

Gregor POMPE

Slovenian “Early Modernism” – Methodological, Terminological, Historiographical and Axiological Dilemmas

Slovėnijos „ankstyvasis modernizmas“ – metodologinės, terminologinės, istoriografinės ir aksiologinės dilemos

Abstract

The history of Slovenian music of the first decades after the First World War cannot be written without drawing certain parallels with the history of music in Central Europe. From this perspective, Slovenian composers in the period after 1918 followed the examples of the style that, according to Dahlhaus and Danuser, can be in German labelled as *die Moderne* (Gustav Mahler, Richard Strauss, Hugo Wolf) and in Slovenian correspondingly as *moderna*, the closest English appropriation of the term being “early modernism”. Before the war, Slovenian early modernist composers published their compositions in the magazine *Novi akordi*, and after the war they maintained the same stylistic orientation. What had changed was the social position of these composers: they were no longer the daring, young and innovative artistic generation, instead taking their place as the main leaders of Slovenian music culture, and therefore increasingly becoming the guardians of conservatism, of the aesthetics of expression, rooted in the romantic convictions of the 19th century. The present text analyses the aesthetic viewpoints and compositions of Anton Lajovic, Janko Ravnik and Lucijan Marija Škerjanc, who either almost ceased to compose after 1926 or remained indebted to the early modernist style well into the 20th century. It also examines works by Risto Savin and Emil Adamič, who embraced the new stylistic trends more eagerly, especially the New Objectivity, which was introduced into Slovenia by Slavko Osterc. The conclusion identifies the specifics of Slovenian early modernism, especially its commitment to the more intimate, lyrical genres of *lieder* and piano pieces, which were more typical of the 19th century than of the early modernism of the canonised Central European composers, who wrote predominantly large *weltanschauung* symphonies and operas.

Keywords: Slovenian music, music of the 20th century, modernism, early modernism, historiography.

Anotacija

Slovėnijos muzikos istorija, susiklosčiusi pirmais dešimtmečiais po Pirmojo pasaulinio karo, negali būti aprašyta nepasitelkiant tam tikrų Vidurio Europos muzikos istorijos paralelių. Žvelgiant šiuo aspektu, po 1918 m. kūrė slovēnų kompozitoriai rėmėsi pavyzdžiais stilistikos, kuri, pasak Carlo Dahlhauso ir Hermanno Danusero, gali būti vokiškai pavadinta *die Moderne* (Gustavas Mahleris, Richardas Straussas, Hugo Wolfas), o slovėniškai – *moderna* (artimiausias esmei šio termino vertimas būtų „ankstyvasis modernizmas“). Prieš karą slovēnų ankstyvojo modernizmo atstovai publikavo savo kompozicijas žurnale „Novi akordi“ ir tą pačią stilistinę orientaciją išlaikė pokario metais. Tiesa, pasikeitė socialinė šių kompozitorių pozicija: jie nebepriklausė drąsių, jaunų ir novatoriškų menininkų kartai, o užėmė Slovėnijos muzikinės kultūros lyderių poziciją, tuo pat metu tapdami konservatyvizmo saugotojais, propaguojančiais ekspresijos estetiką, grįstą XIX a. romantiniais įsitikinimais. Straipsnis analizuoja Antono Lajovico, Janko Ravniko ir Lucijano Marijos Škerjanco estetinius požiūrio taškus ir kompozicijas. Šie kompozitoriai arba beveik nustojo kurti po 1925 m., arba liko skolingi ankstyvojo modernizmo stilistikai net ir įsibėgėjęs XX a. Taip pat nagrinėjami Risto Savino ir Emilio Adamičio kūriniai. Tie kompozitoriai gerokai lengviau priėmė naujas stilistikos tendencijas, ypač naująjį objektyvumą, kurį Slovėnijoje išpopuliarino Slavko Ostercas. Išvadoje pristatoma Slovėnijos ankstyvojo modernizmo specifika, ypač jos prielankumas labiau intymiems ir lyriškiems žanrams, tokiems kaip *lied* ir fortepijoninė muzika. Šie žanrai buvo būdingesni XIX a. nei ankstyvajam modernizmui, kurį kūrė kanonizuoti Vidurio Europos kompozitoriai – šie mieliau rinkosi kurti didelės apimties *weltanschauung* simfonijas ir operas.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: Slovėnijos muzika, XX a. muzika, modernizmas, ankstyvasis modernizmas, istoriografija.

Methodological and historical starting points

The present text can be considered as an early attempt to write the first chapter of a new history of Slovenian music of the 20th century. It therefore addresses two issues: while attempting to present the Slovenian music of the first decades of the 20th century, it also poses some important methodological questions, mostly associated with the specifics of writing the music history of a nation that was

not in the centre of European developments, but nor was it totally cut off from the important trends and innovations. Slovenia is positioned on the border of Central Europe, resulting in a specific relationship between international influences and local specifics (information about new developments arrived quickly, but these developments were only sporadically absorbed into the current musical praxis), as well as between more developed music culture in terms of performing infrastructure and more restrained

compositional practices. Hence, one of the important problems is connected with whether it is possible to adopt the musical-historiographic categories that were developed with regard to the music that forms the canon of 20th century European art music for describing the local music history, which should also demonstrate local specifics and deviations. Should one focus on discovering influences and consequently write the history of Slovenian music as a parallel but nevertheless integral part of European music, or should one invest all of one's efforts into revealing national characteristics, and therefore write a more or less independent, autonomous history of Slovenian music? My point of departure is the assertion that both principles should be merged, skilfully controlled and adapted to the specific periods and trends, but for the time being my methodology will follow two consecutive steps:

1) first I will describe the achievements of Slovenian music in first decades of the 20th century, and then

2) I will compare these results with the "canonised" European music history of the same period in order to highlight local differences and characteristics.

This comparison will hopefully also provide some answers to the central methodological dilemmas.

The end of the First World War can be used as an important historical as well as socio-cultural division in Slovenian 20th century history: after 1918, the Slovenian national space entered the political alliance of the South Slavs, within which we can speak for the first time of limited political sovereignty of the Slovenian nation, and consequently of Slovenian culture (e.g., the Slovenian language was introduced at all levels of the education system and the first university was founded). Greater autonomy and an opportunity for national growth in music culture is reflected in the establishment of national music institutions and bodies (the nationalisation of the Philharmonic Society, formerly the distinctly German *Philharmonische Gesellschaft*; the founding of the Ljubljana Music Conservatory in 1919, which transformed into the Academy of Music in 1939; the further expansion of the already strongly proliferated choral activity; the important influence of the increasingly regular radio broadcasting from 1928), while the role of the German population in cultural life diminished (Cvetko 1991: 378). However, the early euphoria was soon replaced by bitter sobriety: with the new constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes of 1921, the state was heavily centralised. Therefore, "the time after First World War, the first decade, brings stagnation in Slovenian music compared to the other arts. This stagnation can be found on the organisational as well as on the creative and performative levels" (Kuret 1988: 70). Atypical example of such stagnation is the Philharmonic

