued in her seminal biography of Mieczysław Karłowicz that this composer never was part of Spółka Nakładowa but that Szeluto was. She also strongly stated that Reiss, Łobaczewska, and others were wrong when they promoted this notion. Consequently, she wrote:

Generally, one takes Karłowicz for the leading proponent of the ideology of Young Poland in Music; in reality, his work falls during the years of modernistic turmoil. In musicological literature we often meet with diverse support for the "young Polishness" of Karłowicz. However, because of the supposed membership of the composer in "Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich," this group itself, has become the subject of a major misunderstanding. This misunderstanding has even deeper origins because the so-called period of Polish music history—Young Poland—is commonly connected, above all, with the appearance of "Spółka" in the musical arena. We find such [erroneous] points of view in the works of authors such as Reiss and Łobaczewska. Thus, Reiss promotes Karłowicz, Fitelberg, Różycki, and Szymanowski as the group of composers representing Young Poland in Music and Łobaczewska adds Szeluto to the composers mentioned. Moreover, the use of the designations Young Poland in Music in articles as well as monographs also contributes to this misunderstanding.

From the perspective of a half-century, the notion of Young Poland in Music now requires revision: I say that one alludes too systematically to the ideo-artistic affinity of some of the founders of "Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich." Of more substantial importance to the formation of the [erroneous] definition of the ideology of these musicians were the influences of the then powerful ideo-artistic phenomenon known as Young Poland in Literature.

... The actual work of "Spółka" was the deciding factor that led to a veering away from the real facts. This clearly has caused music historians (Reiss, Łobaczewska, and Chybiński) to be unable to divorce the composer Karłowicz from such a representation of the ideology of Young Poland. Consequently, they
ended up wrongly attaching him to the group despite the fact that this composer did not belong to "Spółka" at all.

And so it is through this [misunderstanding]—not with the founding of "Spółka Nakładowa"—that Young Poland was formulated with respect to music.

In the fall of 1905, with the initiative of Grzegorz Fitelberg and Ludomir Różycki under the patronage and financial support of the affluent Prince Władysław Lubomirski, "Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich" was founded. The fact that both the composers and the musical commentators arrived at the designation [Young Poland] primarily because of its attraction at that time, one should recognize this as simply an affiliation with a popular ideology. A few months later Apolinary Szeluto joined "Spółka" and later Karol Szymanowski.48

It is interesting to note that Dziębowska's careful study almost perfectly interpreted the situation involving the composers' association. Nevertheless, her findings appeared to go unnoticed, as numerous articles and books throughout the 1970s continued to present a variety of viewpoints regarding the central issue. For one writer, however, Dziębowska's research was influential. In 1974 Anna Mielczarek-Bober agreed with Dziębowska's interpretations when she contributed biographies of Ludomir Różycki and Grzegorz Fitelberg to a large compendium of Polish musical biographies. In both she stated that

In 1905 Ludomir Różycki, Karol Szymanowski, Grzegorz Fitelberg, and Apolinary Szeluto founded the "Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company" in which the task was the propagation of new music, the opposition to backwardness, and the raising of artistic standards. Later the group's founders were called "Young Poland in Music."49

Dziębowska's research, unfortunately, would not influence others widely. In 1974, for example, the political
The Lands of Partitioned Poland:

Prominent among the "Young Poland" composers were: Mieczysław Karłowicz . . . and Ludomir Różycki . . . .
The period saw the rise of probably the most gifted and original Polish composer of the first half of the twentieth century, Karol Szymanowski.50

1975 is especially noteworthy because it witnessed the publication of Ludwik Erhardt's Music in Poland, a work significant to the study of Polish music because it was one of the first histories translated into the English language. In it, Erhardt unequivocally proclaims

The young composers in question were four pupils of Zygmunt Noskowski, linked by personal ties of friendship and common hopes of reviving Polish music through its modernization and Europeanization: Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, Apolinary Szeluto, and Karol Szymanowski. They were later joined by the older Mieczysław Karłowicz. This group called itself "Young Poland in Music" to match a movement that had sprung up at the end of the 19th century in the fine arts and literature.51

The tenth edition of The Oxford Companion To Music of 1975 in its article on the music of Poland by Percy Scholes, states the following concerning the composers' association:

With the beginning of the twentieth century an increased activity in composition became manifest and a society called 'Young Musical Poland' was in 1905 formed to foster modernistic and nationalistic tendencies. The acknowledged leader in this new school was Szymanowski.52

Two other histories of Polish music perpetuating the misinterpretation appeared in 1979. The first was another important English language publication edited by Tadeusz Ochlewski entitled, An Outline History of Polish Music.
In it Henryk Swolkiń contributed the section dealing with the "post-Chopin to Szymanowski" era. Addressing the issue of the composers' association, in which he included Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg, Szeluto, and Karłowicz, Swolkiń commented:

Immediately after 1900 they became known as Young Poland in Music. They eagerly accepted the new trends, and it was their sincere desire to learn about and explore everything new in contemporary music . . . They introduced the symphonic poem and recitative song reverting [sic] Hugo Wolf's patterns into Polish music . . . The ideals of the Young Poland group of composers were most clearly evident in the work of Mieczysław Karłowicz . . . .

The second history, more important for Polish scholars, was the Mała Historia Muzyki by Józef Reiss. Borrowing significantly from his earlier work of 1958, particularly regarding its interpretation of the events surrounding Spółka Nakładowa, Reiss still contended that the membership of Young Poland in Music (he did not use the name Spółka Nakładowa) consisted of Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg, and Karłowicz; he continued to ignore Szeluto and his contributions:

His [Noskowski's] students were the members of Young Poland with Mieczysław Karłowicz at its head. As happened in literature, the name Young Poland was given to a group of composers whose creations opposed traditions and assimilated new technical ideas and instrumentation, particularly as seen in the music of R. Strauss and in the music of the Russians, Piotr Tchaikovsky, Rimski-Korsakov, and Aleksander Skriabin.
Yet another 1979 publication advances interpretations similar to Reiss'; Józef Kański's biography of Różycki. Discussing the early 1900s he writes:

Onto the scene of Polish music life now entered a group of young avant-gardists . . . . To this group belongs: Mieczysław Karłowicz, Apolinary Szeluto, Grzegorz Fitelberg, Karol Szymanowski, and Ludomir Różycki . . . .55

Kański continued to say that Zygmunt Noskowski's greatest contribution to Polish music was his instruction of many early twentieth-century composers "particularly the musical 'Young Poland' with Mieczysław Karłowicz and Karol Szymanowski in its forefront."55

At the conclusion of our survey, we find that the current decade of the 1980s, like the preceding seven decades, has not been immune to scholarly controversy concerning Spółka Nakładowa. Four cases can be identified. For example, various interpretations of the composers' association can be found in the articles concerning the four composers in the 1980 edition of The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians.57 These interpretations give membership of Spółka Nakładowa either as Karłowicz, Szymanowski, Fitelberg, and Różycki or of Szymanowski, Fitelberg, Różycki, and Szeluto depending on the author. Furthermore, in most of the articles, the composers' association is simply identified as Young Poland in Music with no mention made of Spółka Nakładowa.
In the following year the Szymanowski scholar, Teresa Chylińska, in her first volume of Szymanowski correspondences, resurrected Jachimecki's seventy year-old description of the composers association, as being a publishing-promotional association. She also correctly stated that the group was founded as Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich and not Young Poland in Music as promulgated by her earlier commentators like Opiński. She argued that Spółka Nakładowa was the idea of Szymanowski and Fitelberg, and not of Różycki and Fitelberg as presented by Gliński several decades before. Finally, although she correctly accepted Dziębowska's premise and excluded Karłowicz from the association's membership, she repeatedly questioned Szeluto's importance, relegating him to peripheral involvement only.

Despite Chylińska's arguments in support of Dziębowska, the English musicologist and Szymanowski scholar, Jim Samson, who consulted Chylińska while researching his book, *The Music of Szymanowski*, reasserted Karłowicz's membership and the argument that the composers' group initially started as Young Poland in Music, not Spółka Nakładowa. He did agree with Chylińska concerning Szeluto, holding instead that "Apolinary Szeluto was always a peripheral figure in the 'Young Poland' group." Samson concluded that
United by the common aim of up-dating Polish music and admitting some fresh air from contemporary European styles, four composers, composition students of Noskowski, organized themselves into a group which came to be known as "Young Poland in Music", by analogy with the "Young Poland" movement in Polish letters.60

In the foregoing survey, we have seen that, despite what the composers actually stated about their association, scholars over the past eighty years ignored the composers' views and fabricated their own interpretations. There are five points germane to this analysis: 1) the membership included Karłowicz, Szymanowski, Fitelberg, Różycki, and, at times, Szeluto; 2) the association created a new, modern, Polish nationalistic school of composition; 3) the association founded the modern Polish symphonic school; 4) the composers' association started as Young Poland in Music which in turn founded Spółka Nakładowa; and 5) the composers themselves founded their association as Young Poland in Music.

These erroneous views of Spółka Nakładowa are the result of numerous interrelated factors. First, as discussed in the previous chapter, there was the overall socio-cultural situation of Poland at the turn of the twentieth century which exuded renewed nationalistic tendencies brought about by both the Young Poland movement in the arts and the rapidly shifting political climate. Second, certain quarters of Poland's musical community began to accept the fact that Poland's musical development
lagged far behind that of its Western counterparts and that its musical tradition needed to be brought up to a level with that of Western Europe. Such acceptance necessarily colored the intentions and actions of the young generation of artists and scholars, particularly in their relationship to Spółka Nakładowa. Third, there were the reviews of Poland's leading music critics who wanted to maintain the status quo. These critics initiated the confusion over the name and raisons d'Être of Spółka Nakładowa. Fourth, there were the composers' colleagues and friends who frequently were blatantly wrong in their interpretations of the composers' association. Adolf Chybiński is the key actor involved here. Finally, there was the ongoing scholarly dependence on secondary sources for information concerning Spółka Nakładowa which led to the continuation of erroneous perceptions. Together, they produced the eighty-odd years of misunderstanding illustrated above.
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CHAPTER III

SPÓŁKA NAKŁADOWA MŁODYCH KOMPOZYTORÓW POLSKICH:
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, ADOLF CHYBIŃSKI,
AND PUBLISHING ACTIVITIES

The success or failure of any cooperative venture depends largely on the relationships among the individuals involved. This was, of course, true of Spółka Nakładowa. As has been previously established the company operated from 1905 to 1912. However, because of the quick disintegration of personal and professional relationships among the major figures, by 1909 the composers had, for all practical purposes, become estranged from each other and, to a great extent, from their publishing company. The present discussion will, therefore, concentrate on the period up to 1909.

The Composers' Personalities and Relationships

The personalities of the four composers were very different: Szeluto was the most sensitive to criticism; Szymanowski the most susceptible to outside influences; Różycki the most stern, conservative, and paranoid in outlook; and Fitelberg the most volatile, confident, and headstrong in dealing with other people. Finally, Prince Lubomirski, the composers' financial benefactor, possessed
the calm, reassuring personality of the aristocratic benefactor, although this often made him too quick to overlook misdeeds and transgressions. The mixture of these varied personalities resulted in a vast array of interactions, both positive and negative. However, before their interpersonal problems developed, there was a great deal of friendship among the composers. The Polish musicologist and Różycki biographer Józef Kański points to this dimension:

Because Różycki had his own home [in Berlin], all the artistic Bohemia met in the evening in his apartment where frequently late into the night, music rang and everyone carried on passionate discussions about the latest art. It was a warm family mood, an open and friendly atmosphere where the proverbial Polish hospitality of the hosts pervaded everything. The serious Karłowicz came over, the subtle, refined Szymanowski, and the young enthusiast, Fitelberg (the first performer of the symphonic works of his friends). The poet Cezary Jellenta who was gifted with a good voice, also came. He and the lady of the house frequently performed new songs of Różycki. Now and then other foreigners also dropped in.

And, in the later memoirs of Apolinary Széluto we find that he also remembered the early Berlin period as one of pleasantness and musical fulfillment for the four composers.

More than once we [Szeluto, Henryk and Talia Neuhaus] attended symphonic concerts at the Berlin Philharmonic with Karol Szymanowski, Grzegorz Fitelberg, and Ludomir Różycki. We attended the first performance of Reger's Symphonietta. We were in Berlin for the canape receptions of the bohemian artists, as guests in the house of the Różyckis. The author of the future Pan Twardowski constantly received the composers of Young Poland into his "gastsztuby." Mieczysław Karłowicz, as usual, retired to the most
distant dark corner. Karol Szymanowski captivated his convivial guests with his engaging manner . . . . In those days, Cezary Jeilenta arrived at one of those canape receptions at the Różyczki's "gastsztuby" in order to meet the musical anarchist; this anarchist was one of the founders of "Young Poland in Music" now writing these words. This is how I was called by the contemporary musical reporter from Kurier Warszawski, the late Aleksander Poliński.²

Yet, despite these early friendly relations, personal frictions quickly surfaced, becoming increasingly destructive. Conflicts developed because of the mixture of differing personalities, viewpoints, and professional goals. Adolf Chybiński, writing from first-hand experience, observed:

It is difficult to imagine greater antitheses, as for example Karłowicz and Szymanowski, or Szymanowski and Różyczki, even if one disregards the differences of strong talents and points of view. Different also were the degrees of self-criticism. Before the clear-sightedness of Karłowicz or Fitelberg . . . nothing was able to survive.³

Even prior to their professional associations, certain events set the tenor for the development of relationships between the composers and their supporters. One humorous incident is related by Arthur Rubinstein in his autobiography. Rubinstein, who was an ardent supporter of the members and interpreter of the music of Spółka Nakładowa in the first few years of its existence, and especially of Szymanowski, had been introduced to Różyczki years before the founding of Spółka Nakładowa when he was a piano student of Różyczki's father. Rubinstein wrote:
On one occasion, when I rang the bell to his [Różycki's] apartment, a young boy of about thirteen opened the door instead of the maid. "Did the cavalier . . . bring the money?" he asked in a rude voice. "No," I answered meekly. "Then there is no lesson," he shouted, and slammed the door . . . . The boy who had offended me was his son, Ludomir Różycki, who later became a well-known composer of operas, ballets, and other works. I have never played a note of his music.  

Rubinstein's memories of Fitelberg also were not the most complimentary. He met Fitelberg for the first time through Szymanowski, also before the founding of Spółka Nakładowa. Rubinstein recalled his negative reaction.  

Karol's friend Gregor Fitelberg, a composer and conductor, joined us sometimes. Only a few years older than Szymanowski, he put on grand, superior airs. He was a broad-shouldered, strong man, though only of middle height, and he had thick, wavy hair, a round, shaven face, and behind his eyeglasses a stern expression . . . . Instinctively, I did not like him.  

Rubinstein also relates several later insights into Fitelberg's personality which were the result of personal experiences the two had during the years under discussion. For the most part, these concerned Fitelberg's frequent refusal to pay Rubinstein for his services when the composer arranged or conducted concerts of Polish music, particularly when he directed the Warsaw Filharmonia, and his often questionable handling of finances earmarked for Rubinstein and Szymanowski, or his plain abuse of their friendship. Oftentimes, Rubinstein had to petition the good graces of Prince Lubomirski to mediate his disputes with Fitelberg. Lubomirski, according to Rubinstein,
often became aggravated at his young colleague because of his behavior. Yet, arbitrator was the role Lubomirski undertook most frequently in his relationship with Spolka Nakładowa. Despite acknowledging that Fitelberg accomplished a great deal for young Polish musicians, including himself, Rubinstein voices his antipathy toward Fitelberg:

Fitelberg was, without doubt, a good musician and a talented conductor, but a ruthless character. Nothing was sacred to him; he would walk over dead bodies to reach his goal. . . . His close friendship with Szymanowski, on whom he exercised a great influence, both musically and personally, was based on his genuine faith in Karol’s genius, as well as on full awareness of the advantage of being accepted as the only authorized interpreter of the Polish composer. Szymanowski’s delicate, sensitive nature, full of complexes, was an easy mark for this man’s forceful personality.

The pianist’s first impressions of Różycki and Fitelberg contrasted with those of Szymanowski, whom Rubinstein considered a genius of the first rank. For example, after Bronisław Gromadzki, an amateur violinist, introduced him to several of Szymanowski’s works, Rubinstein became adamant about meeting the composer. Indeed, he wrote directly to Szymanowski requesting a meeting, and when they first met in Zakopane, Rubinstein recalled:

Then there he was: a tall, slender young man. He looked older than his twenty-one years, dressed all in black, still in mourning, wearing a bowler hat and gloves—appearing more like a diplomat than a musician. But his beautiful, large, gray-blue eyes had a sad, intelligent, and most sensitive expression. He walked toward us with a slight limp, greeted his friend [Gromadzki] cordially but without effusion, and accepted our warm welcome with a polite but aloof smile . . . . He told me that my letter made him want
to come to Zakopane, that he had heard me at a concert in Warsaw, that he was anxious to show me his latest works, that he wanted me to be their interpreter. . . . It was a happy afternoon . . . .

Throughout his autobiography, Rubinstein indicates that he was always an admirer of Szymanowski. The composer reciprocated by dedicating a number of his works to Rubinstein, who in turn publicly performed many of them for the first time. Demonstrably, Rubinstein’s relationships with Fitelberg and Różycki were professional and cold, respectively; his relationship with Szymanowski was much more personal.

Given the diversity of personalities involved, it is not surprising the quickness with which problems surfaced after the formation of the publishing company. Almost immediately Szeluto and Fitelberg had a parting of the ways that resulted in Szeluto’s departure from active participation with Spółka Nakładowa; Różycki developed adversarial relationships with Fitelberg and Szymanowski; and Fitelberg even abused Szymanowski’s trust in him. None of these problems, of course, bode well for the smooth operation and success of Spółka Nakładowa.

The first indications of serious problems appear to have come to Chybiński’s attention shortly after May, 1906, shortly after the first Warsaw and Berlin concerts. Replying to a letter from Chybiński, which apparently alluded to problems developing within Spółka Nakładowa,
Karłowicz wrote: "You bring me sad tidings concerning Spółka. I learned about this only from your letter because Różycki has not written to me in a long time." Further indications of difficulty are related by the pianist, Henryk Neuhaus. Although, on February 11, 1906 Neuhaus, in relating to his family his reactions to the first composers' concert, wrote that "Generally, Różycki is the Cinderella in this association . . .," but by February 22 his opinions of Różycki had changed because of something Różycki and his wife did. Thus, he wrote his family that

(By they way, Różycki offended me so that I did not play one of his works . . .). I really do not care for him at all. Różycki and his wife live in Berlin. He writes much but poorly. He is now very depressed because, after the bad reviews, his father does not want to send him any more money. He has a most ordinary wife. She caused a scandal for Ficio because in the program there were three large works of Katot's and only one of Różycki's. Everything was so stupid.

Różycki also quickly developed serious differences with Fitelberg and Szymanowski, resulting largely from jealousy over professional achievements. Such conflicts were a continuation of the pattern that Różycki already had exhibited with Rubinstein and Neuhaus. By mid-1906 Różycki was voicing great animosity toward Szymanowski and Fitelberg. This animosity reached its peak by 1909 and was most frequently expressed to Chybiński, who quickly became Różycki's sounding-board and confessor. For
example, by October, 1906 Różycki was writing Chybiński that he did not have complete confidence in Fitelberg.\textsuperscript{13}

Also, later that same month he advised Chybiński about the possible problems that a Fitelberg-Jachimecki liaison could have for the musicologist:

As for Fitelberg, I advise heartily that you not send him Jachimecki’s address because when the rascal Fitelberg fraternizes with Jachimecki, there will be such intrigues let loose against you. Also some wickedness will be written about you in the same way as is written about me when Fitelberg and Szymanowski fraternize . . . . I do not fully understand why you count Fitelberg. You are a friend of Karlowicz and mine and you know what a masked cad this Fitelberg is . . . .\textsuperscript{14}

Różycki’s opinions of Fitelberg had not changed a year later when he again wrote to Chybiński in October that “Fitelberg wrote to me about a Kraków concert. I answered him that I would participate with pleasure, but he has not replied. Possibly he changed his mind or, once again, is swindling me . . . .”\textsuperscript{15} Later that month he takes another swipe, writing Chybiński that

Fitelberg wrote that he is directing \textit{Salome} from the 1st to the 15th of November. Can you imagine how I rejoice at such an eminent director and at the Filharmonia engaging such an idol of [the conductor] Reznicek? Is this not a scandal?\textsuperscript{16}

The year 1908 saw no change in Różycki's opinion of Fitelberg. His dislike for his former colleague grew as it expanded beyond personal perspectives. In January he wrote Chybiński:

As usual I doubt very much that now, in directing the Filharmonia, he [Fitelberg] is doing anything for
Polish music. [Instead] he initiates the introduction of the foreign monkeys [artists]. For Poles there will be neither places nor money. I wrote to him expressing wishes and hope for a future institution for Polish matters, but he did not answer. Apparently, he has other intentions.... Dear Sir, you have influence over Fitelberg; do not rely too much on him. This is my advice.... Fitelberg already had wasted one blameless person [Szeluto]. 17

Różycki's final 1908 stab at Fitelberg came after what he considered as Fitelberg's dismal performance of his music on a Warsaw concert in early August:

Fitelberg spoiled the concert in Warsaw for me. That dirty scoundrel supposedly wanted to perform my works, but he predisposes everything against me.... It was such a really, dirty trick. 18

Later that year Różycki contacted Karłowicz complaining about Chybiński's friendship with Fitelberg, against whom he had been raging for two years. Trying to soothe Różycki's apparently bruised ego, Karłowicz wrote:

Do not grieve because Chybiński temporarily busies himself with Fitelberg.... I know that he is always friendly towards you. You know, we spoke with him many times about you. Surely he will do the same for you that he does for Fitelberg. Chybiński, from the moment of the appearance of the young generation of musicians, constantly paves the way with true enthusiasm. From my perspective I do not see that he is guided at all by private interests. 19

Różycki's last major outbursts against Fitelberg came in 1909 and, again, were written to Chybiński because Chybiński had received a letter from Fitelberg which stated: "Where is Lura [Różycki]? In September I submitted a plan of my campaign. I am anxious to speak with Lura. Perhaps he will be friendlier to me this year and
allow his music to be performed in Warsaw." After receiving from Chybiński this indication that Fitelberg once again wanted to perform some of his works, Różycki replied on September 1:

I received your letter and if Fitelberg wants to meet me because of such interest, give him my address. Of course, I will give him my scores most happily. However, before I do that, he is obliged to arrange a composer's concert for me since he speaks so much about our friendship.

