

Czech Music and Politics from the Late 19th Century to Early 20th Century  
: Formation of a Modern Nation and the Role of Art Music

Litt. D. Hisako NAITO

地域学論集（鳥取大学地域学部紀要） 第14巻 第2号 抜刷

REGIONAL STUDIES (TOTTORI UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY OF REGIONAL SCIENCES) Vol.14 / No.2

平成30年3月12日 発行 March 12, 2018

# Czech Music and Politics from the Late 19th Century to Early 20th Century:

## Formation of a Modern Nation and the Role of Art Music

Litt. D. Hisako NAITO\*

### 19 世紀末から 20 世紀初頭のチェコ音楽と政治

#### － 近代国家の成立と芸術音楽の役割 －

内 藤 久 子\*

Key Words: Czech Music, National Revival, Cultural Nationalism, Czech Nationalist School,  
Hussite Revolution

キーワード：チェコ音楽、民族再生、文化ナショナリズム、チェコ国民楽派、フス派革命

## 1. Culture and Nationalism — How were Music and Politics Related?

The development of art, in particular the development of musical culture, has occasionally been influenced by strong political ideologies. Since musical development is strongly linked to the guiding principles of national policy, it can certainly be considered an important key for particular eras. Perhaps, the most striking example of this situation existed in Europe between the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, a period characterized by the successive formation of new nations, each determining its own form of government. This occurred in several different contexts, for example, when nations (e.g., Hungary, Czech Republic, Poland, Norway, and Finland) were gaining independence from an empire, when nations were uniting with other nations from which they had previously separated (e.g., Italy and Germany), or when nations were undergoing a transition from monarchy to democracy (e.g., Great Britain and France). In each of these cases, the countries found themselves in an extremely nationalistic situation that involved “casting off the old and becoming modern nations.”<sup>1</sup> These developmental periods and politically nationalistic situations would inevitably influence various aspects of cultural nationalism, beginning with the “national musical phenomenon.” Under these strong political ideologies, “nationalism” served as a weapon for “peripheral” European nations to produce world-famous artistic works as they advanced toward independence from imperial rule.

Particularly, in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a group of composers known as the “Nationalist School” became active in the peripheral European nations, such as Russia and Eastern and Northern Europe, which had been musically underdeveloped until that time. The actions of these countries generated a pinnacle achievement of the “nationalism of music” as the “crystallization of nationalist culture.” In particular, the

---

\* Studies of Global and Regional Cultures, Faculty of Regional Sciences, Tottori University

“Czech nation,” which was under the domination of Hapsburg Empire (comprising Bohemia in the west and Moravia in the east), had historically been burdened with political unrest due to its position at the crossroads of Europe. Since the first half of the sixth century, this region had been the western stronghold of the Slavs, even as it was destined to confront the aggressive policies of the Germans living to the west. Nevertheless, the “nationalism and culture of the Czech people incorporated European ideas and various cultural trends, and then could originally create their own national culture.” This was also expressed in František Palacký’s (1798–1876) federal plan, known as “Austro-Slavism,”<sup>2</sup> and in the thoughts of the first president of the revitalized Czechoslovak Republic, Tomáš G. Masaryk (1850–1937).<sup>3</sup>

According to the analysis of Joseph F. Zacek, an American historian, the “beginning of ‘Czech nationalism’ goes back to the end of the Middle Ages and at the latest, to the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.” Czech nationalism was enhanced during the “Hussite revolution of the 15<sup>th</sup> century”<sup>4</sup> and the *Národní Obrození* (the National Revival),<sup>5</sup> which occurred from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century to the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was further reinforced during the two decades of independence in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as well as during the several years immediately following the Second World War. It emphasized the national unity of the Czechs in opposition to other countries.<sup>6</sup>