Society. Prior to the war, the institution operated under the name *Philharmonische Gesellschaft* and was managed by the Germans, but in 1918 it was nationalised under the baton of Anton Lajovic (1878–1960), a move that was regarded as a great national act. The *Philharmonische Gesellschaft* had, in the period before the First World War, provided fruitful symphonic seasons, but after nationalisation the society came under the auspices of the music society *Glasbena matica*, which was not capable of organising a full symphonic season, nor of establishing a new symphony orchestra. This resulted in an almost complete lack of symphonic music in Slovenia (some concerts were given by the Opera Orchestra, some by the military band and some by the amateurs of the Orchestral Society). The central role in musical life was regained by *Glasbena matica*, which continued its pre-war ideology. Whereas in the time of German political and cultural predominance the tasks of collecting folk music and performing choral music had been of great significance for nurturing national identity and self-confidence, it was precisely these endeavours that lost their importance in the period after 1918. Nevertheless, *Glasbena matica* continued to nurture the cult of amateurism, which, in the new socio-political situation, prevented a more rapid professionalization of Slovenian music culture (Kuret 1988: 71). The main representatives of this ideology were the leaders of *Glasbena matica*, conductor Matej Hubad (1866–1937) and composer / lawyer Anton Lajovic, and anyone seeking a new way or criticising the ideology of *Glasbena matica* was at risk of becoming an outsider, as was the case with composer Marij Kogoj (1892–1956). It therefore comes as no surprise that nothing changed in the post-war period with regard to compositional techniques and style. Most Slovenian composers maintained their interest in early modernism, as is reflected by the *lieder* of Lajovic and Risto Savin (1858–1948), the choral piece *Trenotek (Moment)* by Kogoj, and the piano compositions by Janko Ravnik (1891–1982). All of these compositions were published in the magazine *Novi akordi (New Chords)*, which was published and edited by another lawyer / composer, Gojmir Krek (1875–1942), who had lived in Vienna before the war and was primarily interested in raising the quantity and quality of Slovenian instrumental music, which he felt was neglected and underdeveloped.

The question of "early modernism" (*die Moderne*)

I have labelled the style of the aforementioned composers as early modernism, bearing in mind the untranslatable German designation *die Moderne*. The terminology is unproblematic in Slovenian, which, similar to German, distinguishes between *modernizem* (modernism, *der*

Modernismus) and *moderna* (“early modernism”, *die Moderne*). More importantly, this term is common not only in Slovenian musicology, but also in Slovenian literary criticism, where it is used to designate the literature of Ivan Cankar (1876–1918), Josip Murn Aleksandrov (1879–1901), Dragotin Kette (1876–1899) and Oton Župančič (1878–1949), all great poets and writers who lived and published in the time of *Novi akordi*, and whose works could be stylistically described as a mixture of symbolism, decadence, neo-romanticism (*die Neuromantik*) and impressionism (Kos 1987: 146). According to Carl Dahlhaus, who uses the term *die Moderne* in the most convincing manner, these are precisely the trends that are typical of the music of the last decade of the 19th century. Dahlhaus is convinced that it would be very difficult to define all of these stylistic terms (impressionism, secession, symbolism, etc.) with pure compositional-technical designations, although some of their characteristics can be found in compositions of this period (the first prototypes include Strauss’ symphonic poem *Don Juan*, 1889, Mahler’s *First Symphony*, 1889, and Wolf’s *lieder*). Following Austrian writer and critic Hermann Bahr (1863–1934), who was the first to use the term *die Moderne*, Dahlhaus therefore suggests this designation as a kind of umbrella term for all of the smaller movements of the *Fin de siècle* (Dahlhaus 1980: 280).

The key feature of *die Moderne* is ambivalence: on the compositional-technical level, composers had already embraced certain new techniques, procedures and materials, while, on the level of aesthetics, they remained indebted to the romantic idea of expression. Dahlhaus also highlights the stability of the genre system, which later collapses: the composers of *die Moderne* still composed symphonies, operas, *lieder* and symphonic poems for traditional forces (symphony orchestra, string quartet), whereas later modernists wrote compositions – often called simply “pieces” – for innovative instrumental combinations (mainly chamber configurations) with new formal ideas (Ibid.: 281).

Carl Dahlhaus’ diction was later also adopted by Hermann Danuser in his history of 20th century music (Danuser, 1984). For our purposes, the most important part of the latter’s writing is the notion of *die Spätzeit der Moderne* (the late time of early modernism). With this designation, Danuser solves the problem of the ending point of *die Moderne*. Dahlhaus gives us two possibilities – Schoenberg’s embracing of atonality in 1908 or the end of expressionism with the rise of dodecaphony in 1924 – while Danuser understands this timeframe (1908–1925) as the period of *die Spätzeit der Moderne*, which brought one important turning point: the composers who spearheaded

development and innovation at the end of the 19th century became increasingly conservative and restrained regarding the innovations of Schoenberg and his pupils (one need only think of Richard Strauss and the major stylistic difference separating his operas *Elektra*, 1908, and *Der Rosenkavalier*, 1911; Strauss’ very negative and dismissive private opinion of Schoenberg’s music is also symptomatic; Ibid.: 282). It seems that the ambivalent position of early modernism was not longer acceptable in the time of *die Spätzeit der Moderne*; composers were somehow obliged to choose between a more conservative and a more innovative approach. In other words, to be in-between, which typified the composers of early modernism in the last decade of the 19th century, was not innovative enough in the first decade of the 20th century, the quest for innovation being one of the key forces of the modernist movement.

Although English-language musicology does not have a similar term available, it nevertheless discovers the same phenomena. Hence Leon Botstein, in his article *Modernism in Grove Music Online*, places the beginnings of modernism precisely in the time of *die Moderne*:

Modernism first took shape as a historical phenomenon between 1883 and 1914. [...] By the early 1890s, the word was used equally in assigning praise and blame with respect to post-Wagnerian music that experimented with form, tonality and orchestration in a manner evocative of the radical qualities of contemporary culture and society. (Botstein 2015)

Later, however, he corrects this view somewhat with the statement that Mahler, Debussy, Scriabin and R. Strauss “were ultimately understood as precursors of the 20th century Modernism”. The difference between being a precursor or an early representative of a new style is, however, rather insignificant; more important is the notion of ambivalence and a new beginning, which, in its early stages, was still firmly rooted in the aesthetics of the “old” style.

The lack of an English term for *die Moderne* could, however, also be a sign that this style was somehow predominantly bound to Central Europe, a group of nations that were under the cultural influence of the German-speaking world. Slovenia can also be placed in this group. Thus, the term *die Moderne* is not used only in Slovenian literary criticism, but also in Slovenian musicology. Dragotin Cvetko, the “father” of Slovenian musicology and the author of the first thorough history of Slovenian music, used it when describing the endeavours of the more advanced composers of the magazine *Novi akordi* (Cvetko 1964: 262), although he later also used the term late romantics (Cvetko 1991: 358), which was rejected by Dahlhaus as a terminological blunder (Dahlhaus 1980: 280). Cvetko was, however, aware of the central early modernist dichotomy; in a later book, he uses the term late romantics for the pre-war

early modernists, applying the descriptive but tautological title "between early modernism and tradition" (the essence of early modernism is precisely its ambivalent relationship towards tradition and innovation; Cvetko 1991: 377). Later, Slovenian musicology was more cautious, and the term late romantics was avoided. Hence, Darja Koter avoids any stylistic designation and speaks about the music of the interwar period (Koter 2012: 19); Niall O'Loughlin, an English musicologist who devoted his life to the history of 20th century Slovenian music, writes in the manner of Botstein about "music precursors" who remained indebted to the "romantic tradition" (O'Loughlin 2000: 17); while Ivan Klemenčič uses the stylistic designations romanticism and impressionism in opposition to expressionism and the avant-garde (Klemenčič 2000: 127). It must be clear that all of the aforementioned historians are aware of the typical ambivalence, of the dichotomy between the traditional and the "new", which is the essence of "early modernism" or *die Moderne*.