Apparently Różycki did not like the reply he received from Chybiński. Chybiński apparently had included Fitelberg's letter in his correspondence to him, because Różycki voiced his strongest sentiments, writing:

I most strongly protest that which you write regarding Fitelberg. It is not because of my irritation as you seem to think, but rather from my feelings and opinion about Fitelberg. Yet his letter proves only his double-dealing ways, and does not convince me [of his good intentions]. There has been a whole series of dirty deeds between colleagues from the Berlin times ... even during the time of the Warsaw concerts. Thus, considering all of this, I cannot believe in the sincerity of his artistic and friendly intentions. In fact he is probably most comfortable with the fact that I did not give him my works. It is even possible to think that he may say that I have given up composing. This precious document, Grzegorz's letter, I return to you with the greatest of pleasure.

At this point Różycki formally ended his personal relationship with his former colleague, Grzegorz Fitelberg. Even Chybiński's continuing efforts as a go-between failed to reconcile the two musicians. Nevertheless, Fitelberg would continue to program Różycki's works frequently during the next six decades of his conducting career.
Because of his professional sensitivities, Rozycki developed a personal jealousy of Szymanowski and Karłowicz as composers. This jealousy was particularly directed at Szymanowski because Rozycki was upset with the greater acceptance of Szymanowski's music than his by the Warsaw critics. In a letter to Chybiński from October 2, 1906, Rozycki expressed these feelings:

Szymanowski frequently stops in Lwów, but I think that this possibly will do more harm than good because he has a fondness for the Niewiadomskis and also because he dedicated his Variations in B Minor, Op. 10 to Noskowski. As Fitelberg was saying to me the other day, he [Szymanowski] dedicates them to Noskowski . . . to benefit his career. Sad indeed is this career made by kissing the ass of [the composer] Mr. Niewiadomski, etc. Also, [the critic] Polinski begins to value [the composer] Nowowiejski on the same level as Szymanowski and he also christened him a genius. Every day I say a Hail Mary that I was not chosen as a genius in Warsaw, or that I was not made out to be one.

Fitelberg wants to make things better between us, but when something gets broken it is not so easy to fix with me. Although I want to maintain for the sake of art all appearances of good will, I do not have complete trust in him. In any case it is better, in the presence of Noskowski and others who search for blemishes and gaps in this sunshine, that we hold to this agreement. And as Fitelberg said, let's be in agreement at least as artists! If he only would live up to this. It seems to me that Fitelberg and Szymanowski will quarrel soon. Are they not artists with high ideals? Where is art? Such vileness?23

Two weeks later, on October 18, Rozycki again wrote Chybiński, this time criticizing the works of Karłowicz: "Why do you go on writing about Karłowicz's songs when these songs are worthless, even more so than his symphonic works?"24 Rozycki, although becoming very critical about
the music and activities of his colleagues, was insecure in his own musical endeavors. He obviously was worried about his colleagues' opinions. He indicated this when writing Chybiński about several upcoming concerts in Poznań, Lwów, and Kraków:

Please, I beg of you, do not write to the Publishing Company about these concerts . . . . Also, do not write to Karłowicz about these concerts! In either case, it may be harmful to me . . . . I already have been disappointed with several people.25

Shortly after Spółka Nakładowa's second Warsaw concert in 1907, Różycki again wrote to Chybiński in May. This time he expressed his dissatisfaction over the collegiality between Szymanowski and Jachimecki, particularly since Jachimecki had written several highly complimentary articles about Szymanowski and his music. Różycki observed mockingly: "Imagine Jachimecki already started to correspond with Szymanowski and already has written of his scores using the expressions 'honorable, splendid, exceptional.' Honorable, etc., as he usually writes."26 And, on July 25, 1907, Różycki complained to Chybiński about the way Jachimecki portrayed him in comparison to the portrayal of Szymanowski in Jachimecki's recent publication about Polish music, which had included a section on the composers of Spółka Nakładowa. Needless-to-say, Jachimecki found Szymanowski the far better composer of the two. It should be pointed out that at this time Jachimecki had trouble contacting a number of the composers to
corroborate a number of facts and theses before his deadline for publication arrived. Those whom he did contact were Różycki and Szymanowski. Apparently, Różycki believed that Szymanowski passed on untruths about him to Jachimecki, because he wrote:

About the affair with Dr. Jachimecki; it still proves one thing: namely that Jachimecki, even before the writing of this booklet, wrote to me asking if I would give him Szymanowski’s address (of course I did). It is possible that Szymanowski undertook his usual leadership in starting intrigues behind my back! For example, in Warsaw there was a notorious meeting with Poliński and the whole band of our critics. Szymanowski is, at any cost, the general creator of the Etude, B-flat Major, a horribly small creation

Różycki was not alone in his dislike of what Jachimecki had written. Chybiński and, surprisingly, Fitelberg also were critical, particularly of what was written about Różycki. For example, on April 14, 1907, Chybiński wrote to argue with Jachimecki about latter’s conclusions:

Regarding Szymanowski and your admiration of him, I must call attention to the fact that just as in the history of our music of The One [Chopin], one must be compared against the background of his own epoch. Therefore, it is not possible to put Szymanowski on a pedestal because, if you really knew all of his works, you would find traces of Chopin, Liszt, Reger, and chiefly Skrabin, whom as I know, you do not know and whose whole pile of compositions lies on my cottage’s piano. With Różycki we do not find foreign influences in such measure, although Różycki’s works for piano are weaker ... . Even if you had been in Berlin last year and had been able to ascertain for yourself, [you would have to admit] that Różycki uses the orchestra better than Szymanowski ... . 28

Fitelberg also communicated with Chybiński on several occasions about Jachimecki’s publication. The first such
was a letter from Geneva of July 23, 1907, in which he also replied to some questions that Chybiński must have posed regarding his disappointments over what was developing within the company—about this issue Fitelberg was vague.

I must tell you that I do not completely understand your last note. About which disappointment do you speak? Why do you consider that the situation in which Jachimecki supports Jachimecki and not me or Różycki means an involvement for you in various messes? And why do you want to turn away from us? Really, I do not comprehend all of this... That Jachimecki may be an idiot, this is another question (possibly a very unpleasant one); however, why must it concern us? I am sure that you are now reassured and will serve, with even greater energy, both the truth and the fight against prejudice.  

On August 17 from Munich Fitelberg further commented

I read in Nowa Gazeta the polemics and replies between you and Jachimecki... I do not know what he wants from the Berlin critics; after all, Różycki and my compositions were much more favorably received than Szymanowski's. I had all those critics on my side.  

Finally, also from Munich, Fitelberg once again corresponded with Chybiński not only concerning Jachimecki's opinions of the composers but also about Chybiński's obvious inquiries into Fitelberg and Szymanowski's relationship with his colleague. Such inquiries may have come in response to Różycki's comments of months earlier.

It is too bad that I did not read [the journal] Nasz Kraj. I do not know for sure what Jachimecki wrote or writes at present. I am a little surprised that you are creating such a horrible tragedy about all this. Why? After all, you acknowledged many times that you consider Jachimecki a nothing, a zero—so why do you feel indignant...? And now I want to say something, but I bring myself to this with some difficulty
as it is not in my nature to make confessions. However, I want to make this one to correct some things for you: for a while I have noticed that you suspect Szymanowski and me (of him I will not speak because it is not my way) of, as it were, being in collusion with Jachimecki. Where you get this idea, I do not know. I assure you that there was and is no such thing.

As can be determined from the above citations, Rożycki became quite distrusting of and unfriendly toward Fitelberg and Szymanowski in a relatively short period of time. He also totally disagreed with Jachimecki's comparisons of his and Szymanowski's music. At the same time, either through Rożycki's constant complaining or through their own actions, Szymanowski and Fitelberg came under the suspicion of Chybiński, prompting inquiries into their intentions and Fitelberg's vague replies. Since during these three critical years of confrontations virtually nothing was put in writing by Szymanowski, little is known concerning his personal feelings. And most important for this study, it must be noted that Fitelberg was not a totally innocent victim during this time. Rożycki did have justifications for his complaints, although he did let his emotions prevail.

Fitelberg often proved to be a very difficult individual with whom to deal. For example, we know that he had a serious falling out with Szeluto, so serious that Szeluto virtually disengaged himself from the publishing
company after that. Chybiński informed Jachimecki about this on June 11, 1907, when he wrote:

In the Association there are quarrels and as Rozycki informs me, Széluto broke off with Ficio who is presently staying in Geneva and wrote me today. It is too bad about Széluto because in my opinion he is a very gifted young man with a great future. But who does not have problems with Fitelberg? Lura Różycki wanted to break away a few times, but thanks to my persuasion he made peace, retaining an objective position towards everything. I do not know yet the details regarding Széluto. Generally, Fitelberg dominates excessively. In musical knowledge he is beyond all the younger Poles. He has respect only for M. Karłowicz . . .

Rozycki replied to Chybiński's inquiries into this development on July 23, writing that Fitelberg had cheated Széluto and the company out of money when he used company funds for his own purposes:

About the affair of Fitelberg and Széluto it is hard for me to say anything with surety. I know only that if formerly they liked each other a great deal . . . Széluto now hates Fitelberg sincerely. He says that Fitelberg kept money from him from the concerts of songs (besides this, Lubomirski had to pay for the concert). Széluto suspects that Lubomirski gave Fitelberg money for the Association and Fitelberg, in turn, used it for the arrangements of his concerts conducting Strauss. However, because scores continue to emerge from the Association, the prince thinks that this is being accomplished because of his money . . . Of course these things are not spoken about because they would be compromising.

Széluto was so profoundly affected by this situation that Rożycki commented to Chybiński that "Széluto is shaken and grows completely livid when speaking about Mr. Grzegorz." By 1909 Széluto, according to Różycki, "Could not believe
the tendencies of the 'Publishing Company' toward unity
(moral naturellement)."35

Concerning Fitelberg's relationship with Szymanowski,
we find that Rubinstein's assessment of Fitelberg's in-
fluence over Szymanowski, as cited above, was most ac-
curate. It is fully endorsed by Teresa Chylinska in her
introduction to her publication of Szymanowski's corre-
spondences. She concluded that:

It may be supposed that the composer's sense of lone-
liness after the loss of his father played an im-
portant part in his so openly and readily submitting
to the influence of Grzegorz Fitelberg. Fitelberg,
several years older than Szymanowski, was an experi-
enced and well-educated musician and a resolute man of
action and clear judgment that was not affected by un-
due reflectiveness. Karol Szymanowski made the
acquaintance of Fitelberg a few months before the
death of his father, with whom he had discussed Fitel-
berg's idea of setting up the Young Polish Composers
Publishing Company. Throughout the next year the com-
poser was in very low spirits. He only recovered with
difficulty, painfully adjusting to his mentally inde-
pendent existence. It was just then that he entered
into Fitelberg's orbit. However meandering the course
of their friendship was to be in the future, Fitelberg
was, with Stanisław Szymanowski and Pawel Kochanski,
Szymanowski's closest and indispensable confident as
regards musical issues.... Szymanowski patiently
excused and forgave his friend's unrestrained, some-
times downright drastic behaviours (in Vienna 1912-
1913). Things must have been carried too far, as it
came to the cooling of relations and, as far as Fitel-
berg was concerned, to an out and out breach. The
 correspondence stopped in 1913 and, despite attempts
made by Szymanowski.... it was not resumed until
1921....

.... It is not irrelevant to say that Fitelberg
was far from being an easy friend. He did not allow
criticism of himself, while in friendship he was
peremptory and greedy, jealous and domineering.
Fitelberg's suspiciousness of Stefan Spiess, who
allegedly had robbed him of some of Karol's friend-
ship, caused Szymanowski much bitterness. In the long
run, Szymanowski was the loser in this conflict. The breach hurt his feelings painfully, and he felt resentful, neglected and desolate... The punishment of silence and long-lasting absence inflicted on the friend by Fitelberg was too severe, but it would not have been such if it had not been for its strongly emotional substratum. Szymanowski needed his Ficio both emotionally and for practical reasons.

What is evident in Szymanowski's correspondences to various friends concerning the topic of his and Fitelberg's relationship is that he needed Fitelberg in many ways and that Fitelberg often manipulated him for his own self-interest. Also, we find that whenever Fitelberg felt threatened by another person's closeness to Szymanowski, he always managed to inflict pain on this perceived outsider through Szymanowski. Rubinstein relates such an occurrence of this behavior in his autobiography. Through it all, Szymanowski seemed oblivious to what was happening around him as he had put great trust in Fitelberg. Nevertheless, in the end Fitelberg alienated even his most ardent admirer and friend for a period of time. However, this transpired long after the time of Spółka Nakładowa and is not relevant here.

In the end, what is most important from the citations above is that the relationships among these composers were not at all similar to what Stefania Różycka wrote in 1937, on the anniversary of the founding of Spółka Nakładowa:
Katot, Ficio, and Lura .... As they were called. Is it so long ago? No .... not long. Just like yesterday .... I see them on the street in Berlin. They stand before the advertisement kiosk; they are reading the announcement of the Berlin Philharmonic's schedule .... I paused and observed the original trio. They are not alike. Katot—slender, leans on a walking stick, has a slight limp. Dressed carefully, slow movements, nice ironic face. A sure smile for the ladies. He speaks with animation as if he wanted to convince Lura and Ficio. He points to the post with his cane.

Ficio, active, not at ease. Brilliant eyes. From under his hat his short hair appears thick. He smiles, he chokes with laughter. From afar brilliant white teeth ....

Lura—the youngest .... He stands near—as if not trusting. Dressed in nonchalant elegance. A hat with a broad brim pulled low on his head. Hands crossed behind his back, holding an umbrella. A nervous manner. He walks back and forth. Finally, he becomes calm and smiles. His eyes become brilliant and gleaming. Apparently he hears something very pleasant.

All concentrate and bend toward the kiosk. Do they see something there? After a moment they leave together. One with the other .... They laugh out loud. It is obvious they have much to say to each other. I come close to the kiosk and read: Polish Symphonic Concert! with the Berlin Philharmonic in the Beethoven Hall under the direction of Grzegorz Fitelberg. Works by Karol Szymanowski, Ludomir Rózycki, and Grzegorz Fitelberg.

Yes, it was yesterday. The composers arrived in Berlin. Prince Władysław Lubomirski organized a concert of Young Poland there. The first Polish concert in Berlin .... He chooses the best composers. A fine director .... may that everything sounded well and the young composers were satisfied and drew strength for the belief of further work. The composers beamed with delight. There was no discordant note. Life is so beautiful. Berlin fascinates. So much is new. Everything thrills and comes together. Young Poland, full of spirit, of hope and of delight, enters the world .... it enters.
Adolf Chybiński and Spółka Nakładowa

From the foregoing it becomes apparent that Adolf Chybiński played a multifaceted role in the life of Spółka Nakładowa. He was more than anyone else the composers' most ardent supporter and promoter, the one who most insistently and unceasingly carried forth their musical banner. It must be pointed out, however, that it was not the banner of Spółka Nakładowa but the banner of Young Poland in Music. Additionally, as we have seen, he was their father confessor during times of personal hardship. Therefore, because of his importance to Spółka Nakładowa we might now ask: what was Chybiński's professional position regarding Spółka Nakładowa?

It must be understood that Chybiński was a contemporary of the composers of Spółka Nakładowa, not only in age (mid-twenties) but also in professional development (a recently graduated musicologist). Like his composer colleagues, he had experienced the need to study abroad because of the stagnant artistic and cultural life in Poland. The formation of a Spółka Nakładowa fighting for the rights of young, forward-looking composers was just the revolutionary musical event to attract and excite his professional ambitions. Chybiński was the first to recognize this potentially historical event which, according to him: "since the time of Chopin, allowed Polish music, for the first time, to take a breath of fresh air and
begin an independent flight." For him Spółka Nakładowa marked "the dawning of a new epoch in our music ... and those who immediately took notice did not come to regret their actions in the fight for the rights of individual developments of talent."

With such an understanding of the potential importance of Spółka Nakładowa, Chybiński quickly decided to become its scholarly patron. He undertook this role with such tenacity that he quickly became known as its most ardent advocate. In executing such a role Chybiński frequently discussed characteristics of the association, oftentimes however, from contradictory points of view. One need only to survey the more important of forty-odd articles and reviews that he wrote from 1906 to 1912, as well as those of his later years, to ascertain his opinions about the composers' association (a number of examples have been presented in the previous chapter).

Chybiński's interpretations of and his support for the composers' association, which he called Young Poland in Music, are in evidence in a variety of publications. What is particularly striking in these writings is Chybiński's frequent changes of opinion and viewpoint. For example, in a 1906 reply to the concert reviews of the Warsaw critics, he observed the following concerning the members of the association--Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg, and Szeluto--and their works:
But what reproaches have our authors brought on themselves? They are called "nuts" and are reproached for striving after "effects" of orchestration, for excessive dissonance, cacophony, lack of melodiousness, eccentricity, and for not deepening the "wonders of Music", etc., etc. This is exactly the same as what was criticized in the time of Beethoven, Berlioz, Wagner, Liszt, Strauss, and others who had the courage to think and feel differently from the ordinary musician, from the critic . . . .

... [Because Społka Nakładowa's works are] so uniquely different from what is currently produced and heard among us, it is not unusual that nothing has been understood at all about its music . . . . Our energetic youth are so impudent that they dare not to pay attention to the estimations of qualified and unqualified critics. Let these youngsters keep these policies which are now used against them by the noble toreadors of the pen. Let them go forth together as a host, hand in hand, courageously. To the summit!41

Later that same year, Chybiński wrote another article discussing his perceptions of the Polish reception of Young Poland in Music, to which he unexpectedly added other composers such as Ignacy Paderewski, Henryk Melcer, Zygmunt Stojowski, Juliusz Wertheim, and Henryk Opieński.

They are well-known to us only as names, their art is not only not known, but is not even performed in the period of their importance . . . . To us these underestimated and excluded voices did not find even the possibility of exploiting their knowledge and talents. They did not find even a place in which they were able to display their work . . . .42

In succeeding articles, however, Chybiński not only dropped these five individuals but also Szeluto from the ranks of Społka Nakładowa. Almost immediately, though, he added Mieczysław Karłowicz to the membership. Clearly, Chybiński's perception of what was Young Poland in Music, and thus Społka Nakładowa, changed over time.
Throughout his many writings, Chybiński often asserted the importance of Young Poland in Music to the development and future progress of Polish music. We already know from the above that he generally considered the members of the group and their work the "dawning of a new epoch" and a "breath of fresh air for Polish music." However, he also advanced specific, often differing reasons for their importance. For example, in 1908 Chybiński held that the greatest import of the group to Polish music was its re-introduction into the Western world of that which he considered

One of the greatest, impressive rejoinders to those who diminished us. [With Spółka Nakładowa] we begin to possess those weapons which afforded German music its victory over the music culture of the 19th century... Thus, we are now armed with the weapons of knowledge, of a higher musical culture, and of great talents. Only through our catching up with the rest of Europe will we be able to have a positive influence and to occupy an historically firm position in music of the twentieth century.43

However, in 1911 he shifted his position somewhat by declaring that the greatest service of Young Poland in Music to Polish music was "... the creation of a new symphonic school in Poland, a school completely separate in character and dissimilar to that which has existed among us to the present day."44 Finally, in his 1918 article about Polish music after Chopin we find the following comments reverting partly to his 1908 views:

"Young Poland in Music" in its collective appearance denotes the realization of its tasks and
aims. The talents of all four composers [Szymanowski, Różyczki, Fitelberg, and Karłowicz—not Szeluto] advanced them to the forefront. Knowledge allowed them to be creatively independent in all musical means. These creators, however, quickly noticed that it is not always possible to walk hand-in-hand with Europe. If Polish music does not equal it [European music], it is because until now it has always been at least one generation behind . . . . The young generation, perhaps for the first time in Poland, proved by its works that it is impossible to be content with that which one learns so young [musical traditionalism]; it endeavors, however, to move forward in wider directions . . . . All of the teasers [musical compositions], of these four artists, contributed to one thing: the liberation of the Polish symphonist from the shackles of conventionality. This is their service, which in the development of national art, possesses decisive importance. This change came so suddenly and with such force that we cannot but be surprised that the series of works of these composers has not yet become the possession of the entire community . . . . Their works determine the spiritual capital of the country, their value is a lofty representative value to the rest of Europe . . . .