In Slovenia, the first traces of early modernism can be found in the compositions of Risto Savin, Anton Lajovic, Marij Kogoj and Janko Ravnik, published in the magazine *Novi akordi*. Before the First World War, these compositions acquired the status of being completely new and advanced, and as such were greeted by the editor Krek with the typically emphatic words:

When the rising generation of composers begins with such products [Krek is referring to Kogoj's choral piece *Trenotek*] we can await the future full of pleasant hopes. Our choral masters will shake their heads, but we ask them: Is it not delightful to watch how our youngest apprehend the art? (Krek 1914: 17)

After the war, the same group of composers – with the exception of Kogoj and the addition of the slightly younger Lucijan Marija Škerjanc (1900–1973) – took over the leading role in music culture: Lajovic was the administrator of the Philharmonic Society, which was attached to *Glasbena matica*, where he also had an important influence; Škerjanc was a lifelong professor for composition at the Academy of Music and, from 1950 to 1955, also the manager of the Slovenian Philharmonic; while Ravnik established his distinguished pianistic school as a piano professor at the Academy. Stylistically, all three remained more or less faithful to pre-war early modernism, so their aesthetic attitude remained unchanged. What had changed was their social position: they were no longer the leaders of progress, the catalysts of innovation; on the contrary, they became the most prominent representatives of aesthetic conservatism. It is therefore possible to connect their position to Danuser's notion of *die Spätzeit der Moderne*; in English one can ironically label them as representatives of "late early modernism".

"Late early modernists": Anton Lajovic, Lucijan Marija Škerjanc and Janko Ravnik

The most typical representative of late early modernism in Slovenian music is undoubtedly Anton Lajovic. He studied law in Vienna, which connects him directly to the older generations of Slovenian composers, who were almost as a rule medical doctors (e.g., the Ipavec family: Benjamin, Gustav and Josip) or lawyers (e.g., Gojmir Krek). In addition to law, he studied music at the Conservatory under Robert Fuchs (who was also the mentor of Wolf, Mahler, Zemlinsky and Schreker), completing his music studies in 1902 and law in 1906 in Graz (Cvetko 1985: 15). During this time, he had close connections with *Glasbena matica*, which supported his studies. His most prolific creative period was the pre-war era, when he composed his best known *lieder* (e.g., *Mesec v izbi* on the text by Li-Tai-Po, who also inspired Mahler in his *Das Lied von der Erde*). Lajovic's compositional technique is predominantly homophonic, he uses tripartite forms almost without exception; he is at his best in miniature forms, and at his most innovative in his harmony, which is full of alterations, unresolved seventh chords and unprepared dissonances. Hugo Wolf therefore comes to mind as a possible model, although Lajovic paid much more attention writing a singable melodic line.

After the war, Lajovic became a kind of *spiritus agens* of Slovenian music culture (Ibid.: 116). He was employed as a judge and his compositional inspiration was sporadic, so he devoted more time to various essays in which he passionately advocated his often polemic ideology. It seems that, in the new social conditions, he was more interested in controlling cultural life than pursuing his own artistic expression. He was particularly interested in sociology, and he read widely,¹ becoming remarkably well educated compared to the average Slovenian musician. However, his extensive reading only reinforced his ambivalent position, which was therefore a typical early modernist view. For example, he was somehow convinced that art performs social functions, but that the artist himself should nevertheless follow the imperative of *l'art pour l'art*, which seems somewhat paradoxical. The topic in which he invested the majority of his energy, however, was the question of national art / culture. It is no exaggeration to claim that Lajovic was a true nationalist. He was convinced that there is no such thing as international culture, believing that culture is inevitably bound to the nation (after Kuret 1988: 96) and that there accordingly exists very little mutual understanding between cultures of different nations or about the artefacts they produce. Consequently, the nation should give preference to nurturing its own culture, especially a nation like Slovenian, which was for a very long time suppressed by the dominant German culture, preventing the growth of an independent cultural identity. Typical of this attitude

was Lajovic's judgment of the repertoire performed by the military band of the *Dravska divizija* (Drava Division), led by conductor Josip Čerin:

What causes me almost physical uneasiness at Čerin's concerts is that I see in each of them a quite regular part of the Ljubljana German minority. [...] If I judge the essence of his concert repertoire of recent years, I see the same basic thread: the essence of his programmes is represented by *German music* (Lajovic after Kuret 1988: 113).

Later, he also spoke about the "poison of German music" (Ibid.: 115): Slovenian music must first gain its own national identity and only then will it be prepared to be confronted with "international" music and to be exported. The main task of national cultural institutions should therefore be the performance of Slovenian music, operas and dramas. Lajovic's views were radical, and they were met with strong opposition. Particularly fierce were the responses of art historian Stanko Vurnik (1898–1932) and composer Kogoj (*Vzajemnost evropskih kultur*),² but their arguments did not halt Lajovic's crusade.

Lajovic's anti-German attitude did, however, also conceal some seemingly typical German prejudices: when reporting about concerts organised by the ISCM, he devoted a great deal of attention to commenting on compositions by Jewish composers, whom he regarded as a special national group, sharing the same aesthetic and compositional characteristics. Lajovic was convinced that the latter were intimately connected to the specifics of the Jewish nation, and his argumentation came close to Wagner's infamous claims in his pamphlet *Das Judenthum in der Musik* (1850). Like Wagner, Lajovic was convinced that the fragmented, highly negative and "dark" nature of Jewish music reveals traces of a broken, atomised nation without a homeland: "Schoenberg's amorphism is a faithful, albeit instinctive image of the broken Jewish soul" (Lajovic after Kuret 1988: 151). According to Lajovic, Jewish music has many different faces, leading in fact to the faceless international music of the time (Kuret 1988: 143).

Although Lajovic was well educated and well read, it is clear that he was a kind of a relativist and pragmatist, who strongly followed his emotional instincts. He openly rejected the importance of the intellect and rationality in the domain of art, believing that German contemporary music was dull and non-suggestive (Ibid.: 186), while true national art can be achieved only through intuition. The same holds true for the evaluation of artworks, which leads out of the realm of the intellect and into the realm of emotions (Ibid.: 245). Such strong emphasis on the importance of emotions and intuition clearly reveals Lajovic's commitment to the aesthetic of expression that had dominated the 19th century, reaching its climax in

the works of Wagner. However, it is precisely the axis emotionalism-Wagner that reveals Lajovic's main personal paradox (perhaps ambivalence): he constantly repeated the mantra about the poison of the seeming beauty of works by Bach, Beethoven and Wagner, but at the same time it was precisely German music culture to which he was indebted on the aesthetic and compositional level. This was exactly the answer that Stanko Vurnik gave to Lajovic in one of his responses to Lajovic's writings:

If we cut the path of German influences that leads toward us, and if we exterminate from our culture everything that resembles German culture, then we are robbed of any culture at all (Lajovic alone would lose a great portion of his oeuvre). (Vurnik after Kuret 1988: 369)

It may in fact be an awareness of this paradox that caused the decline in Lajovic's compositional activities after the war. Whereas the *lied* was the main genre of his pre-war oeuvre, after the war Lajovic devoted more attention to choral music, resulting in the publication of *Dvanajst pesmi za zbor* (*Twelve Songs for Choir*, 1920). The songs in this collection could be ascribed to two types: the first, composed on the verses of Oton Župančič, bring a more joyful note, some ironic distance and very stylised echoes of folk music (the use of asymmetrical meters: 5/4, 7/4; the combination of a solo that announces the main melodic material, followed by the repeated phrase in the whole choir), while the songs composed on the verses of Croatian poet Dragutin Domjanić (1875–1933) – written in the Kajkavian dialect, which strongly resembles Slovenian dialects from the border regions with Croatia – are more "impressionistic", with loose harmony and a slow tempo. The latter in particular represent the peak of Lajovic's post-war achievement, as well as representing the climax of the ambivalence of early modernism (similar to the point that R. Strauss touched with his *Elektra*, but, of course, in a totally different genre). In the song *Lan* (*Flax*), the composer's harmony reached extreme borders of tonal logic (the use of accidentals suggests E major, although the E major triad comes to the fore only once in the entire composition: the choir begins with a 13th chord and ends on an E major chord with an additional *sixte ajoutée*, much like in Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde*; the cadential logic is not strictly functional), and he abandoned the clear tripartite ABA form (it could be analysed as ABBC form with developed transitional sections), while remaining faithful to a periodic logic. The result is a kind of a dreamy atmosphere that alternatively suggests the echoes of highly stylised folk music (the *quasi ostinato* bass in the middle part), indulges in "sweet" harmonies, or presents some hints of melodic cells that quickly sink and give word to the interesting harmonic turns.

Široko, izrazito.

Dal - ko po - lje, be - ti dan, vpo - fju se za - pla - vil lan - ro - sa dro - bna le sve - ti,
du - sa dra - ga gdje si vi? Du - sa dra - ga gdje si vi?

Example 1. The beginning of the choral song *Lan*

In 1922, Lajovic also tackled the genre that was most undernourished in Slovenian music: symphonic music. His *Caprice* is again a testimony to his aesthetic ambivalence: conceived in a simple ABA form, the entire composition is written in a 5/4 metre, which is considered to be a feature of Slovenian folk music; the periodic logic is preserved, but instead of threading two-bar phrases, Lajovic follows a three-bar pattern that can be again understood as a specific folk music characteristic, as is the use of the Dorian mode in the A section, which could even be reminiscent of Béla Bartók. There is, however, another formal level, that of motivic development, which is conceived in an almost Brahmsian way: practically the whole composition is derived from a small cell and its transformations (even in the expression of the contrasting middle section). To this, one can add the third stylistic trait: the very fresh orchestration, with the remarkable role of the piano, reminiscent of Stravinsky's *Petrushka*, a composition that Lajovic heard at the Festival of Slavic Music in Zagreb in 1924 and greatly praised in his review (Kuret 1988: 121).³ Following his own ideology, Lajovic tried to establish a kind of national art that would find its own, distinct identity, released from German cultural influences, but in fact his "model" was derived from and mixed with Brahmsian economic motivic-thematic work, the inclusion of folk elements, and the colour refinements of Stravinsky.

There is no doubt that, with time, Lajovic became increasingly aware of his own inner paradoxes, thus producing fewer and fewer compositions. After the completion of *Caprice*, he was more or less silent as a composer, but in 1938, some 15 years later, he completed his swan song, perhaps his most "sincere" piece, which is, of course, once again marked by specific ambivalence: *Pesem jeseni* (*Song of Autumn*). Lajovic wrote this ambitious symphonic piece without a clear programme, but the subtitle itself – the genre designation "symphonic lyrical poem" – brings us back to the *lied*, and it is therefore of no surprise that the form of the work is torn between tripartite song form and sonata form. However, rather than for the composer himself, this kind of formal conception

raised problems for Slovenian musicology. Hence, Cvetko speaks about tripartite form in connection with *Pesem jeseni* (Cvetko 1985: 67); Škerjanc about A and B sections, disintegrated into even smaller sections that are intertwined by the logic of free variations (Škerjanc, 1958: 86); Koter about loose song form with variations (Koter 2012: 90); while Ivan Klemenčič was convinced that the composer's plan was to write in sonata form, but that he failed to do so because he was unable to compose a proper development section, and therefore replaced it with new thematic material (Klemenčič 2000: 127).

Precise analysis reveals that Klemenčič was the closest to the correct "solution", but in the end he too fell back on the old prejudice that Lajovic was incapable of writing proper motivic development, and therefore of creating developed symphonic form. It is, however, astonishing how straightforward Lajovic's conception of sonata form is (see Table 1). After the introduction, he presents the first subject in G minor, which is followed by a slightly livelier transition in C minor, based on new material that leads towards the second subject in D major (the dominant of the central G minor), and the exposition is concluded with a short final phrase that again brings new material. What follows is not a simple repetition, but in fact a written out repetition of the exposition (instead of using repetition marks), which brings only slight changes in orchestration (the most prominent being the ornamentations in the solo violin accompanying the first subject). Only then does the development section begin, commencing with a reworking of material from the transition. Very soon, however, Lajovic's uneasiness with sonata form, which has led other analysts to understand the composition as being in song form, becomes apparent: instead of developing the exposed material, he presents another thematic subject (C), which in reality springs from a seemingly unimportant figure in the final phrase. Later, however, Lajovic also touches upon other material from the exposition, leading to the biggest climax, which at the same time serves as the beginning of the recapitulation. The first subject is now presented in a solemn G major, as is the second: the dialectic between tonic and dominant

Introduction	Exposition							
announcement of the rhythm of the 1 st subject	1 st subject	transition	2 nd subject	final phrase	1 st subject	transition	2 nd subject	final phrase
G minor	G minor	C minor	D major	G minor	G minor	C minor	D major	G minor
<i>Larghetto</i>	<i>Živabnejše (Livelier)</i>			<i>Tempo I^o</i>	<i>Živabnejše</i>			

Development					Reprise			
material from the transition	new material (C)	material from the 2 nd subject	material from the 1 st subject	material from the final phrase	1 st subject	transition	2 nd subject	final phrase
F minor	G major	E-flat major	A minor	D-flat major	G major	C minor	G major	C minor
					<i>Tempo I^o</i>	<i>Živabnejše</i>		

Coda		
the new material from the exposition (C)	2 nd subject	1 st subject
G major		G minor

Table 1. The form of the symphonic lyrical poem *Pesem jeseni*

is surpassed. Yet Lajovic complicates the overall form by adding an extensive coda, which again brings the material (C) that was presented in the development. Lajovic's sonata form is rather straightforward; what obscures it is not so much the new material in the development and the extensive coda, but the quality of the material, which is always singable, as well as the fact that there is no contrast or opposition (with the exception of the tonal plan) between the first and the second subjects, both of which are "hopelessly" lyrical. It is precisely this characteristic that must have led Lajovic to give the composition its genre subtitle – "symphonic lyrical poem" – and the final result could be understood as a true symphonic form by a composer whose inspiration was predominantly of a vocal nature. However, this is just another example of the typical ambivalence of early modernism (the fusion of symphonic form and song is also typical of Mahler), or, perhaps better, a statement of an "old" composer writing a "romantic" piece in the time of high modernism, and therefore a typical example of "late early modernism".

Ravnik's compositional "path" and personal career were similar to those of Lajovic. He reached his peak with piano compositions, published in *Novi akordi*. Ravnik, a piano student at the Prague Conservatory (1911–1915), was the first Slovenian composer to write piano pieces that were conceived in an idiomatic manner, tailored to the specifics of the instrument and performing techniques. After the war, he became a piano teacher at the Conservatory of *Glasbena matica*, and subsequently also a piano professor at the Academy.