Chybiński's writings in support of the individual styles and talents of the "four" composers also reveal a great deal of appreciation of the importance of their association to the development of Polish music. For example, we have observed previously that he considered the composers' association, although professing one goal, as consisting of differing personalities presenting individual styles and manners of expression in contrast to the older generation of composers which could not generate such differences. In an article about Karłowicz Chybiński held that

Szymanowski, Fitelberg, and Różyczki in fact introduced a "de facto" trait of individuality into Polish music; each of them speaks alone from himself, for
himself, and through himself, while not considering the sum of convictions and opinions of a certain estate [critics]: each of them is an individual... It was possible for Polish music to receive a series of great and valuable works only when these composers decided to follow the path of their own individual inspiration and thought without the slightest consideration for what the critic or older colleague might say of their creations.47

In other essays, Chybiński addressed the dilemma of the non-acceptance of the composers and their creations by the old-guard Polish critics. In 1908 he penned two important commentaries on the dangerous control that the older Polish critics exerted over general musical acceptance in Poland. First, Chybiński wrote that:

In the one who presented more courageous harmonies, who wrote the more colorful symphonic works or wanted to bring out polyphony, the critics, with one attack, annihilated the will to create.48

Second, Chybiński bluntly opined that the Warsaw critics simply "do not realize the importance of our youngest composers."49

Chybiński continued his attack on Polish critics in a defense of the composers' association in his 1911 article devoted to Karłowicz. He complained that the critics

... have carried on and continue to carry on private interests and posturings which have jealousy as their source. [And that] if 'Young Poland in Music' is accused of something... it is always the individual who is judged, not the art.50

Finally, he attributed their lack of understanding or interest in the young composers and their "new" music to the general state of Poland's musical maturity at that time,
stating that: "There is such ignorance here about which no one in the Western countries has the faintest idea. In no other field does such disparate laziness rule." In the end, just before the dissolution of Spółka Nakładowa, Chybiński finally issued an indirect challenge to his backward-looking colleagues:

If someone with true love [for music] ... devotes himself to a thorough study of the works of Szymanowski, Różycki, and Karłowicz, and those other few with true vocations, he will be able to say that he himself has crossed the threshold of great art, an art not knowing either compromise nor casual aims.

Toward the end of his career Chybiński reflected on his oftentimes overly zealous professional support of the association. Two references to such actions are found in two of Chybiński's major monographs: the first, appearing in his 1949 biography of Karłowicz stated:

There began at that time the battle between "the old" and "the young" and "the youngest" in music and musical criticism. Each action called forth an almost immediate reaction and such a reaction was oftentimes very energetic and even sharp. The first side [the old] wanted to preserve its domination (of the press) and its authority . . . ; the second side [the youngest] wanted to create works, works whose meaning, regardless of their objective value of idea, direction and individuality, were important to Polish music not only in the minds of their authors, but also in the minds of those who were representatives of the first side [the old], as well as both the old composers and seminarists. Regarding the works of "Young Poland," their defenders replied in a manner which we must frankly acknowledge today as often having been excessive. However, it always was done with an enthusiasm for new things; it also brought a fresh breath to the then still moldy atmosphere and poor state of Polish music, particularly symphonic music.
The second reference is contained in Chybiński's later remembrances of the times penned in 1958.

Both because of my association with Mieczysław Karłowicz and our exchange of letters, I became acquainted with the group of those young Polish composers. In 1906 and 1907 I went to Berlin for their orchestral concerts chiefly because of the excitement of Karłowicz, but also because I was invited by some of the composers who knew me from my musical correspondences from Munich and my musical articles in various journals; tinged, of course, very progressively. After seeing how these composers were treated in our country for their progressive directions (they were possibly too threatening to their older colleagues), I decided not only to acquaint myself with their works but also to begin energetic, but not combative, propaganda. It was to be a joint effort with a certain degree of exaggeration in order to expose the attack from the writings of the then influential Warsaw (and Lwów) critics. I realized my task despite various invectives. 54

It must be noted that, despite these later admissions of questionable activities by Chybiński, latter-day scholars continued and continue today to base their interpretations of Spółka Nakładowa on the early writings of Chybiński, an unfortunate situation for Polish scholarship.

At this point we might well ask what type of personal relationship developed between Chybiński and the composers of Spółka Nakładowa as a result of his prominent activities? For the most part the relationship was positive; Chybiński was their major advocate and personal mentor. The composers frequently wrote to him to express their feelings of friendship and camaraderie, as well as their opinions of the poor state of Polish music. Often, they wrote to him to express their gratitude for his support of
their goals and their music. For example, on February 6, 1906, Różycki wrote to Chybiński:

Thank you very much for your kindness. It is a great pleasure for us that you are interested in our association [company], all the more so because you are anxious to stand up for the defense of young Polish music . . . .

Sometime after Różycki's letter, Szeluto also wrote to Chybiński expressing his delight in the musicologist's support: "I read through your letter several times, as it gave great pleasure to all of us. It is not because you write about us, etc., but because we feel an affinity with you." Fitelberg also responded with enthusiasm to Chybiński's general support in three letters to him dating from March, April, and May, 1906. In the first two Fitelberg wrote the following sentiments:

I see from your letters that you really understand our affairs perfectly. It is necessary to work much. It is necessary to work together; it is imperative [to work] together. Thanks to this, our Spółka arose;

Thank you so much for the [articles in] Gazeta Lwowska. It was nice for me to hear of your Berlin impressions. I think that you are overly kind to us . . . . We are all beginning to work and are trying to realize the hopes, if only in part, that you put in us.

Fitelberg's third letter to Chybiński acknowledged: "Your note pleases me a great deal. It is fabulous for us and for our affairs that we will have you as our champion and defender, even in the German journals!"

Chybiński played an additional role in the life of Spółka Nakładowa besides that of public advocate and
champion. He also found himself to be the primary person upon whom the composers depended heavily for professional and, as we have seen above, personal moral support. This dependency became greater as the opposition that the composers felt growing against them increased. Out of this developing dependency came the immediate and free access of Chybiński to the composers. One need only to examine the personal correspondences between Chybiński and the composers to begin to understand this dependency. Thus, returning to Różycki's letter of February 6, 1906, we find the composer writing Chybiński that

Here in Poland, the unfriendliness towards all that is young and new is greater than anywhere else. The critics are unable to understand that, Noskowski and Moniuszko notwithstanding, there still exists a whole world of tones—I say that there are other ways of understanding the same essences of music. Unfortunately, these people hold the more prominent places in the Polish press and, since the whole of Poland is unmusical, the critics, therefore, frequently exert negative and harmful influences on musical society.

All the more are we happy that you want to join us in our fight in the name of new Polish music . . . 60

Returning to his March 9, 1906 letter, we also find Fitelberg writing to Chybiński that

I have composed a song and prelude to the words of Berent. I want this song to be published and I would like to ask you to translate it into German . . . . How splendid it would be if you could come to our concert. We would get to know you and you us and our works . . . 61

On March 25, 1906 Różycki also informed Chybiński about the upcoming concert:
I sent you and Karłowicz two tickets in order that you two could sit together. My wife and I also have seats: on the 29th we expect you for tea—I have invited Fitelberg and Szeluto. May I assume that you will not refuse?*

Finally, on April 6, 1906, even the confident Fitelberg indicated a professional reliance on Chybiński when he wrote to his new friend saying, "It is I who should thank you, because you deigned to come to us. I firmly believe that you will become the sort of critic that we do not yet have. We will work together and it will be positive."**

Finally, on May 25, 1906, Fitelberg wrote Chybiński that in a few days you will receive *Kobądź* [song for voice and piano]. Do you know the journal *Nasz Kraj*? There will be an article in it about our group. Prince Lubomirski asked me to subscribe to *Hasło* for him. Perhaps you could please do this and find an opportunity to write the prince a few words. The prince was very touched by your article in *Gazeta Lwowska*. Did you read about my Symfonia in number 14 of *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*? Not at all a bad review; only the idiots call me Der Deutsch-Russe!*

There are, of course, many other examples illustrating the multi-faceted relationship that Chybiński developed with the composers of Spółka Nakładowa, examples too numerous to cite here. Nonetheless, to best describe Chybiński’s relationship with the four composers one need only refer to the statements of Chybiński himself.

I speak not about the old direction, but about the new. They are not wrong, those who consider the undersigned an “apostle of modernism and musical progress” (as was expressed not long ago by one of the members of the critical cavaliers). Advancement is the most important thing: 1) valuable compositions, 2) substantial compositions, 3) the bringing forth of new ideas in their genuine forms. It is a trivial matter
for artistic value that someone exhibits national or individual elements. In the latter, the composers do not necessarily stop being representatives of the spiritual output of their country... They [critical cavaliers] directly accuse the undersigned of overestimating many of the compositions of the so-called "Young Poland." It is only for the future to decide if this accusation is correct or not. I allow myself a loyalty to Richard Strauss who, in a very instructive manner, stated: "Let time be the judge! If one overrates the worth of someone, never mind! It is much better to overestimate by a twentieth than to close off even one direction!" The most important thing here is that someone wants to and knows how to [estimate]! Certainly, it is not the fault of the undersigned that misfortune becomes a fact for many of the composers among us. These composers were overestimated by me... If I was frequently forced to express myself in an offensive manner against the languid, antagonistic, and irritating elements among whom opportunism is the eleventh commandment, I did so only to guard native interests, nothing more.

The Publishing Activities

The four composers who founded the publishing company Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich on the Berlin premises of the Albert Stahl Publishing Company, did so, as has already been determined, for one primary reason: to promote through publishing and concerts the music of the company's members and that of other worthy young Polish composers. However, because of the immediate upsurge of activity in critical and scholarly debates which surrounded the company's concerts and the musical creations presented on them, the publishing activities of the company received little actual discussion by Polish critics and historians. Surviving evidence concerning the publishing activities is scanty; it relates either to the
company’s founding or to the procedures for submitting works for publication. Nevertheless, the resultant general Polish reaction to Spółka Nakładowa’s publishing endeavors is illustrated by the following humorous, yet telling comment of Zdzisław Jachimecki from 1908:

... the friendly Warsaw musical aestheticians made the sign of the cross at the sight of the blue-green cover of the publications of "Spółka" thinking that they could expel through exorcism the Evil One of Dissonance who possesses these works.66

Despite such a public reception, Spółka Nakładowa did publish a sizable number of works in its first two years of existence. These included works for orchestra, piano, violin, cello, and voice.

A survey of the publishing activities of Spółka Nakładowa reveals several interesting facts concerning the company and its members. The first is that despite the important implications of its founding and its early concentrated publishing activities, little information about the actual business aspects of the company appears to have been put in writing, either by the composers or their associates. Direct references found today consist of a few statements gleaned from various letters of those involved with the publishing association. The first one referring directly to the process of submitting a score for publication, is a two-letter correspondence between Zdzisław Jachimecki and Adolf Chybiński. On April 22, 1906 Jachimecki wrote to Chybiński expressing interest in having his
works published by Spółka Nakładowa, stating: "Today I have one sincere desire: to join their membership. That is if my items will not offend their minimum requirements. Please let me know to whom I should inquire about this . . . " Chybiński, in his reply, outlined the procedures one had to follow in submitting works for possible publication by Spółka Nakładowa.

I am writing back because I think that you are anxious to learn about the "Polish Publishing Company" in Berlin. Thus, I will proceed: You send the scores that you want published to Fitelberg. He then summons the rest of the group and an open consultation follows . . . Later, they will write back whether or not they consider them worthy of publishing. If they decide they are not, that in no way means that it is a categorical rejection. They will advise on what one should do [further]. You, alone, bear the cost of printing . . . I have spoken much to them about you and they have a liking for you "a priori." It is possible, therefore, for you to rely on their impartiality . . .

Two further brief references of the business relations between Spółka Nakładowa and Albert Stahl come from letters of Fitelberg and Różycki. In one dated May 25, 1906, containing general news, Fitelberg simply informs Chybiński that "Tomorrow I will be at Stahl's and will speak to him about the compositions of Brzeziński and Różycki . . . ." (Fitelberg possibly was referring to his intention to interest Stahl in publishing Brzeziński's Temat z wariacjamy, Op. 3 and Różycki's 4 Impromptus, Op. 6 and Melodie as a result of Chybiński's positive critiques of these works.) The second is found in a letter
by Różycki to Jachimecki of February 20, 1907 in which he replies to a request for a complete set of scores published by Spółka Nakładowa:

"I am sorry that I am not able to present you with all the editions of the Company. I cannot give orders to the investor [he most likely is referring to Stahl] for any other works except my own. Therefore, if you want to write to the other composers I will give you Szymanowski's address..."

The second interesting fact concerning Spółka Nakładowa is that the majority of the works written by the four composers during the years 1905 to 1912 were not published by their own company. This, of course, is most surprising since the four composers founded their company with the express intention of publishing their own compositions because of the lack of interest on the part of the Polish publishing community. What is also surprising is that more works by non-members of Spółka Nakładowa received their first publication by the company than did those of the founding members. Only five of Fitelberg's first twenty-four opuses, six of Szymanowski's first twenty-six, and five of Szeluto's first fourteen were published by Spółka Nakładowa. Różycki, however, published thirteen of his first thirty opuses with the company.

One can only speculate as to the reasons for this. First, a number of early, immature works of the composers had been written before Spółka Nakładowa was founded, and some of these already had been published. This was
particularly true of Fitelberg. However, the composers later decided to publish some of these early works through their company, those not published perhaps being considered unworthy of publication. Second, the interpersonal problems that soon developed had to have had a highly negative and restricting impact on the composers' business ventures. Third, Fitelberg and Szeluto had given up composing, the former in favor of a conducting career and the latter because of his difficulties with Fitelberg. Fourth, one may attribute Szymanowski's few publications with the company to his early dissatisfaction with their publishing arrangement with Albert Stahl. In his correspondences with Fitelberg one finds that Szymanowski quickly began to question seriously the integrity, honesty, and business acumen of Stahl. In a letter from May 15, 1908 Szymanowski expressed his general displeasure with the German publisher, writing:

"Stahl" as a firm does not represent anything; the local booksellers speak about him in a sneering way. They do business with him only because of us, beyond this he plays no role in contemporary music publishing, no one knows him, no one has accounts with him. No wonder our publications are of little interest to anyone. For now it seems that it is necessary to leave behind this status quo ante—and to discuss this question among ourselves.71

Szymanowski continued to voice to Fitelberg and others his doubts as to the advisability of maintaining the company's association with Stahl until he formally broke with Społka
Nakładowa by signing a contract with Universal Edition for the exclusive rights to publish his music.\textsuperscript{72}

Finally, one may also speculate that Różycki's numerous publications with Spółka Nakładowa resulted from the lack of interest on the part of other publishers. One must remember that it was only in 1914 that Różycki received a contract for the publication of his works by the Howard Hansen Company of Copenhagen. Whatever the reason, Różycki remained, of the four founders, the one solid supporter of Spółka Nakładowa throughout its existence.

As a result of its publishing activities, in a short period of time Spółka Nakładowa became the publishing vehicle for non-members. Indeed, Spółka Nakładowa was often the sole hope of publication for many young Polish composers such as Henryk Opieński, Paweł Romaszko, Wojciech Gawronski, Juliusz Wertheim, and Ignacy Friedman, composers who had many of their early works published by the firm. In the final analysis, Spółka Nakładowa fulfilled its purpose, at least partially, both for the founding composers and the colleagues it intended to assist. Finally, one must state that without Spółka Nakładowa there would not have been Young Poland in Music.
NOTES


5. Ibid., 208.

6. Ibid., 279-80, 282, 295-97, 377-78.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid., 279.

9. Ibid., 119.


11. Ibid., 82.

12. Ibid., 84.

13. Ibid., 108.

14. Ibid., 111.

15. Ibid., 142.

16. Ibid., 144.

17. Ibid., 152-53.


20. Chylińska, Karol Szymanowski, 185.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., 186.

23. Ibid., 108-09.

24. Ibid., 110.

25. Ibid., 111.

26. Ibid., 136.

27. Ibid., 140-41.


30. Ibid., 141.

31. Ibid., 159.

32. Winowicz, Troski i Spory, 174-75.

33. Chylińska, Karol Szymanowski, 140.

34. Ibid., 153.

35. Ibid., 177.

36. Ibid., 33-34.

37. Rubinstein, My Young Years, 377-78.


42. Adolf Chybiński, "Młoda Polska w muzyce a społeczeństwo," Nowa Gazeta (19 sierpnia 1906) as cited in W czasach Straussa i Tetmajera (Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1958), 94.


52. Adolf Chybiński, "Karol Szymanowski," Sfinks, 18, z. 5-6 (1912): 292.

53. Adolf Chybiński, Mieczysław Karłowicz (1876-1909 Kronika życia artysty i taternika (Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1949), 305-07.


55. Chybińska, Karol Szymanowski, 79.

56. Ibid., 79.

57. Ibid., 85

58. Ibid., 94.

59. Ibid., 100-01.
60. Ibid., 79.
61. Ibid., 84-85.
62. Ibid., 87.
63. Grzegorz Fitelberg to Adolf Chybiński, 6 IV 1906, Biblioteka Polskiego Wydawnictwa Muzycznego w Krakowie, Kraków.
64. Chylińska, Karol Szymanowski, 101.
67. Winowicz, Troski i Spory, 73.
68. Ibid., 77.
70. Ibid., 115.
71. Ibid., 169.
72. Ibid., 334ff.
CHAPTER IV

THE CRITICAL RECEPTION OF THE THREE CONCERTS OF
SPÓŁKA NAKŁADOWA MŁODYCH KOMPOZYTORÓW POLSKICH

After their initial, yet semi-public concert given in Zakopane in 1905, the members of Spółka Nakładowa arranged and presented only three public concerts under their company's auspices: two in Warsaw (1906 and 1907) and one in Berlin (1906). But before these concerts took place, another one that did not take place contributed to the opacity surrounding Spółka Nakładowa and Young Poland in Music. In May of 1905 a concert scheduled at the Warsaw Filharmonia was billed as a concert of Young Poland. It was to be directed by Mieczysław Karłowicz, then the musical director of the Warsaw Music Society. His involvement with the Warsaw Filharmonia is surprising because he had repeatedly complained that this institution was nothing more than a platform for the old, established foreign and Polish composers and, therefore, had withdrawn his own works from the Filharmonia's programs. For a number of years there ensued a public battle in the press between Karłowicz and the directors of the Filharmonia on whose side was Aleksander Poliński the influential music critic. Nevertheless, in May of 1905 Karłowicz subdued
his personal animosity toward the Filharmonia and agreed
to organize four concerts, two of which we know were to con-
sist entirely of Polish music. On April 14, 1905
Karłowicz wrote a letter to his close friend Adolf Chy-
biński which contained the following salient message con-
cerning these concerts: "... the Filharmonia has turned
to me to direct two Polish concerts devoted entirely to
the works of the younger generation of composers." The
program was to include the works of Tadeusz Joteyki, Wanda
Landowska, Ignacy Pilecki, Feliks Starczewski, Juliusz
Wertheim, and Karłowicz himself. But because of the re-
volutionary activities which arose in Warsaw as a result
of similar conditions in Moscow, the concert had to be
canceled. Karłowicz wrote to Chybiński about this
stating: "The concert of 'Young Poland' remains postponed
until autumn due to the atmosphere which reigns in the
city." Because of the continued unrest in the city, how-
ever, neither of the all-Polish concerts was performed.

Why would the Filharmonia announce a "Young Poland"
concert? The answer is quite simple. At that time Poland
was reeling with the euphoria of revitalized nationalism
brought about, in part, by the Young Poland Period's ap-
proach to art and literature. This approach, as previ-
uously explained, was one of strong post-romantic and na-
tionalistic ideals, fueled even further by the revolu-
tionary movements emanating from Russia. Because the term
"Young Poland" elicited certain specific feelings and ideas in the other arts; it was only natural for Polish society to desire that such sentiments and ideas also be expressed in music. Answering this desire, the directors of the Filharmonia approached the young prominent Karłowicz to take on this musical task. He did so by programming composers who he thought best represented the ideas and feelings of the period. These were composers of his or the previous generation, however. Karłowicz had not yet met the members of Spółka Nakładowa nor heard any of their so-called progressive works. Despite the fact that this concert was never presented, the concept of a "Young Poland" concert had entered public consciousness. The confusion that resulted when the works of the four composers under discussion first appeared in public in Warsaw in 1906, was inevitable.

The 1906 Warsaw Concert Of Spółka Nakładowa

The first of three public concerts given under the auspices of Spółka Nakładowa, although scheduled for October, 1905, took place in Warsaw on February 6, 1906 and was repeated three days later. The second concert was given in Berlin on March 30, 1906, and the third in Warsaw on April 19, 1907. With these concerts, the four composers presented to the world the works they felt brought a new musical direction to Polish music. These were the
compositions they considered as having broken away from
the status quo of the previous generation and which incor-
porated many of the new and exciting advances in music
that they, as composers, had encountered in their travels
and studies abroad.