However, his compositional voice became very sporadic, and after the war he finished only a few compositions: the *lieder* cycle *Seguidille* (1919), and piano compositions *List v album* (*Album Leaf*, 1921), *Groteskna koračnica* (*Grotesque March*, 1943) and *Nokturno* (*Nocturne*, 1951).

In the pre-war period, Ravnik was, like Lajovic, at the forefront of the new trends and innovations. He remained faithful to straightforward tripartite form and periodic logic, deriving most of his novelty from the imaginative use of harmony. In an autobiographical manner, Ravnik explained his fascination with the perception of just one isolated C major chord:

At that moment it was clear to me how much beauty there is in vertical music – in a single chord! (Ravnik after Bogunović Hočevar 2009: 47).

The composition *List v album* is a typical representative of this vein: the structure is periodic and the form a simple AA' + coda, while the harmony is more "advanced", with complex chromaticism somehow connected to the still central D minor tonality. The same could be said of the cycle *Seguidille*, based on poems by Oton Župančič. Once again, the leading role is attributed to piano harmonies, while the melodic voice is subjected to surprising harmonic shifts and combinations. More important is the overall conception of the cycle, which is bound together with the help of recurring motifs. After *List v album* from 1921, however, Ravnik composed his next piece, *Groteska koračnica*, not fewer than 22 years later, in 1943, a gap that can be compared to Lajovic's artistic silence separating *Dvanajst pesmi* and *Pesem jeseni*.



Example 2. The beginning of the piece *List v album*

Again, the reasons for this creative silence should not be ascribed to the composer's personal situation, nor to the prevailing social situation, but above all to his aesthetic convictions. In his own words, Ravnik searched for "beauty" in his art, attempting to reflect "human emotionality" in his music (Ravnik 1968: 74). In his letter to a friend from the 1950s or 1960s, he indirectly revealed his aesthetic position:

Do you notice, perhaps, that today's young people are somehow differently oriented? And that there is no sunny place for us "romantically" sensitive artists? And that there is no place for sentiment? (Ravnik after Bogunović Hočevar 2009: 60)

It is clear that Ravnik was committed to the aesthetic of expression (emotionality, human feelings) and the metaphysical conception of beauty, thus to the aesthetic postulates of the 19th century. With his harmony, Ravnik greeted the 20th century, but his expression was rooted in the 19th century, and his work can therefore be understood in the context of "late early modernism".

The same holds true for Škerjanc, but with one important exception: he did not cease to compose in the 1920s. Quite the opposite: his opus is vast, embracing almost all genres, including those that had been neglected by his predecessors. His role as a pioneer of genre, together with his long tenure as a professor of composition at the Academy of Music, assure Škerjanc the leading position in the history of Slovenian music of the 20th century. In other words, his position is typically ambivalent: his "figure is important, but conservative" (O'Loughlin 2000: 259) and can therefore again be understood in the context of "early modernism". In spite of this position, Škerjanc's role in the history of the 20th century also has some shady tones.

In the time of the First World War, Škerjanc presented his first mature compositions: his *lieder*, which reveal some influence of Lajovic and share some characteristics with Ravnik's pieces. Thus Škerjanc's attention is focused on harmony, the vocal part is more recitative than melodic, the piano part reveals an idiomatic conception, the basic atmosphere is almost always lyrical, and the selected poetry brings above all impressionistic images and atmospheres, giving the impression that the composer was avoiding

more existentialistic texts. His inspiration is two-fold: it stems from complex harmonic-functional relationships (as a commitment to post-Wagnerian harmony) or coloristic ideas (Bergamo 1990: 197) that remind us of impressionism (for his first concert, Škerjanc selected Debussy's *Preludes* in addition to his own *lieder*, which sheds light on his preferences, Koter 2001: 50).

Later, Škerjanc went on to study in Prague (1920–1921), between 1922 and 1924 he studied composition in Vienna with Joseph Marx, and from 1924 to 1927 he studied at the *Schola cantorum* in Paris with Vincent d'Indy. This international milieu brought new stylistic impulses, with which Škerjanc experimented in the 1920s, when he approached expressionism stylistically (Klemenčič 2000: 167). His most "daring" compositions from this period are the *Concerto for Violin and Orchestra*, the *Concerto for Orchestra*, the piano variations *Pro memoria* and the *Three Poems after Gradnik*. With his *Concerto for Violin* (1927; later, in 1944, the composer wrote a second violin concerto, but he did not number the two works) Škerjanc reached his most adventurous stage: on the level of harmony, there is almost a complete lack of tonal stability, which is often compensated for with ostinato rhythms (Barbo 2001: 41); there is no thematic evolution, although one can discern some splinters of motivic material; the texture is very dense; the relationship between the soloist and the orchestra is troubled; the orchestration is very heavy (with six horns and two saxophones); and on the formal level the concerto is fragmented, consisting of a succession of episodes with constantly changing meter and tempo. However, this dreamy fragmentation, a kind of "formal looseness" (Pokorn after Barbo 2001: 40), is not really something new in Škerjanc's oeuvre: it can be regarded as an offshoot of "his basic impulse [...] that springs from the piano and an improvisational relationship towards the instrument" (Bergamo 1990: 194). In other words: Škerjanc applied the most daring improvisatory procedures in his pieces from the late 1920s, but in the 1930 he "regressed" to the more traditional concepts of "early modernism", sometimes supplemented with the clearer structures of neoclassicism.

The most prominent sign of Škerjanc's indebtedness to the tradition is his commitment to conventional genres: in a period of just a few years, he tackled several classical cyclical forms, starting with the *First Symphony* (1931, first conceived as a symphonic movement, but realised as a symphony in one movement), which was followed by the *Wind Quintet* (1934), the *Fourth String Quartet* (1934), the *Piano Trio* (1935) and the *Seven Nocturnes for piano* (1935). The *First Symphony* in particular, with its sonata form and impressionistic harmonies, sounds like a late product of early modernism, while the *Nocturnes* bare some traces of Scriabin's harmonic procedures. In addition to Škerjanc's love for unresolved seventh chords, connected with long melodic spans, this period is marked by open references to the baroque and classicism, testifying to Škerjanc's assimilation of neoclassical procedures. The *Prelude, Aria and Finale* for strings (1933) already brings neo-baroque monothematic motoric impulses and counterpoint, suggesting the influence of Hindemith; *Suita v starem slogu (Suite in an Old Style)*, 1934) is conceived as a kind of *concerto grosso* (string quartet as *concertino* vs. string orchestra as *ripieno*); while the extensive sonatas for cello (1935) and viola (1936), with their succession of baroque forms, could be understood as a homage to Bach's partitas.

It could be claimed that, with each year and each new influence, Škerjanc's opus became more eclectic (in his works he combined the basic romantic idea of an artwork as an expression of emotion, but with a sense for impressionistically coloured harmony, traditional forms and some hints of neoclassicism), although the principal stylistic tone nevertheless remained indebted to early modernism. In the late 1950s, he even experimented with dodecaphony, but in the compositions *Sedem dvanajsttonskih fragmentov (Seven Twelve-Tone Fragments)*, 1958) and *Tri skladbe za violino in klavir (Three Pieces for Violin and Piano)*, 1959) twelve-tone rows are used more as thematic material; there are some hints of inversions and retrogrades, but Škerjanc does not apply the full system, instead handling the rows as melodies, avoiding dense counterpoint or complex solutions. This kind of treatment clearly reveals his central aesthetic position, which, deep into the 20th century, was still attached to the aesthetics of the 19th century, that is, to the central notions of expression and emotionality. Škerjanc himself acknowledged:

Our century has brought music so many technical resources, so many totally polished systems, new procedures and views on musical material, that technical ability has often outgrown expression, and so an era has begun that gives the impression that composition is generally learnable, like the subjects of general education. (Škerjanc 1953: 170)

Much like Lajovic, Škerjanc rejected the importance of the intellect, and in connection with dodecaphony and serialism he repeatedly spoke about "calculating operations", "numerical relationships" and "elemental mathematics", all designations that he understood as pejorative. In opposition to these terms, he promoted "sincerity", believing that the convincingness of an artwork is:

... a function of the inner ecstasy that pervades the artist-creator when working, and an ability to lay the reflection of such ecstasy more or less perfectly as a foundation of the artwork. Only the artwork that faithfully reflects this kind of artist's mood can move us and take us to this special world. (Škerjanc 1953: 178)

Such statements are clear declarations of Škerjanc's "romantic" aesthetics, which remained unchanged deep into the second half of the 20th century. Although they clearly belonged to the past, Škerjanc's important position in Slovenian music culture gave them special importance, almost gaining the status of eternal truth. As a professor of composition, Škerjanc was able to pass on his aesthetic convictions to many younger generations of composers, but as a director of the Slovenian Philharmonic (1950–1955), regular member of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (from 1949 onwards) and recipient of the highest state prizes, he was also an important, influential and powerful figure in wider cultural life, which enabled him to impose his ideas as a kind of a basic aesthetic canon, resulting in the prevailing conservatism of Slovenian music after the Second World War.

Nevertheless, or perhaps precisely for this reason, Škerjanc must be regarded as one of the central figures of Slovenian music of the 20th century. He was one of the first Slovenian composers with a really astonishing compositional technique, who devoted all of his life to composition: his vast oeuvre testifies to his great craftsmanship, although some of his compositions show a certain lack of melodic inspiration and can be regarded as indulging in "open", impressionistic harmonies. One of his main contributions is connected with his mastery of all of the various genres and forms: he wrote five symphonies, five string quartets, two full-length cantatas with ambitious national topics (*Ujedinjenje*, 1936, *Sonetni venec*, 1949), several symphonic overtures and symphonic poems, and a cluster of concertos (two for violin; one each for piano, 1940; cello, 1947; harp, 1954; bassoon, 1956; clarinet, 1958; viola, 1959; and flute, 1962). In many ways, he was a pioneer, but in the end he failed to recognise the fateful changes in the general aesthetics of 20th century art. Škerjanc must therefore be acknowledged as a very important composer, albeit one who did not always produce the greatest works.

Between early modernism and the New Objectivity

Not all of the Slovenian early modernists remained ignorant of historic change: in the oeuvres of Savin and Adamič, one can find apparent traces of the gradual acceptance of new trends, especially that of the New Objectivity, which was promoted by Slavko Osterc (1895–1941) in Slovenia.

It is noteworthy that the oldest composer of this generation, Risto Savin (1859–1948), showed interest in the new trends, and that he consequently adapted his aesthetics and poetics. As a professional soldier, he travelled through Europe and gained his compositional knowledge in several centres: he studied music in Prague (1888–1890, 1897–1899, 1901–1903) and, like Lajovic, with Robert Fuchs in Vienna from 1891 to 1897, where he regularly attended opera performances. Through his contact with Central European music, Savin accepted early modernism, as is reflected in his *lieder*. Later, however, he devoted much of his time to opera, completing two full-length music dramas after the war: *Gospovetski sen* (*The Dream of Gospovetsko Polje*, 1921) and *Matija Gubec* (1923). Both operas are ambivalently torn between the influences of Wagnerian music drama (the leitmotif technique and the form of "musical prose") and the composer's desire to create a national opera (folkloristic music material). Savin himself was fully aware of this dichotomy:

My works spring from neo-romanticism and are the children of this era. Of course, I often sit myself beside Mozart and hasten towards him in order to get some mental freshness. [...] I draw most gladly from the music material of my nation. I often use its musical thoughts and I like most of all things in which I find traces of the Slovenian character.⁴

With *Gospovetski sen*, Savin was clearly trying to create a national opera: his imagination was fired by the Carinthian plebiscite (1920), and he therefore based the plot on this episode from Slovenian history. As usual, however, Savin's thinking was oriented more towards the southern Slavs: the main motif, with its characteristic augmented second, bares traces of typical Balkan music (Ex. 3). On the level of form, Savin follows precisely the dramatic impulses and logic of leitmotifs. Ideas from *Gospovetski sen* were later more consistently developed in the opera *Matija Gubec*, which again deals with national history, uses the Wagnerian form of music drama, and attempts to combine national issues with social themes. Savin's opera is most powerful on the level of dramatic intensity, which is achieved through harmonic means: long harmonic sequences, melodic chromatic ascents, long harmonic pedals and augmented chords that enable a variety of modulations.



Example 3. Basic leitmotif from the opera *Gospovetski sen*

With his operas, Savin remained more or less committed to early modernism and Wagnerian influences, but later he was sufficiently open to accept new trends, which were introduced to Slovenia predominantly by Slavko Osterc. Although Osterc was much younger than Savin, the two were friends and Savin regularly showed his younger colleague his compositions and asked him for advice connected with "new" and "special" chords (Cvetko 1991: 358). In Savin's late oeuvre, which consists mainly of choral music, especially for youth choirs, one can therefore find hints of the New Objectivity, especially on the level of harmony (non-functional combinations of chords, specially constructed chords), but altogether these changes can be regarded more as a kind of spice than a comprehensive change of stylistic orientation. Nevertheless, such details speak about Savin's openness, despite his age and his therefore completely different personality and aesthetic position, which was much closer to that of Lajovic, Škerjanc or Ravnik. There was, however, one important difference: after the war, Savin retired and lived a rather isolated life in rural Žalec and his impact on Slovenian music culture was therefore of negligible importance in comparison to the three aforementioned composers.

Considerably more integrated into the music culture was Emil Adamič (1877–1936), whose oeuvre is extraordinarily vast, consisting of more than a thousand works, predominantly for choir. He learned music at the conservatory of *Glasbena matica*, and later enrolled to study composition at the Conservatory in Trieste and the Academy of Music in Zagreb, although he never finished his compositional studies and was therefore employed as a teacher throughout his working life. During the First World War, he was incarcerated in Tashkent (Uzbekistan; 1915–1920), where he played an important role in the music life of the country, producing typical romantic orchestral works (*Tatarska suita*, 1920), spiced with the folklore music of the Tatar nation. He nevertheless yearned to return to his homeland.

Adamič's vast oeuvre is very uneven: stylistically as well as in terms of quality. He composed a great number of simple choral works without any distinctive flavour, modelled more or less on the common example of the *liedertafel* songs of the 19th century, using only the most conventional cadential combinations, and often alluding to national folklore. At the same time, he also composed more advanced choral works based on texts of some literary

Grave. Iskreno, pobožno ♩ = 40

Example 4. The beginning of the choral work *Vijola*

interest, which testify to the development of his technique and style. The most astonishing fact is that he composed both types of choral work at the same time. In 1925, for example, he composed one of his more interesting choral works *Vragova nevesta*, which is marked by the use of chordal combinations characteristic of Debussy, while in the same year he also composed *Osem labkih zborov na narodna besedila* (*Eight Easy Choral Pieces on Folklore Texts*), which can be regarded as a kind of prolongation of the type of music that was typical of the first Slovenian cultural gatherings in the reading clubs in the mid 19th century. Naturally, one can interpret this dichotomy as an example of the typical ambivalence of early modernism.