The February 6, 1906 concert was announced to the
Warsaw public by one of the musical correspondents (un-
named, but probably Chybiński) of Przegląd Muzyczny,
Teatralny i Artystyczny writing from Berlin:

The first such concert will be held in the near
future at the Warsaw Filharmonia under the direction
of one from the association, Grzegorz Fitelberg. The
performance will consist of orchestral works, deter-
mined now as the first opuses of the company’s
editions, namely Bolesław Smialy, a tone-poem written
on the tragedy of Wyspianski by Ludomir Różycki, the
Spring Overture and Piesń o Sokole (after Gorki) by
Fitelberg, Symphonic Overture by Karol Szymanowski,
Andante by Prince Władysław Lubomirski, as well as
piano works: Variations on a Polish Theme and Fantazja
by Karol Szymanowski and the Prelude and Nokturn of
Apolinary Szeluto.

This program will be repeated on March 30, 1906 at
the Berlin Philharmonic after which it will play in

The announcement reveals the self-confidence of the four
composers: they not only already had planned the Berlin
concert, but additional ones in Leipzig, Vienna, and
Paris. But, despite these initial plans, such concerts
never materialized.

This first concert was arranged by Prince Lubomirski
and Grzegorz Fitelberg—Lubomirski supplying the financial
backing for the hiring of the Warsaw Filharmonia, which was
only four years old at that time, and Fitelberg preparing the program and conducting. The Filharmonia's announcement of the concert states that this was the first concert of Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich. Slightly altered from the previous announcement, the program consisted of Fitelberg's Pieśń o Sokole, Op. 18, Różyc's Bolesław Śmiały, Op. 8, Szeluto's piano works, Prelude Nr. 4, Op. 5 and Nocturne in D Major, Lubomirski's Andante for Orchestra, and Szymanowski's Concert Overture, Op. 12 and piano works Variations B Minor, Op. 10 and Etude in B-flat Minor Nr. 3, Op. 4. Lubomirski's work, no doubt, was included on the concert in recognition of his financial support. On the repeat performance the program was again changed to include Fitelberg's orchestral overture, Wiosną, Op. 17, and Szymanowski's Variations were replaced by his Fantazja, Op. 4 for piano. The pianist on both concerts was the long-time friend of the composers, Henryk Neuhaus.

Although the February concerts were not heavily attended, five major music critics of Warsaw were present. The review in the journal Lutnista by the composer-critic Feliks Starczewski, writing under the pen-name of Jan Tetera, entitled "Concert of the Association of Young Polish Composers," was quite favorable. In his general comments Tetera considered the four composers as young and talented, thus "auguring for the future the brightest
hopes." He also correctly grasped the reason behind the founding of their company and recognized the new paths on which the composers were striving as revealed in the music performed.

In his specific remarks about the composers and their music, Tetera found Fitelberg displaying "complicated contrapuntal combinations and a knowledge of the works of the true masters [Strauss and Wagner]" in his Pieśń o Sokole and Szymanowski manifesting "great imagina-
tiveness" and "great creativity with sure-footed direction toward national motives" in his Fantazja. As for Różycki, Tetera found that this composer continued his re-
puted brilliance of orchestration in Bolesław Śmiały, maintaining "contains several beautiful and melodic moments, but [at the same time] too many shifts and unexpected pas-
sages of violent, almost brutal tones that are somewhat glaring for the unprepared listener." Finally, Tetera found Szeluto, with his often "uncontrollable and tempestuous talent," presenting works (Nokturn and Fourth Prelude) that were "original, effective, and brilliant" yet weak in melody and lacking strong tonal centers which denied the "key to their understanding" to the average listener. At the end of his review, Tetera particularly applauded the Filharmonia for this program and the audience for its positive reception of the composers, particularly of Fitelberg and Szymanowski.
Another important review was written by the irascible Warsaw critic, Aleksander Poliński, who was notorious for his harsh and unforgiving tirades against new, modernistic music. Nevertheless, his review for the journal *Kurier Warszawski* is surprisingly complimentary to most of the composers, while uncomplimentary to the Polish artistic community's perception of new music. His article, perhaps with the canceled concert of Karłowicz in mind, was surprisingly headed "Young Poland in Music." In general, to Poliński the concert presented four composers who were "stars of the first caliber, who possibly will soon cover the native land with torrents of glory and will be leaders in their own as well as in European music." 15 He also clearly understood the composers' association and its goals, despite the fact that he continuously referred to it as Young Poland in Music. At the same time he chided the Polish musical community for its general lack of interest in attending concerts other than those presented by visiting virtuosos, a situation he attributed to basic musical immaturity.

In his specific comments on the composers and their music, Poliński's views were varied. He considered them superb technicians who demonstrated complete musicality, yet he indicated that they "were not all equal in creative talent." 15 He considered Fitelberg talented and level-headed but not "markedly original, being all too imitative
of Wagner and Strauss." He found Różycki displaying an "extraordinary sense of orchestral coloring" but criticized Bolesław Śmiary as a work in which the melodic and harmonic motives are "perhaps at times too rough and violent in their modulations, although well adapted for the mood of the composition." In his most uncomplimentary comments Poliński found Szeluto's works lacking "any iota of melody, order, or framework... with much interesting modulation but no logic, and nothing even slightly resembling a tonal center." In Szeluto's music, he had heard the compositions of either a "maniac or musical anarchist," one who "tramples every rule of music theory and aesthetics with impudence, great power, and certitude." Finally, about Szymanowski, Poliński was his most complimentary, even going so far as to state "I did not doubt for a minute that I was dealing with an exceptional composer, perhaps even a genius." Poliński also compliments the composer on his close affinity to Chopin in his piano works, while congratulating him for the "beautiful melodies, clear originality, unusual yet exquisite harmonies, and the effects of rich polyphony purposefully employed." He stated that Szymanowski "proves that he possesses an artistic reflection that tries to regulate the energy of fantasy while not restricting its flight at all."
A third review entitled "From the Filharmonia" was published in the journal *Dziennik Powszechny*. Although unsigned, we know that Stanisław Dziadulewicz was its author because he published an almost exact copy of this review the following month in the journal *Bluszcz*. Of the five major reviewers Dziadulewicz was the most critical of the composers and their music. In general, he criticized them for their lack of learning from their Berlin studies under Strauss\(^2\) (an invalid criticism since only Różycki had studied with Strauss). Dziadulewicz specifically singled out Szeluto's piano works as the worst of the program because of their "strange feats in alteration, modulation, and deceptive cadencing"\(^2\) and considered Szymanowski's Variations as the best work because it is "beautifully and cleverly shaped on a national theme."\(^2\)

Thus, he considered Szymanowski the most talented and individual of the four. Despite such praise of Szymanowski, in the end Dziadulewicz criticized the four composers for their

... excessive creative independence which resulted in eclecticism, the constant searching for some Archimedean point on which they were able to base their own cosmopolitan music, the insertion of foreign ideas, a struggling with a reputed originality of form and effects, the artificial manifestation of moods through the misuse of dissonance, and a chaos in the overall formal plan.\(^2\)

Several days after the concert Józef Rosenzweig's critique, entitled "The Youngest Poland in Music and Her
Maecenas" was published. As already mentioned, this title clearly is a variation of the Young Poland in Music designation. Rosenzweig was most complimentary of the composers and their music. He began his review with a summation of the composers studies and how the difficulties they were facing in publishing their music led them to found their own publishing house. His general comments about the works consisted of mild criticism of the composers' use of "every compositional means to conjure up the entire possibility of inspiration in the subtleties of form." He also chided them for too close an allegiance to Richard Strauss and Max Reger, as well as for an apparent lack of good themes which resulted, instead, in a "luxuriant wealth of harmonic and instrumental ideas."

In his specific comments about the composers Rosenzweig stated that Szymanowski was the most expressive and bold of ideas, the most advanced in form and inspiration of the four, with his piano pieces being his best. Rosenzweig found Różycki a talent full of "exuberant, independent fantasy." However, for him Fitelberg's Pieśń o Sokole displayed a "certain muddling of form and weakness in characteristic themes which make the composition a little inaccessible." As far as Szeluto was concerned, the critic found him a "promising talent [that] glides rudderless through oceans of conscious moods." Despite such criticism, the most surprising comment by
Rosenzweig was that he considered Szeluto a creative threat to his companions.\textsuperscript{35}

Finally, the short review, "Art and Politics" by Tadeusz Godecki, presented an interesting critique that concentrated more on the general artistic climate of Warsaw than on the concerts themselves. Through it we obtain a good idea of the general musical atmosphere in which the four composers made their first public attempts at self-promotion and the modernization of Polish music.

An example of the presently fashionable indifference to art was [seen at] the two evenings of Spółka. Both took place before a very small audience. If one were speaking only of the general run of concerts, it would not be worth sounding an alarm; however, this particular indifference represents something more serious. This association of young composers is born at an historic turning point. Only recently were we able to proclaim publicly that we Poles were not free to display national idioms, to think about our own life and of our own culture. Today we have obtained this right and no doubt will try to profit from it. Have we had, up to now, Polish music? Unfortunately not! We had Chopin, Moniuszko; we have Żelęński, Gall, and Noskowski. We do not have, however, Polish music as a school, as a direction. Is this attempt at a union, at organizing an association not worthy of the highest recognition, particularly when it occurs at such an important and decisive moment? The answer is yes! Hardly a handful came to the concerts . . . . And what does the future hold for these young men who emerge from the burning fires of criticism, who at the beginning of their careers find that, in fact, there is no one for whom to create and that the public is most completely indifferent? For whom do these musical whippersnappers write? Yet these musicians are no whippersnappers. In their works one can already discern the beginnings of new masters; they are consciously endeavoring toward the summits of art\textsuperscript{37}. 
We can see by these various reviews that the concerts, the works presented, and the composers themselves elicited a variety of opinions. For the most part, the first concerts were well received by the music critics, except for Dziadulewicz who found very little good at all. All five, Tetera, Poliński, Rosenzweig, Godecki, and particularly Dziadulewicz praised the works of Szymanowski and at times those of Różycki and Fitelberg. Szeluto, unfortunately, received understanding only from Rosenzweig and indirectly from Godecki. Most important, although the public notice specifically stated that a Filharmonia concert was to be given by Spółka Nakładowa, both Poliński and Rosenzweig used the title "Young [or Youngest] Poland in Music."

Finally, all five critics also had to cope with the new, modernistic ideas being expressed in the music performed. Some accepted these ideas without question, some rejected them outright, and some expressed a wait-and-see attitude. Despite the variety of opinions exhibited by these five critics, the music of Szymanowski, Różycki, Fitelberg, and Szeluto presented the Warsaw musical community with something entirely new and to some extent even threatening. At this point it is appropriate to consider what the composers, performers, and colleagues involved with these first concerts felt about their first public venture.
The Post-1906 Warsaw Concert Period

After the Warsaw concert the members of Spółka Nakładowa went their separate ways. Różycki stayed in Warsaw for a short time and then returned to Berlin. Szeluto, Fitelberg, and Neuhaus immediately returned to Berlin, and Szymanowski apparently returned home and then went to Lwów in Eastern Poland. Although the reviews tended to be more positive than negative, it was, of course, to their negative aspects that the composers reacted. A few examples of these reactions from Różycki and Szeluto have survived. In a letter written shortly after the February 6 concert, Różycki told Chybiński that the association appreciated his support. He also complained that the contemporary critics could not understand that there existed music other than that of Noskowski and Moniuszko, and, because of such beliefs and their positions of great influence in Poland, these critics did great harm to young Polish composers and Polish musical society in general.38

The strangest reaction to the criticisms came from the pen of Apolinary Szeluto. This young, extremely sensitive musician had a most difficult time dealing with the strong condemnations of his music and his ideas as a composer. In answer to a pre-concert letter from Chybiński, Szeluto wrote, shortly after the Warsaw concerts, a strange, wandering, allusion-filled reply which questioned the general state of affairs in Warsaw.
Surprisingly, it did not specifically defend his music, but eloquently did so indirectly. And, although he did not name critics specifically, Szeluto described accurately the prevailing creative atmosphere in Warsaw in which he and his colleagues were working.\textsuperscript{39} It quickly becomes apparent that Szeluto was not a composer who could graciously and constructively accept criticism of his works. However, given the degree to which some of the critics denounced his works, it is no wonder that this sensitive young man had problems dealing with Warsaw's musical old-guard. Nonetheless, Szeluto did not let depression over his public reception destroy his creative urge or his social life. Karłowicz mentioned to Chybniński that he saw Szeluto with Różycki and Fitelberg around February 24.\textsuperscript{40} Henryk Neuhaus, the pianist on the concerts, wrote to his family on March 16, that:

\begin{quote}
We are now all spoiled with such an ideal sociability, Ficio, Szeluto, and Katot . . . . The kind-hearted Szeluto still was very fond of me after the concert . . . . You have no idea how much good friendship can bring to this boy, Szeluto. I have not met up to now anyone who is like him, so intense for his day and uncompromising in his views of the artistic calling.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

As for the opinions of Spółka Nakładowa's colleagues, there were a number, and these were mixed. Most impressions about the composers and their music would be stated in articles of much later dates, mostly after the Warsaw concert of 1907; a few, however, appeared shortly
after the 1906 concert. For example, Henryk Neuhaus wrote of many interesting things to his family in two letters.

On February 11 he commented:

From the telegram you know that the concert was well received and the second one even better. During the first I felt extremely tired. The Filharmonia was very cold, a hideous atmosphere (contact with the Warsaw musical world conjures up the urge to kill) such that I played only so-so . . . Nobody, of course, understood Szeluto, but Katot [Szymanowski] was well received. I will send articles and paraphrases. The Warsaw idiocy surpasses all conception. A terribly large uproar ensued, they talk and write a great deal in three journals . . . with photographs, except mine, because I didn’t have one. The only sympathetic and artistically original man in Warsaw is [the composer-conductor] Wertheim, but a very nervous one.

The second concert went better. I was in better disposition and played well (the 4th Prelude and Nokturn of Szeluto, Variations and Fantazja of Karol, and for an encore his Prelude). Karol’s Overture, after the corrections inserted by Ficio [Fitelberg], sounded excellent except in some tangled places; the music is simply exceptional. Sokole of Ficio is enchanting and sounds extraordinary. Bolesław Śmiały is average. Generally, Różycki is the Cinderella in this association . . . .

Eleven days later he wrote a second, much longer report on the concerts:

I think Wertheim is in reality the only musician in Warsaw and the only true artist. For many he seems unfriendly with his nervousness and oversensitive metaphysics (for example, to Ficio and Katot) but I understand to what degree everything is sincere with his point of view—one should not refer to him contemptuously.

At the second concert at the Filharmonia it was considerably better. You could not imagine what a wonderful atmosphere dominated this concert . . . . The public, in reality, was small but better, indeed aristocratic—in the musical sense very friendly and favorably disposed. But there is a contrary side: Noskowski, Rajchman, and several critics—idiots!
It was with the greatest delight to hear Katot and Ficio. Sokole of Ficio is very pretty—simply a tremendous step forward from its preceding opus, Wiosna... Katot's Overture was the most beautiful point of the program. Although somewhat harsh, it gives the impression of too clear an influence of Heldenleben [of Richard Strauss]—fabulously, even admirably orchestrated but yet the dilettantism and overloading of the orchestra give the same feeling as if a pianist with insufficient technique played very difficult things. But this is possible to correct easily... Różycki's Bolesław Śmiały was clearly and completely an unsuccessful part of the program. Superficial, not very musical, empty; it has nothing in common with Wyspiański.

Neuhaus's opinions concerning the concerts are interesting in that they show an affection for Szeluto, a respect for the work of Szymanowski and Fitelberg, and, as we have seen before, a general dislike of Różycki and his creations. Some of his opinions concurred with the Warsaw critics, some definitely did not.

Mieczysław Karłowicz, the elder composer and recent acquaintance of the members of Spółka Nakładowa who had attended the concerts, also wrote comments concerning them in a report to Chybiński on February 11:

Several days ago there were concerts here of the Association of Young Polish Composers. I attended the first evening and the second in order to acquaint myself with these works. About my impressions, I will tell you extensively at our meeting. Now I can only say that the best works appeared to me to be for orchestra by Różycki and Fitelberg, though neither one of them managed to show invention of the first order.

The public reacted to these works with emphatic indifference... At the first night and the second, only a handful there listened well... It is interesting to note that Karłowicz, an accomplished composer, found only the works of Fitelberg and Różycki to
be conditionally noteworthy; of those of Szymanowski, which the other reviewers praised above all, he made no mention.

Finally, there was Adolf Chybiński who, writing in an article concerning the piano music of the members of Spółka Nakładowa shortly after the 1906 concerts, commented in the journal Nowa Muzyzna. It is noteworthy that Chybiński had not as yet met the members of Spółka Nakładowa nor heard their music. This he would be able to do only at the upcoming Berlin concert. Nevertheless, after studying their works, particularly their piano compositions, Chybiński, as one might expect, placed Szymanowski, Różycki, and Szeluto

... in the front ranks of the best 20th-century piano composers ... Różycki appears to be possibly the most Chopinesque ... The expert treatment of the instrument is characterized by the piano works of Różycki as well as by Szymanowski and Szeluto. They elicit every subtle nuance ... It is possible to conclude that they are all good knowledgeable pianists of what Liszt and his entire school characterize and of what is possible to extract from the piano ... Szeluto did not have the honor of being liked in Warsaw. This [honor] should exert an influence on him that should be more encouraging than not ... Everything is found in Szeluto's works ... There are many, very many of those attributes which the critics do not desire to see ..., one feels immediately that one is dealing with a powerful individuality, who knows no obstacles in the achievement of his high, stormy, heroic, and free ideas that result from feelings of compassion and sympathy ... His compositions are always attuned to an elevated, noble tone even when a drawn-out quiet fills his soul ... His Nokturn is an idyll ..., but one with the dazzling flashes of lightning, with the deepest claps of thunder, and with many passions.
Despite all these characteristic traits, everything is written logically and with tonal centers, with order and composition, everywhere rich in melody without treading on the rules of theory and musical aesthetic . . . .

Szymanowski is not exactly multifaceted . . ; he is such a deep thinker, looking perhaps through dark glasses of pain and melancholy at this world. He possesses more concentration and reflection, and he knows how to master his passions; sometimes, however, storms rise up in him . . . . What is in the great nature of Szymanowski is that unusual nobility of themes, yet the avoidance of dangers from whatever brutal effects are used, the gnashing teeth of unresolved dissonance, the careful avoidance of too great a distance between the parts for the right and left hands, and the avoidance of banality . . . . Szymanowski is a musician of the future . . . .

In response to this overly laudatory article by Chybiński, Karłowicz wrote the following, terse comment: "I read your article about the compositions of Spółka; I cannot agree with your opinions about these works."46

It is interesting to note that, in a letter to a fellow musicologist, Zdzisław Jachimecki, Chybiński complained about another rebuke he received, this time from the editors of the journal in which his article appeared. This, quite naturally, elicited the following complaint from Chybiński to his young colleague:

I wrote to Nowa Muzykczna about the piano works of Rozycki, et al. The editors did not like it and permitted themselves to write stupid footnotes about "the disgusting newest Polish music" et al. No, there is no advancement for this intellectual minority . . . . Do you also have the feeling that we do not yet have the luxury of musical competences in our circumstances? How much work must one devote to the preparation of that whole group of people with good ears in order for them to recognize this knowledge? We cannot work and at the same time worry about their
understanding us here, because it would be lowering ourselves to the level of these people.47

The editors had inserted the following footnote to Chybński’s article:

The works designated as Op. 2, 3a, 3b, and 4, edited by Spółka Nakładowa, are sad proofs of what evokes the search for originality that one can accept from the young students of art—how disgusting an art it [this search] makes . . . .48

The same diversity of critical appraisal was to continue after the next public concert of Spółka Nakładowa, given in Berlin the following March.

The 1906 Berlin Concert Of Spółka Nakładowa

Berlin played an important role in the musical development of the members of Spółka Nakładowa. Two individuals who became very close to the members of Spółka Nakładowa have written about this. In an article from October, 1906, the singer, Cezary Jellenta, writing under the initials "AN," presented the following brief comments about the Berlin Polish enclave and the association of the four young Polish composers, as well as on the results of the Warsaw concert.

The Polish colony in Berlin remains the cradle of young Polish composers. [Berlin is also] where they formed Spółka Nakładowa; the works of these pioneers move our music onto a new track. The general Warsaw public had the opportunity to hear them last season in the Filharmonia Hall. The Warsaw critics duly evaluated the works of Szymanowski, Różycki, Szeluto, Lubomirski, and Fitelberg, and [upon] hearing them, we do not doubt the honest, fresh talents which already, today, have presented works of rare quality.49
Chybiński's comments, which were written shortly after he had met the composers for the first time in Berlin, provide even more telling insights into the four individuals and their association. This meeting resulted from Chybiński's earlier appreciation of the works of Spółka Nakładowa which had prompted Karłowicz and Fitelberg to invite him to the Berlin concert scheduled for March. Chybiński did, in fact, attend this concert. Afterwards, he personally befriended the four composers, forming an association with them that quickly became, in his own words, a "mutual admiration society." He summarized his impressions and experiences:

In Berlin I met at that time Grzegorz Fitelberg, Ludomir Różycki, Apolinary Szeluto, and Karol Szymański and their entourage, Feliks Szymanowski (pianist), Henryk Neuhaus (later Director of the Moscow Conservatory) and several other Polish musicians who were in Berlin at that time for studies or who were occupying musical positions. At one of the concerts was the present director of the Warsaw Filharmonia, Emil Młynarski.

... But—as already stated—there are unfavorable music values in the country [Poland] especially in Warsaw, where the directors of the Filharmonia (A. Rajchman, et al) and some older musicians treat this group of composers with hostility...; they forced the formation of this group of composers into a common mission and forced them to take up individual positions against the rest of the Polish musicians, among whom such seasoned artists as [the composers] Melcer and Szopski are the exception.

The Warsaw, Lwów, or Kraków critics were no better than those [musicians] who were unable to vent the musty atmosphere with breaths of new and fresh air of truly European standards of thinking and endeavoring. Whereas everything that is new and fresh surely appeared in the works of this young Polish group; no one can possibly deny this.
From the above it can be assumed that immediately after meeting and becoming friends with the members of Spółka Nakładowa, Chybiński began to assume his self-imposed responsibilities of being the composers' herald and promoter in all musical matters. As has been previously shown, with such self-assumed responsibilities, he continuously battled with all variety of critics, colleagues, and other musicians for the advancement and defense of his adopted proteges. These activities on behalf of the association became increasingly evident in the articles, rebuttals, and reviews that he wrote. Some excellent examples of Chybiński's belief in the music of the members are found in his reviews of the Berlin concert. However, before Chybiński's commentaries are addressed, those of the non-Polish critics will be presented in order the better to contrast the great disparity in opinion between them and Chybiński.

The Berlin concert of Spółka Nakładowa presented the tone-poem, Pieśni o Sokole (Lied von Falken), Op. 18 and the Symphonie, Op. 16 of Fitelberg, the Symphonic Overture, Op. 12 of Szymanowski, the tone-poem, Bolesław Śmiały (Bolesław the Bold), Op. 8 of Różycki, and the Andante of Prince Lubomirski; Szulo, for reasons already discussed, was not represented on this concert. The renowned Berlin critic, Hugo Leichtentritt, writing in the
Neue Zeitschrift für Musik, wrote the following concerning this concert:

With much emphasis placed on long and broad matters, it [the concert] lacked distinction and charm. Thus, each one showed the attempts of beginners. When one gives such an indication of special talent, the audience wishes to be pleased. A single such indication stepped forth here ... . I should have expected an excellent performance from Fitelberg. His Op. 18, Piesń o Sokole, exhibits an insolence despite tedious parts which are specifically noticeable towards the end .... Likewise, his Symphonie, Op. 16 has, at least, one good movement, the Scherzo, with it a Trio .... As for the other parts, I can find nothing of note. The orchestral treatment lacks distinction, everything is obtrusive and crass; much is overly grave without a refined good-taste. Nevertheless, it has a full character and unmistakable freshness. The tone-poem, Bolesław Śmiałły, by Rózycki is of transitory musical import and is, in its sound manipulations, too brutal for one to possibly impute artistic appreciation. Szymanowski attempts to surpass Richard Strauss' elan in his Symphonic Overture, Op. 12. Unfortunately, he does not approach it beyond a remarkable imitation of Straussian form. Generally, all these so-called young Polish musicians lack the refinement and the close connection to him [Strauss]--attitude and passionate demeanor alone are no substitutes for a deficiency of spiritual [creative] strength. ...52

A particularly interesting review was written by the Berlin music critic for the American journal, The Music Courrier. This review was reprinted in translation in the Polish journal Słowo by the Warsaw critic, Józef Rosenzweig. In essence, it was a positive report on the composers' association. It correctly identified the reasons for the founding of Spółka Nakładowa and also clearly stated that the composers were united under no particular creative tenets except that of waging a battle
against the old-fashioned conservatism in Polish music.
In the end, the review confirmed that the Warsaw concerts
of Spółka Nakładowa were well received and that only in
Berlin did it receive negative judgments. What is im-
portant to note in this review was the use of the title
"Young Poland" as the designation for the composers' as-
sociation by an American music critic in Berlin. One can
only surmise that it was probably borrowed from the Polish
reviews of the earlier Warsaw concert.

Finally, a third foreign review (untitled) from the
The Musical Times offered the following terse critique of
the Berlin concert, one basically agreeing with that of
Leichtentritt.

An orchestral concert given by four young Polish
composers—G. Fitelberg, Prince L. Lubomirski, L.
Różyczki, and K. Szymanowski—proved a great disap-
pointment, because only the first-named, who
conducted, showed sufficient talent to warrant some
hopes that the young Polish School may eventually pro-
duce music worth performing and listening to.

Except for the seeming second-hand information and
brief comments presented by the American critic from The
Music Courier, two out of the three reviews of the Berlin
concert of Spółka Nakładowa were most critical and unac-
cepting. Yet, for the composers' defense, there was Adolf
Chybinski.

Returning to Chybinski's writings, we find that his
two-part review provides a sharp contrast to the German
and English reviews. Chybinski's report of the concert,
at first, appears almost to be one concerning an entirely
different musical event. In general, he expressed very
few negative opinions while presenting an almost apolo-
getic, defensive style of criticism. With this review,
therefore, Chybiński began what was to be his relentless
crusade in the promotion and defense of the association,
which he now formally designated as Young Poland in Music.

In the first installment of the review, Chybiński
prepared his defense of the works which the Berlin-based
reviewers had criticized. The second installment,
written the following day, discussed specifics about the
actual works performed. Chybiński's opinions, as one
might expect, diverged widely from those of the foreign
reviewers:

The augmenting of the composition of the orchestra
in the works of our youngsters (for example in
Bolesław Smiły of Różycki which requires two bass
tubas) was enough for the Warsaw critics to censure
them as cheap imitators of Richard Strauss . . . as if
to say we have the obligation to imitate only the or-
chestras of Beethoven or Berlioz! . . . But has any-
one in Germany written in the school of R. Strauss
even one symphonic poem so steeped in legend as Piesń
o Sokole of Fitelberg or Bolesław Smiły of Różycki
. . . ? The Symphony in E Minor by Fitelberg possesses
a splendid Scherzo, one which arises neither from
Tchaikovsky or Brahms, or even from the last great
symphonists . . . . The motives are, without exception,
interesting and occur to me to be beautiful without
too much nobility . . . . Piesń o Sokole by Fitelberg,
to the words of Gorki, stands alone beyond comparison.
I speak here not only about the instrumentation . . .
which is dazzling, wonderful, and subtle . . . but of
the economy of form by which I am moved; nothing can
be subtracted nor added . . . . This tone poem of
Fitelberg's easily could be called a Polish Ein
Heldenleben . . . .
... Ludomir Różycki returns to the importance of the heroic poem of Wyspiański by writing an heroic symphonic poem, impregnated so nobly with tragic strength ... In this work Różycki does not illustrate the blow of the sword nor any real events. These things happen in the psyche. If Różycki, in order to animate the action, illustrates or changes key, it is done only to connect the [musical] segments.

The symphonic overture of Karol Szymanowski was a hard nut to crack. It is a work which demands not one or five hearings, but many ... This overture—or maybe symphonic poem—is not exactly unclear or incomprehensible to those for whom Zarathustra or Heldenleben by R. Strauss pose no difficulties. Hearing it reminds me of the Symphonietta of M. Reger. At the end are thoughts so covered by an intersecting whirlpool of voice parts, creating such an intricate web that possibly only the composer can explain its mystery to us ... However, it appears to me that by reshaping the second part he could improve the overture a good deal; likewise an improvement in the instrumentation also would help a lot. If the second part were to resound like the first, then the whole overture would be improved considerably ... .

The last comments by Chybiński about the Berlin concert of Spółka Nakładowa are found in a second review written two months later. In it, he again ardently defended his new-found colleagues and strongly challenged the general attitude of indifference shown them by the German critics and public, an indifference he felt was totally unwarranted.

The Post-1906 Berlin Concert Period

After the Berlin concert the composers again went their separate ways. Różycki and his wife, together with Cezary Jellanta, traveled widely, presenting concerts of Różycki's music while visiting cities such as Dresden, Leipzig, and Vienna, as well as major Polish capitals.
Jel'enta described these travels and concerts in an article for *Gazeta Polska*, telling how the Różyckis and he, himself, would perform the vocal works of Różycki and other young composers in which . . . the Polish spirit is manifested to the fullest; i.e. that which unites their individual characters with strength, emotionality, spirituality and drama, with elegance and fantasy in contrast to sentimentality and cheap Italian melodramatic effects.  

Fitelberg and Szymanowski also traveled widely, mainly to attend concerts in Leipzig, Vienna, Berlin, Dresden, and Bayreuth. Fitelberg, however, soon returned to Berlin to continue composing and to begin a busy conducting schedule. In a letter to Chybiński on May 25, 1906, he told his friend "I work much . . . . I already have begun to orchestrate a large orchestral composition for our future campaign. I have four concerts in Berlin: December 29, February 17, and March 21 and 28."  

Szymanowski eventually was to return to Poland to spend most of his time at home at Tymoszówka working on a variety of new compositions. Despite his musical endeavors, he also managed to take time to visit other Polish cities, particularly Lwów. During this period there were many letters from Szymanowski to various friends describing the musical activities taking place at his home and in the cities he was visiting.  

Szeluto remained for the most part in Berlin continuing his piano studies and finishing several new
compositions. On May 25, Fitelberg wrote Chybiński about Szelo, indicating that he was active at composing once again, stating: "Szelo composed the last part of the Sonata. [It is] something fabulous and beautiful."^61

Although the four composers had gone their separate ways and had engaged in individual endeavors after the Berlin concert, the time between the 1906 Berlin and 1907 Warsaw concerts was one of continuing troubles for them; they still were having considerable difficulty gaining acceptance in the musical world of their native land. Chybiński addressed this in a letter to Jachimecki on May 27, 1906.

If I wrote that all is not well with me, in general it is because I suffer from musical Weltsschmerz, particularly from Polenschmerz. At home, one is subordinated to such music that it is not possible for me to return—not at any price.

... And what can I say about our Musikwissenschaft? Four concerts are arranged in Berlin, one in Vienna, and yet it is not possible to have even one in Warsaw. It is difficult to shove Prince Lubomirski's money at the cultural, artistic thieves who ignore our native composers.^62

As previously discussed, serious interpersonal problems were developing throughout this period. These personal problems and the composers' fight against rejection would be battles that they would wage throughout the lifetime of Spółka Nakładowa. They appear to have reached a climax immediately after the final public concert in Warsaw in April, 1907.
The 1907 Warsaw Concert of Spółka Nakładowa

Despite their Berlin disappointments and growing interpersonal problems, the composers of Spółka Nakładowa managed to arrange a second public concert of their works in Warsaw on April 19, 1907 at the Warsaw Filharmonia. Again Szeluto did not participate, although he was mentioned in one of two pre-concert articles written about Spółka Nakładowa. On April 13th an article signed "Stwasz" and entitled "Polish Music in Berlin" discussed the association's lack of success in Berlin, yet mentioned Szeluto as a member of the group of composers that founded the publishing company.63

The second article was written by the critic, Witold Noskowski for the journal Przegląd Polski. In it he also made reference to the Berlin concert of Spółka Nakładowa while discussing the Polish reception of the group in general.

Some of these young authors—to the pride of our musical pedagogy it must be emphasized—have attained renown and applause, as, for example in Warsaw, through outstanding talents and the new methods they expressed . . . . And so, I was questioned about the successes of the Polish musical emigration to Berlin . . ; but I met with disappointment as I learned that German opinion remains extremely indifferent despite the great admiration for these young and indeed very talented Poles.64

These articles were the first writings by Polish authors admitting the general failure of the Berlin concert, but they also applauded the talent of the composers and
bemoaned the indifference and misunderstanding of the German audience and critics. They also unquestionably supported the modern musical approaches used in the various compositions. Noskowski's article is important because it continued the use of the term Young Poland in reference to the composers' association. In spite of the above, this general support of the composers' musical directions, the April 19, 1907 Warsaw concert was to change radically the views of the most important and influential Polish writers on music, much to the chagrin of the composers involved.

The second Warsaw concert presented previously-heard works, as well as several new compositions. The previously-performed works were Szymanowski's Concert Overture, Op. 12 and Fitelberg's tone-poem Piesź o Sokole, Op. 18. The new works were Szymanowski's Piano Sonata No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 8, Rożycki's orchestral scherzo, Pan Iwardowski, and Fitelberg's Symfonia No. II in A Major, Op. 20. Lubomirski's Cztery Pieśni with piano and orchestral accompaniment was also presented. As previously noted, no works of Szeluto were performed, a fact that the critics did not overlook. The journal, Kurier Warszawski, ran a short notice on April 22, 1907: "A concert of young Polish composers was presented. The artistic and material [financial] outcome average. Reports published tomorrow." As we shall see, the report was to be scathing.
Following the concert three reviews appeared in the Polish press; two were complimentary neither of the works nor of the composers themselves. This was a radical change of opinion from the year before, despite the fact that most of the works had been heard in the previous concert.

The first review, "With Music—The Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company," appearing in the journal, Prawda, was by Władysław Miller under the pseudonym of Boromir. After discussing the beginnings of the association, Miller presented a generally negative commentary on the composers and their music. He points out that what the composers have published and performed to date show that they "do not manage to require of their work individual characteristics of creativity in a solid and consistent enough manner." He concluded that the composers, for the sake of writing more modernly, created works that have

... decadent eccentricities of form and ideas ... assorted dissonant combinations for no apparent reason ... excessive and uninteresting instrumentation ... all of which contradict the physical demands of the laws of acoustics.

He added that the poor programming on this concert created a greater "muddling of the overall value." Of the composers and their works, Boromir felt that Szymanowski possessed the greatest talent, but that his symphonic writing was weak. For him Różycki did not make the musical
progress expected of him in the tone-poem Pan Twardowski. Szelluto, although not on the concert, was considered a musical Nihilist. Finally, Boromir, like his many colleagues, could not decide whether or not Fitelberg was a "prophet of new musical directions [or] an evil spirit leading his associates astray." He found Fitelberg's new symphony not only "boring but moreover arranged without a great deal of concern for logic," one in which he "shrewdly employs someone else's melodies and adopted coloring."  

For the journal Kurier Warszawski Aleksander Poliński wrote a scathing critique. Once again entitled "Young Poland in Music," this review contained such sharp criticisms of the composers and their works that two of them, Szymanowski and Fitelberg, felt obliged to respond in writing. This act naturally elicited a counter-response by Poliński. (All three will be presented in sequence.) In his initial critique Poliński wrote that very little of the concert was newly composed, just Różycki's tone-poem Pan Twardowski and Fitelberg's Second Symphony. Because of this he criticized the composers for a lack of general creative activity. In his specific commentaries, he attacked Fitelberg for the quality of his symphony,

Many new directions are already found in contemporary music, but each of them, even the most bizarre, is subject to something of a rule . . . . The
direction of Fitelberg, however, does not and cannot possibly come under a rule . . . . Listening to this lucubration [the symphony] one experiences the impression that the composer sneered at music and the public, or that it was created by a person suddenly afflicted with insanity. I say suddenly because Fitelberg created much that was good before this composition . . . . His symphonic poem, 

Pisień o Sokole, testifies to this more creative past; it was performed on the concert but written earlier—-it is a beautiful work . . . . full of lovely poetic ideas, lovingly modeled after Wagner and Strauss. I do not detect a trace of these valuable qualities in the Symphony . . . .

Concerning Szymanowski, Poliński said that

From the works of Szymanowski the orchestra played the already-known Overture, and Mr. Neuhaus played the Piano Sonata in C Minor. This is one of the earlier works of this highly talented composer, namely from the epoch when he still listened to his own inspiration . . . and this is why he has created valuable and original works. The Sonata is a beautiful work, much of it in its poetic inspiration and original thinking. In general, it is rich with interesting substance . . . .

Poliński, however, also had very little good to say about Różycki or his new work.

L. Różycki also writes pretty smaller works. His Twardowski abounds in truth with characteristic themes, but forcibly Straussian and not measuring up to his earlier Stańczyk or Bolesław Śmiał which were received with deserved sincerity.

In his sharpest criticism, Poliński personally attacks

Szymanowski and Różycki, by accusing them of being

. . . under the influence of some evil spirit that replaces their creativity, tries to deprive them of individual and national originality, and transforms them into awkward parrots imitating the voices of Wagner and Strauss . . . . May Szymanowski and Różycki manage to free themselves most quickly from such influences! After all, only then can they fight for the title "Young Poland;" it is impudent for them to be bestowed with it yet. What is this to me, a "Young Poland"
that does not serve its homeland as did Chopin and Moniuszko, but slavishly serves German musicians and propagates the ideas of the musical Bundists!?

Although they were generally upset by the content of both Boromir and Poliński's reviews, it was Poliński's that particularly incensed Fitelberg and Szymanowski. As a consequence, they sent the following rebuttal to the Editor of Kurier Warszawski:

Dear Sir: In number 110 of Kurier Warszawski, the music reviewer, Mr. A. Poliński, writing about our concert at the Filharmonia in the area of critical notices, turns to personal assumptions offensive to us as mature people and good Poles.

It is a minor point that Mr. Poliński insults us, using the terms such as "parrots," "slavish," "unexpected insanity," etc. . . .

But Mr. A. Poliński reproaches us because we do not serve our fatherland as Chopin and Moniuszko had served it.

We cannot overlook this accusation in silence.

Started in Berlin, the "Young Polish Composers Publishing Company" had as its aim the promotion of Polish music abroad. Even with this motive our concerts in Berlin met with malicious appraisals from a segment of the German HAKATA press.

On this basis we faced and still face all kinds of vague statements that are full of malice and which state that we promote the ideas of the musical Bundists!; we must consider this as the very will to humiliate our activity in the public's mind.

Against this we protest and appeal to the judgment of society. K.S. and G.F.

In reply to Szymanowski and Fitelberg, Poliński penned the following more striking and condemning counter-rebuttal:

If the above protest is possible to translate into the language of musical tones, we would be richer with one more work, another symphony by Mr. Fitelberg: there is much pretension but little substance and order to it.

Our "youth" become angry at the truth. It is true that our young "serve" a German musician because they "slavishly" imitate all the negative directions of his
talent and, unfortunately, do not manage to imitate the positive. It is true that "they promote the ideas of the musical bundists;" that is such musicians in whose dictionaries such words as fatherland, native, etc., do not exist. They, therefore, create their works in a cosmopolitan musical language, not striving, in the examples of Chopin and Moniuszko, for the growth of their own school such as the Italians, French, Germans, Scandinavians, Czechs, and Russians have managed to produce.

To the supposition that in their statement I tried to humiliate the work of Szymanowski and Fitelberg, I do not answer, hoping that they remind themselves that almost all of their past works I welcomed with joy in another review; and that I overstated rather than understated [the quality] of these works; thus their suspicion is groundless.

Still, there is one last thing. Mr. Szymanowski and Mr. Fitelberg, against the charge that they do not serve their fatherland as Chopin and Moniuszko did, give as their elegant proof their founding in Berlin of the "Young Polish Composers' Publishing Company" with the aim of "promoting (!) Polish music abroad."

My sirs, you either play blindman's buff with me or what is more probable you do not understand that your combination of sounds, traced to Wagner and Strauss, cannot be called Polish music, and that this business in the scores is neither creativity nor art. Do not play the role of the martyr for the fatherland. If your "concerts in Berlin met with malicious appraisals" in the German press, this by no means is due to the "Polishness" of your music but rather to its insignificant value. Berlin does not politicize in music. Noskowski, Paderewski, Nowowiejski, and many others constantly attain renown there because they deserve it. That the Berlin press disregards your compositions, I can feel sympathy for this; but I am not surprised that, because it has the original Wagner and Strauss, it does not want to hear their inferior imitators.77

Clearly, no reconciliation would be reached between these individuals; Poliński remained a strident critic of the composers until his death in 1916.

Finally, the third review of the 1907 concert, "Concert of Young Polish Musicians," by Jan Kleczyński was
for Tygodnik Illustrowany. Although the shortest of the three, it was the most positive:

From a kindly acceptance in Germany, the young Polish musicians came to Warsaw . . ., distinguishing themselves in originality and talent were Różycki and Szymanowski. These are the composers who have outstanding individuality. Różycki impresses one with a wealth of ideas and compactness of construction in his works, Szymanowski with freedom and acuteness of imagination and deep lyricism. Różycki is difficult to judge with only one hearing of his compositions. Therefore, I refrain from a judgment about his new scherzo Pan Twardowski, an ingenious and undoubtedly interesting work. I prefer to point out the beauty of his Bolesław Śmiał which is a symphonic poem that I have just heard a second time in the Filharmonia. This work, which formerly appeared as uncontrollable and sketchy, now strikes me as forceful and imaginative.

That Różycki is able to develop his motives, I have no doubt. But what deserves particular notice in the young composers is their desire to express themselves with short phrasing. This is the first principle of art. A new work by Szymanowski, the Sonata, is no less interesting than his earlier Variations. There is a logic of construction, a lightness of the second part, a beautiful theme in the third part in which there are splendid moments; this work has a high level of artistry. But for me the most beautiful remains Szymanowski's Preludes. These are truly masterpieces, lyric, deep, and sincere.