The first stylistic changes in Adamič's oeuvre came in 1923, and are exemplified in the work for mixed choir *Vijola* (*Violet*). The composition is daring on the harmonic level, almost completely suspending functional logic. We can discern some harmonic points of calm, but there is no central tonality; instead of exploiting functional relationships, Adamič uses mediant (e.g., the succession of chords of C-sharp major, E minor, C major and B-flat major). It seems that Adamič is "painting" with his harmony (the seventh and ninth chords are connected with the semitone steps in the melodic voice) in different colours (the text speaks about "yellow" and "blue" violets), which is why the composer dissolves the traditional cadential order, creating the feeling of a floating impressionistic piece with some more tense dissonances approaching expressionism. Later, he was attracted to texts with a clear narrative note and to ballades (e.g., *Vragova nevesta*, *Kata*, *Mara v jezeru*), thus creating a specific style denoted by amore recitative melodic line, dramatic climaxes and rapid changes of mood.

Compositions written after 1928 show yet another influence, that of the New Objectivity, which confirms the fact that Adamič "was always eager for everything that was new, and aware that only new paths lead to the new goal that pushes away the old age" (Škerjanc 1937: 53–54). For models for his *Otroška suita* (*Children's Suite*), he drew on Bartók, Casella and Hindemith (Ibid.: 114), while

Štirje otroški plesi (*Four Children's Dances*, 1928), with its succession of contemporary dance forms (foxtrot, blues, Boston and Balkan kolo), clearly reflect his commitment to the New Objectivity and its flirtation with music from the USA and with popular genres.

The peak of Adamič's creativity, and his stylistically most advanced compositions, must, however, be sought in the 1930s, when he completed his *Tri duhovne pesmi* (*Three Spiritual Songs*, 1929), *Trije mešani zbori* (*Three Pieces for Mixed Choir*, 1932) and *Tri skladbe za veliki godalni orkester* (*Three Pieces for Large String Orchestra*, 1936). For *Tri duhovne pesmi*, Adamič chose an old text by Slovenian protestants, indicating an inclination towards old expression and form (renaissance motet) even on the level of the text, and therefore towards some kind of "neo" style. The expression of these choral works is more restrained and controlled, which is also a feature of *Trije mešani zbori*, written for five-part mixed chorus. The texture is dense and the movement of voices marked by chromaticism, while unresolved seventh and ninth chords can be found in the harmony. The main aesthetic features are therefore far removed from Lajović's romantic dreaminess or pain. Adamič went even further with *Tri skladbe za veliki godalni orkester*, a composition that shows some signs of heterogeneity: the first movement is monothematic, the harmony is released from functional logic, the pulse is constant, bringing to mind the then fashionable "machine music" (Mosolov, Prokofiev), while the last movement is conceived as a succession of variations on a folk theme: even in his last, most advanced composition, Adamič stayed somewhat ambivalent, torn between tradition and new trends.

Conclusions: a local variant of "early modernism"

Music in Slovenia in the first years after the First World War was clearly modelled on examples of early modernism that composers became familiar with through studying, visiting or living in the main European capitals: Vienna,

Prague and Paris. In this regard, it is of special interest to note the very close personal connections between Škerjanc and his teacher Marx. Škerjanc's letters to Marx, dating from the beginning of his studies in 1922 almost until his teacher's death in 1964, are preserved in Vienna (Kuret 2001: 30). Marx can be regarded as a composer who remained committed to the style of early modernism well into the 20th century, and who predominantly wrote *lieder*, which was also typical of several Slovenian composers from that period. In terms of their achievements and aesthetics, Slovenian composers, who were from a geographical "province" of Europe, were treated similarly to other European composers working in a personal, aesthetic "province", being historically placed outside the "canon". When speaking about European early modernism, about composers better known than Marx, we think of large *weltanschauung* symphonies, symphonic poems and music dramas modelled on Wagner's example, and these are precisely the genres that are missing from Slovenian music of that time: Škerjanc completed his *First Symphony* in 1931, Lajovic his symphonic poem – more lyrical than dramatic in tone – in 1938, while both of Savin's operas are conceived as music dramas, although still aspiring to function as national operas, with some hints of folk material. We could therefore place the birth of all of these typical "early modernist" genres in the time that surpasses *die Spätzeit der Moderne*.

Another of the specifics of Slovenian early modernism is its inclination towards the lyrical and a total neglect of large *weltanschauung* themes, which can be attributed to the special position of the nation: at that time, the biggest theme for Slovenian composers was the possibility of achieving national identity through music, a fact that comes to the fore particularly in the writings of Lajovic. The transition to the new compositional-technical means in Slovenian music was therefore realised in different genres than in central Europe, in genres that were typical of the 19th century, especially of the music of the nations on the edge of Central Europe. Consequently, we find tense harmonies, chromatic melodies and transgressing the borders of functional harmony in choral works modelled on the examples of *liedertafel*, and *lieder* with piano accompaniment (not with orchestra, as was typical of Mahler), and these new procedures were not employed for declaring *weltanschauung* themes or for digging deeper into human psychology (one thinks of Strauss' heroines Salome and Elektra); instead, they were employed for conveying lyrical sensitivity, personal expression and impressionist images. Naturally, all of these characteristics are tightly bound to the specifics of Slovenian music infrastructure: there was no real professional symphonic orchestra, a very small number of professional musicians and practically no chamber groups with outstanding soloists. The predominant performers were singers, with the most important choir being that of

Glasbena matica, whose conservative leadership remained indebted to the ideology of the 19th century even in the new era.

Much like in early modernism itself, Slovenian music of the corresponding period encapsulates an interesting paradox: it can be paralleled with Central European trends, but at the same time should not be. The compositional means were the same, hence drawing parallels is legitimate, but these means were employed in different genres, resulting in the somehow more intimate inner content of the compositions. Thus Slovenian music of the chosen period demonstrates only half of Danuser's notion of the early modernism dialectical stretch between monumentality and inner differentiation (Danuser 1984: 13), which is, for example, typical of Mahler's orchestration (vast tutti vs. typical chamber music "situations"): we find inner differentiation and no monumentality. Although Slovenian music is therefore robbed of one typical ambivalent stretch, it is still deeply rooted in similar dichotomies, one of which is the unusual persistence of early modernist compositional means and aesthetics (the precedence of expression), which were interesting and current for some Slovenian composers almost throughout the 20th century, although expressionist trends and hints of the New Objectivity were introduced into Slovenian music fairly early by Marij Kogoj and Slavko Osterc. A study of the reasons for such persistence would reveal a great deal about the specifics of Slovenian music in the 20th century.

References

- ¹ Jean-Marie Guyau, *L'Art au point de vue sociologique*, 1889, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, *Otázka sociální*, 1898, Franklin Henry Giddings, *The Principles of Sociology*, 1896, Alfred Jules Émile Fouillée, *La Science sociale contemporaine*, 1880, Gabriel Tarde, *Les transformations du droit. Étude sociologique*, 1891, *La Philosophie de l'impérialisme*, 1903–1908, Célestin Bouglé, *Leçons de sociologie sur l'évolution des valeurs*, 1922, Émile Durkheim, *Les Règles de la méthode sociologique*, 1894, *Sociologie et philosophie*, 1924, William James, *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*, 1907 (Kuret 1988: 14).
- ² *Mutuality of European cultures*. See Kuret 1988: 330–331.
- ³ Lajovic regarded Stravinsky as "one of the leading musicians, not only among Russians, but in the whole world" (Lajovic after Kuret 1988: 168).
- ⁴ *Gledališki list 1924*.