The works of Fitelberg completed the concert, written under the apparent influence of Wagner, Strauss, and Tchaikovsky. Piesń o Sokole, known already in Warsaw, is a work in which the reminiscences of the others strongly recur, but they produce a beautiful whole of solid inspiration. Regarding the new Symfonia of Fitelberg, I have the impression that it was created for a mood, supported exclusively on superficial effects—although it is difficult to judge after only one hearing.

Most fundamental for this study from the 1907 concert are the statements of the two critics concerning the "Young Poland" link to the composers. As Miller had
stated in his article of May 11, Spółka Nakładowa was founded to "disseminate the creativity of 'Young Poland'" and that these four composers were at its forefront.

Poliński, however, now held that these composers could not embrace the title Young Poland unless they rid themselves of all the negative foreign influences. He also strongly stated that Poland had "no use for a foreign-serving 'Young Poland'". Poliński's negative comments are most surprising because they are the complete opposite of those from the year before, even though he was, for the most part, reviewing the same music. Finally, although neither critic explained his concept of Polish music and its relationship to the Young Poland movement, their strongly-worded criticisms became very influential upon future discussions of the composers' association.

Regarding Kleczyński's review, one can only say that he was, unexpectedly, quite complimentary of the composers and their music. One possible explanation for such a contrasting opinion is the disparity in age between Kleczyński and his two colleagues—approximately twenty and forty years. This apparently resulted in Kleczyński's more open-minded approach and understanding of the composers and their music. But perhaps because of his youth and inexperience, Kleczyński's views apparently went unheeded by the Polish public, much to the chagrin of the composers.
In summation, there are five specific points of interest concerning the concert activity of Spółka Nakładowa and the critical reception it received: 1) in 1906, for the most part, Polish criticism of the composers and their works was positive, even glowing, even though foreign criticism was negative; 2) the 1906 works that were praised by the Polish critics were, by and large, early compositions imbued with nationalistic elements, while the works most criticized (Szeluto's) were the most modernistic in attempt; 3) in 1907 the works performed were, for the most part, older works, only two being newly composed; 4) the 1907 critical reception of the composers took a completely opposite tone and accused the composers of lacking development in creativity, using excessive dissonance and orchestration, and failing to employ nationalistic traits; and 5) Szymanowski was still considered the most talented, Różycki the most stilted, and Fitelberg the most dependent on and imitative of foreign influences. In the end, Young Poland was defined by the critics as needing to be conservative and slavishly nationalistic, thus, disenfranchising our young composers from this title.
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CHAPTER V

THE MUSIC OF SPÓLKA NAKŁADOWA MŁODYCH KOMPOZYTORÓW POLSKICH FROM THE THREE CONCERTS OF 1906 AND 1907

Introduction

Before discussing the music presented on the three concerts of Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich—1906 in Warsaw and Berlin and 1907 in Warsaw—several facts must be taken into consideration. First, except for the performances of a few early works by Różycki and Fitelberg, these concerts presented the first public performance of the music of the four composers. Second, although the composers were ostensibly presenting the works that they considered to demonstrate a modernization of Polish music (the stated goals of Spółka Nakładowa), several of the compositions that had the best critical reception were written well before the founding of the association. These were Szymanowski's Etude in B-flat Minor, Op. 4, Nr. 3 of 1900-02, Variations on a Polish Folk Melody, Op. 10 of 1904, and Piano Sonata Nr. 1 in C Minor, Op. 8 of 1903-04. Third, as a result of the devastation to Poland in two world wars, not all of the music presented on the concerts has survived. Thus, the scores
to Różycki's orchestral scherzo Pan Twardowski, Fitelberg's orchestral overture Wiosną, Op. 17, as well as his Symphony Nr. 2 in A Major, Op. 20 are not available for study. Finally, the version of Szymanowski's Concert Overture, Op. 12 available today is not the original scoring that was criticized for its orchestration. Despite these losses, the majority of the works from the concerts has survived, and they will be discussed here strictly within the context of the contemporary critiques presented in Chapter 4, with the view that this discussion is taking place eighty-odd years removed from the actual events. No detailed analysis of the works is intended.

It also must be pointed out at this time that, except for the music of Szymanowski, the works of Szeluto, Różycki, and Fitelberg remain virtually unknown in the West, either in print, through performance, or through critical discussion. Only Szymanowski's music is known and performed with any regularity outside of Poland. Additionally, his music has received detailed, critical examination in English by Alastair Wrightman in his unpublished doctoral dissertation "The Music of Karol Szymanowski" of 1972.¹ Wrightman's comprehensive findings were fully substantiated by Jim Samson in his 1980 monograph The Music of Szymanowski.² Therefore, the works of Szeluto, Różycki, and Fitelberg will receive more detailed discussions than those of Szymanowski.
The Music of Apolinary Szeluto

Apolinary Szeluto, as we have discussed previously, took part only in the first Warsaw concert of 1906. On that concert he presented two works for piano, his Nokturn in D Major, Op. 3b\(^3\) of 1904-05 and his Prelude in B Major, Op. 6 No. 4\(^4\) of 1905. The assessment of these works by the Warsaw reviewers was thoroughly negative. The complaints leveled against the works were that they lacked perceptible formal structures, that they lacked the strong tonal centers that normally indicated a logical harmonic structure, that they lacked distinctive melodic material, and that they exhibited an undisciplined use of harmonic relationships, modulations, chromatic alterations, and cadences. One critic compared Szeluto's piano works to "rudderless ships in a storm."\(^5\) Szeluto also was accused of being a musical maniac and anarchist.\(^6\)

Szeluto's formal structures in the Nokturn and Prelude are, even after a cursory study of the scores, very clearly defined. The long Nokturn of 99 measures is a double-cursus form with coda, subdivided into an A-B-A'-C-A''-B'-A'''-C'-A''' structure. The recurring A sections present clearly recognizable thematic material and the B and C sections present sequencing material. The shorter, twelve-measure Prelude is in a simple A-B-A' form of four-bar phrases presenting thematic material in the A sections and modulatory motivic material in the B section.
The formal structures of both works are so clearly defined by their melodic-motivic materials that there should have been no difficulty in distinguishing them upon first hearing (see Figure 1).

![Fig. 1. Szélutó: Nőkturne H-Dur, Op. 3b (Berlin, 1905), mm. 1-8.](image)

Even some of Szélutó's unusual harmonic motions—as in measures 3-5 of the Prelude—should not have confused the professional reviewer's perception of their clearly delimited forms (see Figure 2). Therefore, we must conclude that the critics, for whatever reasons, failed to recognize the clear formal structures in Szélutó's two works.

Another criticism leveled at Szélutó concerned his lack of strong key or tonal centers. This deficiency, the critics contended, resulted in a lack of clearly-defined tonal structures. Once again, a cursory study of the music disputes these criticisms. For example, in the
Nokturne Szelo To clearly delineated key areas in the major melodic sections, not only with the use of strong dominant-tonic cadences, but also with a frequent use of a prolonged I 6/4 pedal. Additionally, although the segmental sections are modulatory, they always end with strong
harmonic preparations for the return of the thematic material. Thus, throughout this work, the composer strongly established and supported his various tonal centers. In the Prelude, Szeluto also clearly defined the tonic key of D Major in the A and A' sections while strongly preparing for the A' return of thematic material on the tonic in the sequential B section in measures 5-9 (see Figure 2). Thus, we must again conclude that the critics were prejudicial in their condemnations, unless, perhaps, the critics were objecting to the metrical displacement of the dominant-tonic progressions underlying the melodic material in which the tonic resolutions occur on weak rather than strong beats in measures 2-4 and 10-12 (see Figure 2).

Despite their questionable reasons for censuring the formal and tonal structures of these two pieces, the critics did have a number of valid criticisms. These concern Szeluto's melodic and harmonic languages, which in the first piece they considered to be extremely weak throughout and in the second illogical and strange. The principal melody of the Nokturn, although not very remarkable, is not as badly constructed as the critics lead one to believe. It is a straightforward, eight-bar phrase having the range of an octave and in an arch form. The composer's use of suspensions, sequences, symmetrical phrasing, and an undulating melodic motion, create a
sensation of tension and release, all supported by a rather simple harmonic structure (see Figure 1). Despite these qualities, however, the melody remains placid, simple, and unexciting.

The melodic material of the Prelude, however, is far more weakly conceived than that of the Nokturn. It is a four-bar melody divided into two, two-bar segments of sequential character. It spans two full octaves in a constantly upward-moving direction, but its effect is of short, choppy melodic segments. What makes this melody particularly weak is its displaced metrical pulse—everything feels hurried. This is felt particularly when the melody concludes unexpectedly in a flourish of sextuplet filigree on the weak last beat of measure 4 instead of on the strong first beat of measure 5 (see Figure 2). This metric displacement is made even more noticeable by the underlying harmonic structure. Of particular effect is the premature arrival and prolongation of the dominant in measures 2-3 and the consequent weak, premature arrival of the tonic in measure 4 (see Figure 2). Pursuing this line of investigation further, one soon realizes that Szeluto was, in this work, concerned more with the horizontal than vertical structures, particularly in the bass. Consequently, the harmonic structure appears to result largely from the confluence of linear components. With his well-developed penchant for movement by step in the base
line, Szeluto quite naturally created unexpected, strange, and even illogical chord progressions and cadential passages as seen in measures 3-8 (see Figure 2). This necessarily affected the shape and rhythmic pulse of his melodic material. In considering all of the above with Szeluto's frequent use of chromatic alterations, one can come to appreciate and accept the critics' harsh comments, particularly in regard to Szeluto's more chromatically daring and compact Prelude.

There are other aspects, not specifically addressed by the critics, that also contribute to the general ineffectiveness of Szeluto's two piano pieces. The first concerns Szeluto's thematic and motivic developments and the second his capabilities at writing idiomatically for the instrument. Both of these aspects prove to be weak in the two works. For example, in the Nokturn, despite its length and structure, there is virtually no development of melodic material. Each repetition of the various sections presents simple octave displacements or uninspired embellishments of the original material. There is virtually no other motivic, metric, or chromatic alteration of melodic material; it is simply repeated literally—thus measures 1-8 and 46-53 are identical. Even in the modulatory sections and their reiterations, Szeluto depended too much
on one or two different ideas which he sequenced through
the octaves, ad infinitum, without alteration (see
Figure 3).

Fig. 3. Szeluto: Nokturne H-Dur, Op. 3b, mm. 24-33.

These same octave displacements, melodic embellishments,
and sequencing are found in Szeluto's later Prelude; how-
ever, they are utilized on a much smaller scale. As a re-
sult Szeluto's two piano works are too repetitive and
static, additional factors that render them uninteresting
and lifeless.

Finally, one must address, Szeluto's idiomatic wri-
ting for the piano. Although the two works are not
particularly difficult to grasp, the frequent crossing of
the hands, wide intervallic leaps, and wide spacing of the hands, resulted in a most cumbersome piano style. One can surmise that Szeluto sought to create interest, variety, and a modern sound by utilizing such technical devices. By combining these devices with the other negative components already discussed, Szeluto succeeded only in intensifying the colorlessness of his piano pieces. In the end, although they were not total failures, these works of Szeluto seem more the works of a student than of the twenty-two-year-old composer whom Zygmunt Noskowski considered the best of his three most advanced students—Szeluto, Szymanowski, Różycki.7

Through the study of Szeluto's two piano works, we may conclude that there are major problems with harmonic, melodic, metric, developmental, and pianistic aspects. Taking these points into consideration, one may come to appreciate and support the caustic evaluations of the Warsaw critics. Nevertheless, from the vantage point of eighty-years of hindsight, we also have observed that several of the critics' censurings are disputable. In summation, one may only surmise that the extremely negative and unremitting reviews of these critics were the results of their reactions to the uninteresting and static musical whole and their personal biases.
The Music of Ludomir Rożycki

Ludomir Rożycki's contributions to the three concerts of Spółka Nakładowa consisted of two orchestral works, his tone-poems Bolesław Śmiał, Op. 8\(^6\) and Pan Twardowski (no opus number). Pan Twardowski did not survive the Second World War; however, the criticism that was cited in the previous chapter indicates that it lacked the musical development that had been expected since the writing of Bolesław Śmiał. Nevertheless, Bolesław Śmiał did survive the war, and, as we have already observed, elicited a variety of opinions from the critics attending the concerts. The negative criticisms concerned the strong influence of foreign composers, particularly of Richard Strauss, the numerous unexpected and unprepared musical shifts causing a muddling of formal structure, the frequently unprepared or badly prepared modulations, the often brutal orchestral sonorities, the overuse of chromaticism, and the lack of strong thematic material. Some critics, however, complimented Rożycki's bold orchestration and praised his beautiful melodies.

In all seven of his tone-poems Rożycki employed programmatic sources that ranged from historico-folk tales to poetry, attempting to depict clearly these extra-musical materials in his compositions. Bolesław Śmiał, Rożycki's second tone-poem, is a one-movement, through-composed work based upon selected segments of Stanisław...
Wyspiński's epic poem of the same title. Because of the strong reliance of the music on the poem, a brief synopsis of the sections utilized by Różycki is necessary in order to comprehend fully the structure of the composition and understand the various criticisms of the Warsaw and Berlin reviewers.

Bolesław the Bold, King of Poland from 1058-1079, was excommunicated from the Catholic Church by Stanisław, the Bishop of Kraków, for having opposed Church doctrine. Realizing that an excommunicated king could not rule a Catholic country effectively, Bolesław attempted to annul his excommunication through deceit; Różycki's musical story begins at this point, as indicated in the accompanying program to the score. Section 1 (mm. 1-48) finds Bolesław secretly attending Mass celebrated by Stanisław, hoping to remain undetected while Stanisław gives the blessing at the Benediction, thus annulling the excommunication. Bolesław remains unnoticed until the exact moment of the blessing, when Stanisław, having just raised his hand, sees the king and immediately stops his blessing. In Section 2 (mm. 49-92) the king, livid with rage at being discovered and being denied his quest, lunges with his sword drawn and eventually kills Stanisław. Section 3 (mm. 93-248) finds Bolesław suffering remorse over his act. In Bolesław's ensuing nightmares the figure of Stanisław appears and ever more forcefully torments
him. In Section 4 (mm. 249-352) Bolesław recovers his equilibrium and finds the willpower to continue as king. This rejuvenation of spirit is short lived, however, as, once again, the apparition of Stanisław appears to torment Bolesław. Finally, in Section 5 (mm. 353-396) Bolesław reconciles himself to living with his deed, and in doing so, achieves a certain degree of inner tranquillity and sad consolation. Nevertheless, he questions if these are true feelings and if they will last. The work ends without an answer as the apparition of Stanisław appears once more.

In depicting these segments of Wyspiański's poem, Różycki formally structured his tone-poem into five rather unrelated sections, in a quasi-arch form of A-B-C-b'-D (a'). Each section portrays an event described above and has its own theme (see Figure 4). Additionally, each section has its own characteristic tempo, instrumentation, and tonality. Section 1 is slow and ponderous, scored primarily for low instruments, in A-flat Minor; Section 2 is fast and frantic, scored for higher instruments, and tonally transient, although tending toward A Minor; Section 3, is moderately paced yet nervous, scored for mid-range instruments, primarily favoring B Minor; Section 4 is similar in character to Section 2, and again tonally transient; and Section 5 is again slow, but not ponderous—it is lightly scored, and moves from F Minor to A-flat Major. For the most part, Różycki leaves these sections
rather suddenly, lurching into the next with little or no harmonic preparation. Thus, the listener is frequently shocked when such changes occur. For example, in moving
from Section 1 to Section 2 (mm. 42-49), Rożycki abruptly shifts from A-flat Minor to A Minor by passing quickly through A-flat Major, with no dominant-tonic motion (see Figure 5). Similar abrupt shifts are found between the remaining sections. In studying Rożycki's formal manipulations, therefore, one can come to appreciate the contemporary critics' concerns over what they perceived were abrupt, unexpected, and unprepared swings of character.

Rożycki's general harmonic language exhibits many of the tendencies of late-romantic music. He employs, without any notable originality, the expanded chordal structures and chromaticism expected of that period. Additionally, he demonstrates a predilection for frequent bass-movement by step and by thirds, all of which indicates the influences of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German techniques, particularly those of Strauss. With their conservative musical attitude, the contemporary Polish critics would understandably find fault with such an harmonic language.

Of particular note in Bolesław Śmiały is Rożycki's obfuscation of key areas. Throughout the work there is a conspicuous lack of dominant-tonic harmonic motion, not only between the major structural sections, but also within the sections, once again indicating Straussian influence. Rożycki even went so far as to avoid such motion at the close of the work (mm. 386-389), where he slides to
Fig. 5. Różycki: Bolesław Śmialy, Op. 8 (Berlin, 1905), mm. 45-50.

A tonic pedal in the key of A-flat Major from a minor supertonic chord (see Figure 6).

Tonality in Bolesław Śmialy is further obscured by the use of extremely long pedals on scale degrees other than the tonic or dominant of the prevailing tonality.
Fig. 6. Różycki: Bolesław Śmiży, Op. 9, closing measures.

This in effect creates false tonal shifts. One finds such pedals utilized for as many as seventy measures, particularly in the inner sections. As a consequence one finds that the work spends time with, but does not formally settle into tonal areas. Różycki's obvious vagueness of
established tonality suggests that the composer intentionally keeps his listener in a state of insecurity concerning tonality throughout the entire piece. Such tonal ambiguities, once again, are indicative of Straussian influences, and quite naturally produced sharp criticisms from the tradition-oriented Warsaw critics.

Brief mention must be made of Rożycki's utilization of tonal centers to underscore specific dramatic depictions, another obvious Straussian influence. For example, in the two sections that are tonally strong, Sections 1 and 5, Rożycki employs a minor key area of many flats (A-flat Minor) to depict solemnity, pain, suffering, and conflict and a minor-relative major key area relationship on the flat side (F Minor to A-flat Major) to depict reconciliation and final consolation, respectively.

With regards to Rożycki's techniques of orchestration, the expanded size of the orchestra called for in Rośleław Śmiały demonstrates a further Straussian influence. In addition to the normal compliment of strings, brass, woodwinds, and percussion, Rożycki also required an additional flute and trumpet, a piccolo clarinet, two harps, two additional horns (for a total of six), and two tubas. Another Straussian feature concerns Rożycki's choices of instrumentation for programmatic illustrations: low-ranged strings, brass, horns, and woodwinds to depict darkness, masculinity and strength, as in the portrayals
of Stanisław and the Church in Section 1; higher-ranged woodwinds and strings to depict struggle, conflict, instability, as in the portrayal of the struggle between Stanisław and Bolesław in Section 2; fully-scored brass instruments to depict heroism and nobility, as in the characterization of the king in Section 1; and the combination of mid-ranged violins, cellos, flutes, and clarinets to depict tenderness and consolation, as found in Bolesław's self-reconciliation at the work's close.

A prime example of the larger application of instrumental depiction is found in the change of dramatic character between Sections 1 and 2. Section 1, presenting Stanisław at Mass, is slow, ponderous, and stately. It is scored sparsely, primarily with bass instruments in their low registers. Theme A (Stanisław's theme) is intoned by the tubas. Różycki clearly is depicting the solemnity and power of the Church and the institution of the Mass. The mood is broken only by the fan-fare-like Theme B (Bolesław's theme) in the horns. The two themes alternate with each other throughout the section, although Theme A predominates. The dark musical mood is unmistakable. Section 2, begins when Stanisław detects the king and continues with the king's subsequent attack on Stanisław. Różycki underscores this radical change of mood by altering the character of the music, which now becomes fast, churning and confused, and scored in the higher registers.
of the strings and woodwinds. Although this and other such shifts in orchestral forces allow Różycki to depict musically the events occurring in specific scenes of the poem, he, nevertheless, accomplished these shifts too abruptly for the musical sensitivities of his critical audience.

Throughout Bolesław Śmialy Różycki utilized such orchestral forces and instrumental combinations and colorings in shifting, alternating appearances to create a vivid, often highly-emotional work. These characteristics, utilized together with tonal obfuscation, resulted in a musical style that was highly influenced by the German late-Romantic school of composition, particularly that of Strauss. Obviously, from the criticisms that were voiced, this was a style too influenced by foreigners to be fully appreciated by contemporary Polish reviewers.

Turning now to the thematic material of Bolesław Śmialy, there are six principle melodic ideas: Theme A—Stanisław's theme, Theme B—the king's theme, Theme C—the struggle-murder theme, Theme D—the remorse-nightmare theme, Theme E—the king's rejuvenation of spirit theme, and Theme F—the king's consolation theme (see Figure 4). In studying these themes, one quickly concludes that Themes B through F are derived from Theme A. Specifically, Theme B is clearly taken from the metrically altered, retrograde inversion of the last half of Theme A.
Theme C appears to be drawn from an inversion of the beginning of Theme A. Theme D in turn is a metrically-altered and extended version of Theme B, while Theme E is an obvious variation of Theme C. Finally, Theme F is another altered version of Theme B. Thus, there are three melodic ideas strongly derived from the last half of Theme A and two melodic ideas loosely stemming from its beginning. Such thematic modifications are indicative of Wagnerian and Straussian influences. Additionally, Theme A, which appears in each major section in either its original, inverted, or slightly modified form, assumes a unifying role in the work and recalls Wagner's use of leitmotifs.

Despite these influences, Rozycki's attempts at thematic derivation and modification produced no strong, memorable themes. Only the opening theme, Theme A, falls in this classification. The other themes lack rhythmic vitality and varied contours, and are not developed. Consequently, Themes B, C, D, E, and F appear only in Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively, with Themes B and F used as fanfare identifications of the king, and the scalar Themes C and E only used sequentially to drive the music forward--normally more the responsibility of motivic material. Because there is little or no interweaving of melodic material, the result is a work of little horizontal interest.
Taking all of the above points into consideration, one may easily conclude that Różycki produced a musical composition that clearly displays the strong influence of Wagner and particularly Strauss; one only has to compare Bolesław Śmialy with Strauss' Death and Transfiguration to see the extent of such influence. This, in itself, was not necessarily reprehensible. However, its appearance at a time of rampant Polish nationalism makes understandable the Polish critics' taking the composer and his music to task for such blatant dependence on foreign influences. Finally, one may also understand the negative German reaction for the reason offered by Aleksander Poliński at the time: Germany already possessed the real Strauss and, therefore, did not need a mediocre Polish copy.9

Despite such receptions, one must look at Bolesław Śmialy for what it was to early twentieth-century Poland: a rather modernistic, programmatic composition, totally dependent on extra-musical material for its overall structure. Such strong dependence, one may surmise, caused the composer to shift wildly from one musical section to another, in a manner that was considered too brusque. Also, the employment of an unusually large orchestra, at least by Polish standards, produced massive walls of sound. Such features, combined with Różycki's characteristically abrupt and unprepared tonal changes, unquestionably give this work brutal, often harsh qualities. Such qualities,
as we have seen, were criticized by the contemporary reviewers. Nevertheless, with Bolesław Śmiały the composer intimated future creative promise, unfortunately, as we have observed in the criticisms of his next major work, Pan Twardowski, a promise that was apparently not immediately realized.

The Music of Grzegorz Fitelberg

Grzegorz Fitelberg presented four orchestral works on the concerts sponsored by Spółka Nakładowa. As indicated above, two of these, his earliest orchestral works, are available for study—the Symphony No. 1 in E Minor, Op. 16 and the tone-poem Piesń o Sokole (Song of the Falcon), Op. 18. The Symphony was performed only on the 1906 Berlin concert and received a generally negative review—the Berlin critic stated that the only interesting part of this work was its third movement. Piesń o Sokole, on the other hand, was performed on all three concerts of Spółka Nakładowa and received more positive critiques.

Fitelberg’s Symphony No. 1 in E Minor, 1904, was the composer’s first work for orchestra and has youthful, first-attempt characteristics. It is a four-movement work written for a medium sized orchestra. Each movement basically follows the standard structural forms found in the more classically-oriented symphonies of the day.
The first movement is in sonata form. Its Exposition (mm. 1-143) begins with a slow eight-measure introduction that presents an augmented pre-figuration of the opening theme. The first key area (mm. 8-90) introduces the lively Theme A (see Figure 7) and a change of tempo from Andante to Allegro agitato. Fitelberg presents five major statements of Theme A in the tonalities of E Minor, G Major, C-flat Major, E Minor, and A Major over an expanse of ninety measures before he introduces his second key area. Throughout these thematic statements, Theme A is sequentially presented with slight alterations, primarily by solo woodwinds and strings with the brass instruments used for harmonic support. With each statement of the theme Fitelberg increases his instrumental forces until by the fourth statement beginning in measure 52 he has reached a full orchestral tutti. This he immediately dissipates and returns to a final solo presentation of the theme. With each change of tonality throughout this
section, Fitelberg employs strong dominant-tonic movements, thus leaving no doubt that a modulation has been made.

The second key area (mm. 90-142), a little more than half the length of the first, introduces the slow, lyric Theme B (see Figure 8) in the relative major. In contrast to the first key area, this section presents only three major statements of Theme B in G Major, B Major, and A Major, tonalities again introduced by dominant-tonic movements; Fitelberg closes the section in D Major. Also, the thematic presentations are now made by choirs of woodwinds and strings and include more of the brasses this time. During this section Fitelberg introduces a simple counterpoint based on a motive taken from the opening of Theme A.

Fig. 8. Fitelberg: Symphonie en Mi Mineur, Op. 16, 1st Movement, Theme B.
The arrival at the Development (mm. 143-203) is accomplished by a simple shift of tonality from D Major to D Minor. Throughout this section Fitelberg develops the motivic figure taken from the beginning of Theme A over sequentially altered statements of Theme B; thus Theme B dominates. He continues to rely primarily on solo woodwind and strings, as well as woodwind and string choirs for presenting his motivic statements.

Fitelberg begins his Recapitulation (mm. 204-302) with no strong dominant-tonic movement. Instead, he slides into it by step-wise movement in the bass. The most interesting aspects of the Recapitulation are the structural, orchestral, and tonal alterations of material presented in the Exposition. Whereas the composer utilized a long first key area and short second key area in the Exposition—ninety to fifty-two measures, he reverses this scheme in the Recapitulation—thirty-six to sixty-two measures. Additionally, the material he returns from the first key area is not taken from the opening, but from a later alteration. Also, whereas Fitelberg began the Exposition with solo instrument presentations of thematic material and gradually increased his forces to a full orchestral tutti statement, in the Recapitulation he begins with tutti presentations, gradually diminishing them to solo statements. Finally, Fitelberg returns the
second key area in the parallel major which he maintains to the end.

The second movement in the unexpected key of B-flat Major is an interesting Rondo because of its formal and tonal structures. Overall, the movements is divided as follows: A-B-A'-C-A''-(G.P.)-A'''-B'-A'''. Besides presenting individual themes (see Figure 9), each section is distinct in its time signature and tonality. Thus, Section A is in triple time in B-flat Major; Section B is in duple time in C Minor; Section A' returns to triple
time and B-flat Major; Section C is in common time in
B-flat Minor; and Section A'' returns to triple time but
is in A Minor. Sections A''', B', and A''' are basically
repetitions of Sections A, B, and A', although some alter-
ations are found in the orchestration. Thus, one may look
at this movement as a Rondo form within a larger A-B-A'
form, divided A-B-A'--C-A''--A'''--B'-A''. It also is in-
teresting to note that Fitelberg's tonal shifts between
sections are based on the interval of the second; he
either shifts up a major second or down a minor second.
Half of the tonal shifts are accomplished by step-wise
movement in the bass, while the other half have dominant-
tonic preparations.

The third movement is in F Major. It is a Scherzo-
Trio-Scherzo, with a written out repeat of the Scherzo
that includes a ten-measure extension at the end. Inter-
estingly, Fitelberg begins his Scherzo (mm. 1-180) with a
Grand Pause, even though there is no attacca indication at
the end of the second movement. The Scherzo presents ten
major statements of its theme (see Figure 10) in F Major.

Fig. 10. Fitelberg: Symphonie en Mi Mineur, Op. 16, 3rd
Movement, Theme of Scherzo.
F Minor, G Major, D Major, E Major, and E-flat Major, before ending in the tonic once more. For his thematic statements Fitelberg again relies primarily on the woodwinds and strings, often as solo instruments standing alone or paired with other solo instruments, as well as in individual or combined choirs. As Fitelberg progresses through his monothematic Scherzo, he creates tension and release by increasing and decreasing his instrumental forces; he ends the section with a full orchestral tutti statement of the theme.

In the undesignated Trio (mm. 181-335), although maintaining the same tempo as the Scherzo, Fitelberg slows down various aspects of the section's rhythm by using dotted half-notes for the pulse, long pedals and extended chords in the strings, and a reduced number of tonal shifts. He moves through only four tonal areas: G-flat Major to B-flat Major to D Major to C Major. After a chordal introduction in which he shifts from F Major to G-flat Major, Fitelberg introduces the theme (see Figure 11)

![Figure 11. Fitelberg: Symphonie en Mi Mineur, Op. 15, 3rd Movement, Theme of Trio.](image)
which receives four further presentations, all of which are given by various solo woodwind instruments. Thus, the overall effect of this section is one of a stately instrumental chorale played by a woodwind-string orchestra. As indicated above, Fitelberg closes the movement with a written-out repeat of the Scherzo that ends with a ten-measure harmonic extension.

The last movement of the Symphony is in a modified sonata form with coda. Fitelberg begins this movement as he began the first movement, with an introduction (mm. 1-12) that again presents an altered, augmented pre-figuration of the main theme. However, this time he also incorporates a change of time signature—the Introduction is in six-eight while the movement itself is in alla breve. The first key area (mm. 13-84) introduces Theme A (see Figure 12) and proceeds to give five major restatements of
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Fig. 12. Fitelberg: Symphonie en Mi Mineur, Op. 16, 4th Movement, Theme A.
the theme through E Minor, F-sharp Minor, and B Major. However, unlike in the first movement, here Fitelberg includes the brass in his thematic presentations, although the strings and woodwinds still tend to dominate the texture.

The second key area (mm. 85-114) is more of a second theme area than key area because of its tonal instability. There are strong indications of C Minor and G Major. What is important here is the introduction of the second theme, Theme B (see figure 13) which appears to be derived from

![Fig. 13. Fitelberg: Symphonie en Mi Mineur, Op. 16, 4th Movement, Theme B.](image)

Theme A. This section is fairly short and gives only four statements of the theme, two by solo woodwind instruments and two with fuller woodwind-string choirs. No strong modulation occurs until the shift to the relative major in measure 115 with a reappearance of a partial statement of Theme A. This strong tonal shift begins the Development section (mm. 115-244).
Throughout the Development the first half of Theme A is the primary thematic material developed, being tossed between various solo string or woodwind instruments. Additionally, but much less frequently, the first half of Theme B is brought into use, however, never in conjunction with Theme A. The most important element of this section is the full-orchestral statement of Theme A from the first movement in the tonic which is presented over a statement of this movement's Theme A (mm. 225-245). At the close of this cyclic statement Fitelberg introduces his Recapitulation.

The Recapitulation (mm. 245-296) is similar to that found in the first movement. Once again Fitelberg presents a shortened version of the first key area having different orchestration, and the second key is again presented in the parallel major. It is an almost exact repeat from the Exposition, but utilizing different orchestral forces. The Coda (mm. 297-320) brings back one final statement of Theme A to round off the movement and to close out the work.

In summation, several characteristics may be identified in Fitelberg's Symphony in E Minor, Op. 16. It is a straight-forward work with few alterations from standard forms. Those that do occur are found primarily in the second and fourth movements. The thematic material does not appear to have any Polish characteristics, such as
elements of the Mazurka or Polonaise. The harmonic language presents no striking or unusual factors; the tonal relationships between the various sections of the second movement are the most interesting. In general, Fitelberg relies more on constant restatements of thematic material in different tonalities rather than motivic manipulations to maintain musical continuity, even though a great deal of motivic material could be derived from the majority of the themes. Fitelberg thus created a work with little polyphonic content, a fact that could be a main criticism of the work. Finally, the most interesting aspect of the work is Fitelberg's constantly changing orchestration. As indicated above, he relies primarily on various solo woodwind and string instruments, as well as woodwind and string choirs for thematic presentations; Tchaikovsky's influence is surely felt. Because Fitelberg was a well-versed master of instrumental shadings and combinations, it is to these constantly changing and contrasting sounds that one's interest is drawn.

In the end, even after a cursory study of this piece, one may conclude that the German critic's remarks concerning the uninteresting quality of the work were perhaps too harsh. Despite its youthful character and flaws, Fitelberg's Symphony really deserved a better critical reception than it received. It is quite possible that the German critic simply was showing a bias against a
conservative, Tchaikovskian symphony without German influence, which paled in comparison to that which was being produced in Berlin at the time.

Fitelberg's Piesń o Sokole, Op. 18 is a work loosely related to a poem by Artur Gorki of the same title. As far as can be determined there never was a specific program accompanying the work. Therefore, unlike Rożycki's Bolesław Śmiały, Piesń o Sokole does not tell a musical story, rather it creates its own musical atmosphere. A more interesting work than the Symphony in E Minor, Piesń o Sokole's reception by the contemporary critics was, for the most part, positive although it did receive negative criticisms for its strong dependence on Strauss and Wagner, as well as for its muddled formal structure and weak themes.

To begin with, the work is scored for an enlarged orchestra. Besides the normal compliment of instruments, Fitelberg requires an additional flute and clarinet (for a total of three each), two additional horns (for a total of six), and two harps. Scoring, for the most part, is quite full in all sections. After a cursory perusal of the score, one comes to appreciate Fitelberg's carefully considered orchestration. To obtain just the right sound, Fitelberg frequently indicates "divisi" of the strings with the first violins in six parts, the second violins in five parts, the violas in four parts, and the cellos and
basses up to three parts. Obviously, the large forces called for and the careful attention to orchestration indicate strong Straussian and Wagnerian influences.

Structurally, despite the views of several of the critics, the work is quite clearly a modified sonata form, which begins in G Major and ends in E Major. It has a monothematic Exposition (mm. 1-77) consisting of a four-measure fanfare theme (see Figure 14) followed by a con-

![Fig. 14. Fitelberg: *Piesń o Sokole*, Op. 18, Theme.](image)

siderable amount of transitional material. The Exposition is followed by a long Development (mm. 78-256) that moves through a variety of tonal areas, which in turn is followed by a greatly truncated Recapitulation (mm. 257-274) and Coda (mm. 275-298). Throughout the entire work there are twenty-four appearances of the theme, over half of which appear in the Development. The monothematic nature of the work and its short fanfare theme may explain the criticisms directed toward the thematic material.

The Exposition is highly organized as it presents clearly-defined standard modulations to secondary key areas. The first key area of G Major (mm. 1-24) ends on a strong dominant-seventh preparation for the second key
area of A Minor (mm. 25-44). Fitelberg further emphasizes this dominant preparation through a restatement of the original theme. Thus, the material of measures 25-44 is a transposed repetition of the material found in measures 5-24. At the conclusion of the second key area, Fitelberg incorporates another dominant-seventh preparation for movement to a new key area of B Minor. He again reinforces his modulation with a restatement of the theme. At this point (the beginning of the Exposition's Codetta), Fitelberg gives a truncated statement of the theme, and immediately begins the preparation for the section's concluding presentation of the theme in F Major. However, this time Fitelberg does not prepare his closing tonality with a dominant sonority; he simply moves to the new key by sequencing scaler material over root-movement by step, arriving at an enharmonically spelled French augmented sixth chord in measure 57. He then ends the Exposition on a long pedal on the flatted-seventh of an F-Major seventh-chord. This, in effect, creates a dominant-seventh preparation for a modulation to B-flat Major at the transition to the Development. However, Fitelberg does not resolve this chord, instead he calls for a Grand Pause and then immediately sounds a C-Minor chord at the beginning of the Development.

In the Development Fitelberg states the theme 14 times on the tonalities of E-flat Major, A Minor, F Minor,
B Minor, A-flat Major, and E Minor. He alternates these thematic statements with sustained, suspended sonorities (mm. 87-93) whose linear movement by consecutive half- and whole-steps in opposite directions in the outer voices is reminiscent of Wagner (see Figure 15). Fitelberg's frequent changes of tempo and time signature combine with these suspended sonorities to imbue his non-thematic sections with a fluid, floating texture.

There are two false Recapitulations in the Development: the first appears at measure 217 presenting the theme in G Major over a C-Major ninth-chord in first inversion; the second and stronger of the two appears at measure 239 presenting the theme in B Minor over a G-Major ninth chord in root position. In both presentations, the sensation of recapitulation is heightened by the abrupt changes and contrasts of tempos and textures from the previous material. After his two false starts, Fitelberg presents his real Recapitulation in measure 257. At this shift between major sections Fitelberg employs another interesting transitional technique. He arrives at his Recapitulation through a four-measure, sustained sonority (mm. 252-256) containing five of the six tones of a whole-tone scale beginning on G, which he encloses in book-end Grand Pauses (see Figure 16).
Fig. 15. Fitelberg: Piesn of Sokole, Op. 18 (Berlin, 1906), mm. 87-93.

The greatly truncated "real" Recapitulation in the tonic key of G Major presents an almost identical repetition of only the first ten measures of the
Fig. 16. Fitelberg: *Pieśń o Sokole*, Op. 18, mm. 252-56

Exposition; thus, Fitelberg provides just one statement of the theme before arriving at his fifth Grand Pause, signaling the end of the Recapitulation and the beginning of
the Coda (mm. 274-275). After the Grand Pause and with a substantial reduction in tempo and rhythmic activity, Fitelberg without any preparation abruptly shifts to the key of E Major and brings back the sustained sonorities found in the Development. At this point Fitelberg initiates a pedal-point on E that continues to the end of the work. Over these sustained sonorities and pedal, Fitelberg restates the theme three more times, in E Major, G Major, and again in E Major to conclude the piece, all the while reducing his orchestration until he is left with muted horns and trumpets over divisi strings. Throughout the Coda Fitelberg frequently changes rhythm and tempo, giving this section a quasi-disjointed sensation. As a result Piesn o Sokole ends in a mood very different from that with which it began. With the harmonic preparations, the changes of textures and melodic-motivic materials, and the structurally important placements of Grand Pauses, Fitelberg clearly defined the sonata form structure of his work. Such clear definition of structure should not have been problematical for the contemporary reviewers, unless for the possibility that they may have become confused by Fitelberg's regular tempo and rhythmic changes.

Harmonically, Fitelberg like Różycki utilizes the expanded-chord structures and chromaticisms of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German music, particularly those that are characteristic of the music of
Wagner and Strauss. However, unlike Różycki, but as we have observed above in measures 254-256 (see Figure 16), Fitelberg makes very limited use of whole-tone sonorities, thus indicating a beginning interest in wider harmonic explorations. Finally, as if to underscore his interest in whole-tone sonorities, there is the possibility that Fitelberg may have organized the tonalities of his thematic statements according to a symmetrically-devised scale of E-flat, E, F, G, A-flat, A, and B, within which is embedded the same five-note, whole-tone collection stated above.

In summation, taking everything discussed above into consideration, one may concur quite easily with the contemporary critics' positive assessments of Fitelberg's Pieśń o Sokole. At the same time, however, one also must concur with their comments concerning Fitelberg's overdependence on Wagner and Strauss. Notwithstanding, even after a cursory study of the score, one must disagree with the critics' contentions that the work has a muddled formal structure and a faintness of thematic material. In the end, one may conclude that Fitelberg produced an interesting and creative musical work in Pieśń o Sokole.

The Music of Karol Szymanowski

Karol Szymanowski contributed the greatest number of pieces to the three concerts of Spółka Nakładowa. These
included four piano works, his *Etude in B-flat Minor*, Op. 4, Nr. 3 (1900-1902),
*First Piano Sonata in C Minor*, Op. 8 (1904),
*Variations on a Polish Folk Melody*, Op. 10 (1904), and his *Fantasia in C Major*, Op. 14 (1905), as well as one orchestral work, his *Concert Overture in E Major*, Op. 12 (1905). All of these works were written before the actual founding of Spółka Nakładowa and all were from his first creative period, heavily influenced by late nineteenth-century German composers, particularly Strauss and, of course, by Chopin. Of all the music presented on the three concerts of Spółka Nakładowa, Szymanowski's received the least negative criticism. In fact, every reviewer, except Leichtentritt, who heard only the *Concert Overture*, considered Szymanowski the most talented of the four composers and accepted his music with the least amount of reservation. Several of these critics even referred to him as a musical genius. Those negative criticisms that were raised concerned the following: that Szymanowski's *Concert Overture* was too heavily influenced by Strauss and had problems in its orchestration and formal structures, and that he presented on the Warsaw concerts works that were written years earlier, thus not putting forth anything new. In turning to the discussions of these works, one must keep in mind that they will not be detailed commentaries for the reasons cited previously.
Szymanowski's four piano works present a rather varied overview of his creative endeavors for the piano up to the year 1905. To begin with, the Etude is one of his earliest surviving works and remains one of his most popular pieces from the period. For example, Paderewski frequently included it on his concerts throughout Europe and Fitelberg complimented the composer by writing what also has become a popular orchestral transcription of it.

The Etude is a fairly short work of only 54 measures, with a clearly defined A-B-A' with Coda form. The four sections can be further divided into the following sub-sections: Section A, measures 1-14 (a-a'-b-'a''), Section B, measures 15-29 (c—a''—c), Section A', measures 30-43 (a'''—a''''—b'), and Coda, measures 44-54 (a-c'). The constant dotted-note figures found throughout the work acts as the main unifying elements.

Harmonically, the work is transient throughout even though it begins in B-flat Minor and ends in B-flat Major. The central section favors F Major, but never really settles in that key. What is of particular harmonic interest in the Etude is that Szymanowski presents only one strong dominant-tonic relationship, appearing at the end of the A' section moving into the Coda (see Figure 17). Although root-movements by falling perfect fifths occur throughout the work, their dominant-tonic pull is weakened by metric displacement. One prime example is found in
Fig. 17. Szymanowski: Etüda b-moll, Op. 4, Nr. 3 (Kraków, 1981), mm. 39-45. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

measures 4-5 where the strength of the V-I passage is diminished by the single measure in 1/4 which serves to complete the harmonic movement but also to initiate the melodic movement. Thus, harmony and melody conflict metrically. By doing this Szymanowski creates constant tonal fluidity.