Literature

- Matjaž Barbo, Prvi koncert za violino in orkester (1927) L. M. Škerjanca, in: *15. slovenski glasbeni dnevi. Glasba, poezija – ton, beseda*. Ljubljana: Festival Ljubljana, 2001, p. 37–47.
- Bergamo Marija, "Življenja zmožni" zgodnji samospjevi Lucijana Marije Škerjanca, in: *Glasba in poezija. Slovenski glasbeni dnevi 1990*, Primož Kuret and Julijan Strajnar (eds.), Ljubljana: Festival, 1990, p. 193–201.

- Bogunović Hočevar Katarina, *Odmevi evropskih tendenc v ustvarjalnosti Janka Ravnika*, Dissertation. Ljubljana, 2009.
- Botstein Leon, Modernism, in: *Grove Music Online*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, <<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.nukweb.nuk.uni-lj.si/subscriber/article/grove/music/40625>> [accessed 2015 12 10].
- Cvetko Dragotin, *Stoletja slovenske glasbe*, Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1964.
- Cvetko Dragotin, *Glasbeni svet Antona Lajovica*, Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 1985.
- Cvetko Dragotin, *Slovenska glasba v evropskem prostoru*, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1991.
- Dahlhaus Carl, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1980.
- Danuser Hermann, *Dies Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1984.
- Klemenčič Ivan, *Music anoster amor. Glasbena umetnost Slovenije od začetkov do danes*, Maribor, Ljubljana: Založba Obzorja in glasbeno založništvo Helidon, Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 2000.
- Kos Janko, *Primerjalna zgodovina slovenske literature*, Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga, 1987.
- Koter Darja, Samospevi Lucijana Marije Škerjanc skozi njegov čustveni in miselni svet, in: *15. slovenski glasbeni dnevi. Glasba, poezija – ton, beseda*. Ljubljana: Festival Ljubljana, 2001, p. 48–55.
- Koter Darja, *Slovenska glasba. 1918–1991*, Ljubljana: Študentska založba 2012.
- Krek Gojimir, Naše skladbe, in: *Novi akordi. Glasbeno-književna priloga*, 1914, Nos. 1–4, p. 16–17.
- Kuret Primož, *Umetnik in družba*, Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1988.
- Kuret Primož, Lucijan Marija Škerjanc in Joseph Marx – skladatelj, ki sta zaznamovala svoj čas, in: *15. slovenski glasbeni dnevi. Glasba, poezija – ton, beseda*. Ljubljana: Festival Ljubljana, 2001, p. 30–36.
- O’Loughlin Niall, *Novejša glasba v Sloveniji*, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 2000.
- Ravnik Janko, Ustvarjalne dileme, in: *Naši razgledi*, Vol. 17, 10 February 1968, p. 74.
- Škerjanc Lucijan Marija, *Emil Adamič. Življenje in delo slovenskega skladatelja*, Ljubljana: Založba Ivan Grohar, 1937.
- Škerjanc Lucijan Marija, *Apologia musicae artis*, in: *Sodobnost*, 1953, Nos. 2–3, p. 169–187.
- Škerjanc Lucijan Marija, *Anton Lajovic. Ob skladateljevi osemdesetletnici*, Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 1958.
- Wagner Richard, *Das Judentum in der Musik*, Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 1869.

Santrauka

Muzika, sukurta Slovėnijoje pirmais metais po Pirmojo pasaulinio karo, buvo akivaizdžiai sumodeliuota pagal ankstyvojo modernizmo atstovų pavyzdžius – su jais kompozitoriai susipažino studijuodami, lankydamiesi ar gyvendami pagrindinėse Europos sostinėse Vienoje,

Prahoje ir Paryžiuje. Žvelgiant šiuo aspektu, itin svarbu pažymėti tvirtus asmeninius Lucijano Marijos Škerjanco ir jo mokytojo Walterio Markso ryšius. Škerjanco laišškai Marksui, datuoti nuo kompozitoriaus studijų pradžios 1922 m. iki jo mokytojo mirties 1964 m., saugomi Vienoje (Kuretas 2001: 30). Marksas gali būti apibūdinamas kaip kompozitorius, kuris ir XX a. liko ištikimas ankstyvojo modernizmo stilistikai ir daugiausia rašė *lied* kūrinis – tai būdinga keliems kitiems to laikotarpio Slovėnijos kūrėjams.

Žvelgiant pasiekimų ir estetikos žvilgsniu, iš Europos geografinės „provincijos“ kilę slovėnų kompozitoriai buvo priimami panašiai kaip kiti Europos kūrėjai, dirbę asmeninėje estetinėje „provincijoje“ ir istorine prasme buvę už „kanono“ ribų. Kalbėdami apie ankstyvąją Europos modernizmą ir labiau už Marksą žinomus kompozitorius, dažnai turime omenyje *weltanschauung* simfonijas, simfonines poetas ir muzikines dramas, sumodeliuotas pagal Richardo Wagnerio pavyzdį. Kaip tik šių žanrų trūksta minėto laikotarpio Slovėnijos muzikoje: Škerjancas užbaigė savo Simfonią Nr. 1 1931 m., Antonas Lajovicas 1938-aisiais pristatė labiau lyrišką nei dramatinę simfoninę poemą, o abi Risto Savino operos buvo sumanytos kaip muzikinės dramos, nors jose ir matyti ambicijų funkcionuoti kaip nacionalinėms operoms ir esama liaudies kūrybos elementų. Taigi galime nurodyti šių tipiškių „ankstyvojo modernizmo“ žanrų radimosi laiką gerokai už *die Spätzeit der Moderne* ribų.

Visai kaip pats ankstyvasis modernizmas, minėto laikotarpio Slovėnijos muzika slepia įdomų paradoksą: ji gali būti prilyginta Vidurio Europos tendencijoms, tačiau tuo pat metu taip lyginti nereikėtų. Kompozicinės priemonės liko tos pačios, taigi paralelių brėžimas visiškai pateisinamas, tik šios priemonės buvo naudojamos kitokiuose žanruose ir sukūrė intymesnę kompozicijų turinį. Taigi šio laikotarpio Slovėnijos muzika parodo tik dalį Hermanno Danuserio suvokimo apie ankstyvajam modernizmui būdingą dialektinę monumentalumo ir vidinės diferenciacijos įtampą (Danuseris 1984: 13). Šis principas būdingas, pavyzdžiui, Gustavo Mahlerio kūrinių orkestruoti (platus *tutti* prieš tipiškas kamerinės muzikos „situacijas“) – čia matome vidinę diferenciaciją, tačiau nepastebime jokio monumentalumo. Nors taip iš Slovėnijos muzikos atimama tipinė ambivalentiška įtampa, vis dėlto ji tvirtai remiasi panašiomis dichotomijomis: viena jų yra neįprastas ankstyvojo modernizmo komponavimo elementų ir estetikos išsvermingumas (ekspresijos precedentas) – tai buvo įdomu ir aktualu kai kuriems slovėnų kompozitoriams per visą XX a. Nepaisant to, Marijos Kogojaus ir Slavko Osterco kūryboje pasireiškė ekspresionistinės tendencijos ir naujojo objektyvumo atgarsiai. Tokio išsvermingumo priežasčių tyrimas atskleidžia nemažai informacijos apie XX a. Slovėnijos muzikos specifiką.