It is quite obvious that Szymanowski was studying the works of Chopin and Skriabin while composing this piano piece. Chopin's influence is felt in the constant obscuring and fluidity of tonalities, as well as in the frequent use of suspensions, passing tones and other non-harmonic tones, all the while keeping the fundamental texture of the music one of accompanied melody. However,
the main influence appears to have been Skrliabin's Etude, Op. 8, Nr. 11. A cursory comparison of the melodies of the two works confirms this point (see Figure 18). Needless-to-say, such influences naturally endeared this work to the hearts of the Warsaw critics.

The First Piano Sonata of Szymanowski is a completely different and more conservative work than his Etude. In short, Szymanowski constructs the piece in the traditional four-movement structure. The first movement is a standard sonata form of no notable consequence utilizing such standard key relationships as moving from the minor tonic to the relative major in the second key area. The second movement in A-flat Major has an A-B-A' form with subsections, all off-set by major changes in tempo. A number
of students of the music have referred to it as more a song-without-words than anything else. The third movement is a Minuet and Trio with Coda, following the key pattern of E-flat Major--B Major--E-flat Major. Although Szymanowski's modulations between the sections seem abrupt, they present typical late-romantic techniques by utilizing transitional chords that contain common, enharmonically written pitches. Thus, only one or two notes need to be altered by half-step to enter the new key. The fourth movement, which Szymanowski had intended to be a rondo, ended up being a fugue on two subjects with an Introduction. Throughout the long fugue, Szymanowski employs all the standard fugal techniques, a tribute to his studies of counterpoint with Zygmunt Noskowski. What is of interest in this fugue, as well as in the entire work, are the cyclic connections with the first movement as Szymanowski interrupts the fugue with a statement of Theme A of the first movement in measures 553-571. Other cyclic elements are Theme B of the first movement being the source for the themes of the second movement and the Trio of the third movement. Such use of cyclic devices by Szymanowski is laudable in conception, but appears rather mundane in execution. Liszt would not have been particularly proud of it.

Harmonically the Sonata is less ambitious than the earlier Etude. For the most part, the harmonic structure
follows traditional patterns of the late-nineteenth century, but establishes clear tonal centers. One may speculate, therefore, that Szymanowski was more concerned with working out the overall structural problems of writing his piano sonata than with experimenting with harmonic manipulations because he possibly felt indecisive in tackling his first large-scale piano sonata. This indecisiveness is exhibited in Szymanowski's constant employment of two- and four-measure, self contained phrases laid end-to-end, particularly in the transitional passages of the first movement (see Figure 19). Nevertheless, there is the one notable point of harmonic experimentation to which students of his music readily refer: the series of sevenths used as individual yet connected concords that open the introduction to the last movement (see Figure 20). Generally speaking, however, Szymanowski created a rather traditional piano sonata that elicited no criticism from the tradition-minded Warsaw critics.

The next major piano work by Szymanowski, as well as his most popular of the period, was his Variations on a Polish Folk Melody, in B Minor, Op. 10. Overall, the work contains an introduction, a statement of the theme in an A-B-A' form, and ten variations, nine of which follow the original form (see Figure 21). The harmonic structure is fairly straight-forward with no unusual harmonic manipulations, although the harmonic movement in individual
variations can be obscured. Of all the variations, the last one is of particular interest for two reasons: it is itself a large A-B-A' with Coda form containing a fugal middle section based on the main theme, while its A sections contain extended variations of the tri-partite theme. Additionally, this variation consumes 194 of the
Fig. 20. Szymanowski: I Sonata c-moll, Op. 8, 4th Movement, opening measures.

Fig. 21. Szymanowski: Wariacje na polski temat ludowy h-moll, Op. 10 (Kraków, 1981). Main Theme. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.
total 441 measures of the work. None of the other variations comes close to matching the finale in complexity or length.

Throughout the variations Szymanowski uses his thematic material freely, often fragmenting it or avoiding the use of some of its elements in succeeding variations, as in Variations I and IV. Also, one finds the not uncommon use of thematic diminution and augmentation, as well as the moving of the theme into other voices, as in Variations I and VI. Finally, one may note that, in contrast to the earlier Etude and Piano Sonata, Szymanowski's Variations makes a conscious effort to avoid rigid four-measure phrasing.

Besides the recurring theme, Szymanowski achieves a sense of underlying unity through the smooth transitions from one variation to the next as evidenced by his use of scalar-passage bridges, dominant-tonic progressions, augmented sixth chord resolutions to the minor tonic, simple changes of mode, and pedal-point bridges. The one abrupt transition that does occur happens between Variations VII and VIII as Szymanowski changes keys from B Major to G Minor without any preparation. Further unity is achieved through Szymanowski's sub-grouping of variations by key or other means such as texture or rhythm. For example, Variations I through V are in B Minor and Variations VI, VII, and X are in B Major. Triplet-figure commonalities unify
Variations I, II, V, and VII, and polyrhythms Variations V and VII. Even Variation VIII in G Minor and Variation IX in F-sharp Major can be grouped together because of their sharp contrasts to the other variations, VIII being a funeral march and IX being a long dominant preparation for Variation X, the finale.

In summation, one may state that Szymanowski created a musically impressive work in his Variations, a work that has stood the test of time. After reading the various reviews, however, one surmises that, despite the interesting varieties of unifying elements, the often intriguing manipulations of the theme, and the large fugal finale, the most important factor of the Variations for the Warsaw reviewers was its use of a Polish folk melody. This fact, by itself, seemed to elicit a multiplicity of platitudes from the various critics.

The final piano work that Szymanowski presented on the concerts was his Fantazja in C Major. Students of the work have discussed its cyclic nature, particularly between the outer sections where transformations of the main melody appear in the latter; its rather loose tonal structure in which the tonic is firmly established only at the end of the work; and its overall through-composed A-B-C structure comprised of sections that follow no familiar or recognizable formal structures—all are free-formed entities, particularly the inner section. Nevertheless,
despite his use of more freely-composed formal structures in an obvious attempt at writing in a more modern idiom, students of this music have criticized Szymanowski's attempts because he fell victim to constructing this work out of small, rather uninteresting, four-square, building-block components that neatly follow each other end-to-end. Thus, by trying to write more modernly overall, Szymanowski reverted to a more conservative approach to his basic material.

Specifically, Szymanowski introduces in his Fantazja a number of interesting techniques not seen in his previous piano music. Harmonically, the work is his most adventurous and chromatic to date. For example, the openings of the first and third sections are highly chromatic, not at all suggesting the C Major tonality of the key signature (see Figure 22). The same can be said of the opening of the second section, which ostensibly is in A-flat Major but begins with three measures sounding strong A-natural sonorities. Throughout the entire work, Szymanowski is maintaining a constantly changing tonal structure that varies with almost every measure. One may speculate, therefore, that the use of key signatures was more for Szymanowski's ease of writing than for the establishment of specific keys. Additionally, Szymanowski incorporates whole-tone elements in the transitional passages between the three large sections (see Figure 23) and
he even includes a two-measure phrase (mm. 154–55) utilizing all twelve tones of the scale (see Figure 24), both of which serve to obscure further the tonal centers. Even at the end of the work, where he finally presents a strong dominant-tonic cadence, Szymanowski inserts material to interrupt this strong tonal motion.

The overall texture of the piece is, as one expects of a piano fantasy, constantly changing. The chordal passages, the scale passages, the arpeggiations, the cascades of sound, the changes in tempi and rhythms, the polyrhythms, and the sudden starting and stopping all combine to create a work that is texturally as fluid as it is tonally. In this regard, one may find the influences of Scriabin or Liszt rather than Chopin to be predominant.
In summation, with his Fantazja Szymanowski seems consciously to break out of the traditional molds utilized in his previous piano works. Despite the structural and
Fig. 24. Szymanowski: Fantazja C-Dur, Op. 14, mm. 154-56.

tonal looseness of the work, the Warsaw critics offered no negative criticism; on the contrary, they found the Fantazja to be an exciting work.

Throughout these brief characterizations of the piano works of Szymanowski, works that were highly praised by the Warsaw critics, we have observed a variety of approaches to the piano medium. Even with such cursory reviews, we may conclude that up to his Fantazja, Szymanowski's piano writing was, for the most part, traditional and even conservative. His positive acceptance by the Warsaw critical establishment may have been helped considerably by such an approach to composition, not to mention the use of a Polish folk melody in one work and the apparent influences of Chopin in others. As a result Szymanowski, with his piano works, endeared himself to the hearts and musical values of the country's critics.

Szymanowski's Concert Overture in E Major, Op. 12 is another orchestral work from the membership of Spółka Nakładowa that shows considerable influence of Strauss. As stated previously, the score to the original version of
the work presented on the concerts has not survived. Thus, it is not possible to comment directly on the criticisms it received concerning problems with its orchestration and formal structure. However, a number of general comments may be made because the later revised version could not have changed the basic musical material. The Overture was first accompanied by a segment of Tadeusz Miciński's poem Witez Wlast as an introduction to the score; however, soon after the work was publicly presented Szymanowski removed the text. It is generally accepted that the text was more of an invocation than an actual program for the work.

To begin with, the work shows Straussian influences in its large instrumentation which includes three each of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, trumpets, and trombones, as well as a bass clarinet, bass trombone, and contra-bassoon. Szymanowski enlarged the horn section to six. He also called for a tuba, a harp, and the normal string and percussion compliments. At times, to achieve the specific sound he required, Szymanowski scored the strings in divisi of three parts each in the first and second violins, and four parts in the violas.

Besides the increased orchestral forces, other influences of Strauss stand out in this work. These are the overall heroic style of the work, the lyrical, broad-sweeping melodic lines, the restless, surging rhythms, the
frequent chromatic alterations, the often complex contrapuntal writing, and the sudden shifts in tonalities. Additionally, the opening presentation of an energetic melody in the horns and strings supported by syncopated chords and repeated with full-chordal accompaniment point strongly to Strauss, as do the virtuoso writing in all sections of the orchestra and the frequent shifts of widely contrasting moods and styles throughout the work, all of which Szymanowski clearly indicated in the score, as was his compositional habit. As a result of these characteristics Szymanowski's Overture has often been called a Polish Ein Heldenleben. It is interesting to note, however, that unlike Strauss, Szymanowski's frequent overuse of contrapuntal writing often obscures the clarity of the work and his frequent overbearing harmonic shifts tend to obscure the tonality—Strauss handled such technical aspects much less cumbersomely.

Specifically, the Overture is constructed in a slightly modified sonata form; the modification comes in the Recapitulation which varies and compresses its restatements of thematic material. The Exposition (mm. 1-117), because of its expanded presentations of the two main themes and intervening material almost equals the length of the Development and Recapitulation combined—117 to 179 measures. Szymanowski's Exposition is without
introduction, and begins the first statement of his main Theme (A) in the tonic in measure 1 (see Figure 25). The theme is repeated again three times between measures 16-22, twice in the tonic and once after an abrupt, unprepared change of key from E Major to B-flat Major. At this point (m. 21) Szymanowski presents a new idea as a counterpoint to Theme A (Motive "a"), which becomes much more thematically important in later sections of the work (see Figure 26). After developing this and other material derived from Theme A, Szymanowski prepares for the presentation of the second main theme, however, not before passing through major tonalities of B-flat Major and
C Major. This last tonal shift is highlighted by sequencing statements of Theme A in an increased tempo marked, "scherzando."

The second key area in B Major present a "classical" but unexciting shift in tonality to the dominant. However, the manner in which Szymanowski makes this shift to the dominant is striking in that the music moves abruptly from a G-major seventh chord under a fermatta directly to B Major without any preparation. Theme B (see Figure 27),
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which is a lyrical sweeping theme, is presented three times, twice in its tonic and once in its dominant tonalities. The final presentation in F-sharp Major over a pedal is a strong dominant preparation for the conclusion of the Exposition in B Major. Of final interest in the Exposition is that throughout the various presentations of his thematic material, both in the first and second key areas, Szymanowski creates interest by altering the scoring and accompanying contrapuntal material. This,
combined with the frequent tempi and mood shifts, an ob-
vvious avoidance of four-square phrasing, and the abruptly
shifting harmonies, allows for a much more interesting Ex-
position than that found in Szymanowski's earlier Piano
Sonata.

Szymanowski begins the Development (mm. 118-212)
with other abrupt harmonic shifts, moving from a B Major
chord up a half step to a B-sharp Major chord to a C-sharp
eleventh chord in three consecutive measures (mm. 117-
119). These measures are followed by longer segments of
continuously changing tonalities. In the first part of
his Development Szymanowski's attention is directed pri-
marily to the manipulation of Motive "a" through a variety
of tonal areas and instrumental and tempo changes. Fol-
lowing this manipulation of Motive "a" Szymanowski intro-
duces frequent complete, segmented, or altered statements
of Themes A and B; oftentimes he has them sounding to-
gether. Under this thematic manipulation Szymanowski fre-
quently employs his Motive "a" as a counterpoint, but also
introduces new contrapuntal material. Thus, taking all of
these ideas into consideration, one may characterize the
Development as: employing full and frequent statements of
thematic material alternating throughout the various in-
strumental groups; having rapidly changing and at times
ambiguous tonalities; having constantly changing instru-
mentation; and showing an increased frequency of
constantly shifting tempi and styles referred to above in
the Exposition. Eventually, Szymanowski brings all of
this to a close by solidly returning to the tonality of B
Major, thus introducing a strong dominant preparation for
the return of Theme A in the tonic at the beginning of the
Recapitulation in measure 213.

Szymanowski’s Recapitulation (mm. 213-297) begins
with an exact repetition of the first twelve measure of
the Exposition, creating a strong sense of return. How-
ever, starting in measure 225 Szymanowski initiates com-
pression and variation of material, which lasts until the
close of the work. The Recapitulation, therefore, is
notable for its condensed and varied presentation of ma-
terial, less stable tonal movements, and denser orches-
tration than was observed in the Exposition, or for that
matter, in the Recapitulation of his Piano Sonata. In
particular, in his restatement of Theme 8, Szymanowski in-
troduces new contrapuntal material, harmonies, and orches-
tral textures, as in the A-Flat Major statement of Theme 8
in measures 233ff. and its statement on the dominant
(B Major) with totally different and more thickly scored
accompaniment in measures 257ff. Finally, after addi-
tional motivic and thematic manipulation, Szymanowski
closes his work in the tonic with a final repetition of
Theme A taken from the opening measures of the work, but
with fuller scoring, thus giving a strong sense of conclusion.

Throughout the Overture there are few surprises unless one considers the abrupt changes of keys between major and inner formal sections or in the constantly evolving material in the Development. One may, however, consider the more confident use of sonata form and the better use of motivic manipulation as surprises only because this work was written not long after the Piano Sonata which had shown weaknesses in both these areas. There is in the Overture a conspicuous growth in Szymanowski’s overall comfort in writing in sonata form. Finally, in comparison to the other orchestral works presented on the concerts, at least those available for study, it quickly becomes apparent that Szymanowski’s Overture qualitatively stands above those presented by Różycki and Fitelberg in individual creativity and general interest, but, at the same time, is the most heavily influenced by Strauss. In this respect, one has to agree with the Warsaw critics in their evaluations of the orchestral works presented.

In summation, after studying the variety of music presented on the three concerts, one comes to the conclusion that the accuracy of criticisms by the Warsaw and Berlin critics was mixed. Their general views of Szelluto’s music were warranted—in the final interpretation—
but the reasons for their views were, as we have observed, somewhat questionable. We have also found that Rozycki and Fitelberg's orchestral works are altogether better than the general critical view expressed, although they have their flaws. Additionally, we observed that Szymanowski's piano works, heavily influenced by Chopin and also Scriabin and Liszt, were the most positively accepted. As indicated above, this positive acceptance may be due mostly to the fact that they resounded with Chopin and utilized Polish folk material, even though they all possess interesting characteristics. Finally, we observed that Szymanowski's Overture was the orchestral work received most positively. Part of this acceptance, one may suspect, was the result of the favorable response to his piano works; the other part probably was the result of Szymanowski's better handling of orchestral, technical, and musical problems than that of his colleagues.

Of all the points mentioned in the preceding discussions, the most important are that the composers obviously searched westward--out of Poland--for new ideas and more modern approaches to composition, and that because of this search, their music was heavily dependent on Richard Strauss for creative impetus. In the final analysis, however, one must recognize that at this stage in their young careers, despite the modernizing intentions binding them, the four composers still were operating from the musical
perspective of classically oriented but highly gilded formal strictures. Nonetheless, of overriding significance is the fact that, because their music—except for Szymański's piano works—was severely criticized for this dependence and its consequent non-Polishness, the historically important public debate over the advancement of modernism in Polish music was initiated.
NOTES


6. Ibid.


CONCLUSION

This study of the publishing association Spółka Nakładowa Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich and its relationship to "Young Poland in Music" as an issue in Polish musical history has elucidated a number of points. The first point concerned the consequences of the shift in the artistic movement known as Young Poland from a Schopenhauerian base to one of revived nationalism grounded in Nietzschean thinking. This shift, combined with the revolutionary conditions of 1905, created a situation that accelerated the Polish post-Romantic artistic crisis existing at the turn of the twentieth century. As we have observed, this shift eventually affected music and, specifically, the historical understanding of Spółka Nakładowa.

The second point addressed the creation of "Young Poland in Music" myth, brought about by the critics' reaction to Polish society's yearnings for a musical "Young Poland" to accompany those Young Polands found in literature and the plastic arts. We have seen that, in response to this yearning, the governors of the newly-formed Warsaw Filharmonia eventually permitted Spółka Nakładowa to engage the orchestra in February, 1906 and March, 1907, in order to present public performances of its members' music. This was a tactical and very effective move on the part of
the governors, for it gave the appearance of fulfilling
the public's yearning for a Young Poland in Music. After
all, the four members of Spółka Nakładowa were all young
Polish composers who had, a few months earlier, estab-
lished their publishing company to promote the music of
young Polish composers. We also have seen that in re-
response to the first concert, the Warsaw musical press,
suitably inspired by the prevailing Young Poland atmos-
phere, and to a certain extent expressing the so-called
vox populi, lauded the concert as a reflection of the
ideals of the Young Poland period and even went so far as
to dub the composers "Young Poland in Music." However,
because the composers did not really fulfill the tenets of
the Young Poland movement, as became evident with the 1907
concert, the final critical reception of the music of
Spółka Nakładowa, except for the works of Szymanowski, was
one of general condemnation. Nevertheless, the contempo-
rary critics' initial identification of the publishing
association with the Young Poland movement resulted in the
protracted eighty-odd years of misunderstandings about
Spółka Nakładowa that have been cited in the foregoing
chapters.

Another important point concerned the clarification
of the actual membership and purpose of Spółka Nakładowa
from the external and erroneously perceived ideas of the
critics and public. This study has definitively concluded
that Spółka Nakładowa was an association made up of Karol Szymanowski, Ludomir Różycki, Grzegorz Fitelberg, and Apolinary Szeluto that did not include Mieczysław Karłowicz.

As the composers clearly stated, their purpose was two-fold: the first was to found a publishing house in order to break free from the restrictions of the small conservative publishing community in Poland; the second was to promote in print and in performance the works of its founders and other worthy Polish composers, thus avoiding a dependence on the good-will of conservative impresarios. As the documentation has revealed, this purpose eventually was ignored totally by contemporary and latter-day scholars, who incorrectly attributed the broader characteristics of Young Poland to the composers. This contributed to further misunderstandings of Spółka Nakładowa. While constantly being referred to as Young Poland in Music, Spółka Nakładowa was perceived as a group of composers that had a central nationalistic manifesto, indeed as a Polish nationalistic school, as well as a new Polish symphonic school. However, the present study has conclusively proved that Spółka Nakładowa was not an ideologically-based union of composers having a central manifesto, nor was it a school of any type, contrary to perception engendered over the past eighty years. The unifying element of the publishing company, if any, was the attitude of its founders toward art and the duty of the
artist. The composers' only musical goals were individualism and progress deriving from a protest against the hegemony of the Elsnerian-based tradition. Spółka Nakładowa's members were keenly aware of the distance between the actual European musical experience and the anachronistic, aesthetic model bequeathed them. Thus, these composers' only aesthetic bond was their desire to have Polish music adopt the contemporary advances of Western European music. Indeed, several of the works presented on the three concerts of Spójka Nakładowa introduced to Polish music elements of a contemporary musical vocabulary, compositional technique, and aesthetic, elements that precipitated the eventual break with the nativistic and German pseudo-classic stranglehold on Polish music.

In summation, by assessing all of the available evidence one must conclude that, while the Young Poland period existed in literature and in the plastic arts, and while Spółka Nakładowa was founded during that period, Young Poland in Music is a myth in Poland's music history, a myth that evolved from the misinterpretations of many individuals for over eight decades. It truly existed in the minds and desires of Poland's musical society, but not in the actual affiliation of the four composers. The inherent complexity of the Young Poland period, combined with the nationalistic fervor that had seized Polish society at the turn of the twentieth century
understandably led to misinterpretations of the historical facts concerning the association of these four young composers. Nonetheless, despite whatever errors in interpretation have developed over time, the emergence of these four composers in 1905-06 with their fresh, often revolutionary views on music was pivotal to the entrance of Polish music into the twentieth century.

Now that the basic historical facts concerning Spółka Nakładów Młodych Kompozytorów Polskich and "Young Poland in Music" have been delineated, research into other issues surrounding this composer's association can be pursued. Two such areas of continuing interest to this author concern further questions of Rezeptionsgeschichte and the wider implications of Nationalism in early twentieth-century Polish music.
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