However, the nationalist movement in the Czech lands was characterized by “cultural nationalism,” which focused primarily on music and literature. This cultural nationalism developed prior to “political nationalism,” which advocated separation from the Hapsburg Monarchy and the formation of the modern state.<sup>7</sup> During its prime, the Czech nationalist movement was clearly inspired by the ideas of the German philosopher and folk-song collector Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803). The movement materialized through the National Revival program (which focused on the liberation and development of the previously suppressed national culture). There are clear signs that an independent national culture centered on music and literature was created. These developments can be observed by following the trail of the distant events of Karel IV, in whom interest was revived, along with the rise of the Czech language and literature as well as the democratic Hussite movement of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The tendency to hope for a “national cultural revival” showed no signs of weakening in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the field of art music, the activity of the Bohemian School, which advocated “national music,” was remarkable. These trends in the Bohemian School reflect the cultural significance of the musical culture, which found ample nourishment at the crossroads of Europe.

In this article,<sup>8</sup> I examine the political messages conveyed by various musical works, the conflict between the “progressives” and “conservatives” involved in the political world, and the idea of “Czech national music,” which was nearly established by the time of the first republic (during the interwar period), as well as the backlash that it invoked. In addition, I trace the types of political thought that influenced composers and critics concerning the above issues, as well as the Moravian cultural nationalism that followed pan-Slavonic ideas of the will. Furthermore, I consider the “role of art music in a changed society.”

## **2. The Era of “Nationalistic Disputes” — Symbolizing National Culture and the Phenomenon of Nationalist Music**

### **2. 1. Cultural Institutions for the Czech People**

From the March Revolution of 1848 to the fall of the Hapsburg Empire in 1918, Bohemia underwent a remarkable transition from an agrarian to an industrial society. Czech intellectuals also began to cherish high hopes for “national reinstatement.” In particular, at the end of 1860, a radical *Mladočeši* (Youth Czech Party; formally known as the *Národní Strana Svobodomyslná* [the National Liberal Party]) developed its own nationalist movement, being dissatisfied with the notions of “Austro-Slavism.” The confrontation between these traditional and radical parties intensely escalated. Amidst a situation in which the bourgeois merchant class was already rising, this “developing bourgeoisie” of the eastern region of the empire poured their intellectual and artistic energies into the nationalist movement. While Slavonic Nationalism reinforced their influence in this manner, they eventually came to form the “pan-Slavonic movement.”<sup>9</sup> Consequently, Prague became a symbol of the Czechs’ strong resistance to the German rule. Moreover, the antagonistic relationship between the Czechs and the Germans became even more remarkable, particularly with regard to the construction of theaters.

The Czech national consciousness was reflected in cultural productions, as well as in all academic fields. Following the 1860s, it was symbolized in various public cultural institutions in a manner similar to that observed during the National Revival period. The most important institutions included the Czech youth sports organization *Sokol* (meaning “falcon”) (1862);<sup>10</sup> Prague University, which held classes in Czech for Czech students (1882); and the Czech National Theater (1883), where the composition of “national music” was realized. One notable event was the opening of the Czech Provisional Theater on November 18, 1862, which became the greatest symbol of the Czech culture. This was in opposition to the Stavovské Theater in Prague, where operas were performed in German (after 1888, the New German Theater was established). Thereafter, the construction on the National Theater began in 1868, finally reaching completion 13 years later, in 1881. (This theater opened on June 11 with the Smetana opera *Libuše*, but it was destroyed in a fire on August 12. It ultimately reopened on November 18, 1883).

The years to follow would see a sudden increase in the number of national theaters in all of the eastern part of Central Europe. In 1884, the National Theater was constructed in Brno, the capital of Moravia. The establishment of these theaters was accompanied by the organization of choirs and theaters in every region. In 1860, the male chorus *Hlahol* (meaning “sound”) was established in Nymburk. Another male choir was established in Prague one year later, followed by another the next year in Plzeň. In 1863, the *Umělecká Beseda* (Artistic Society) was established in Prague, consisting of highly renowned artists. These public cultural facilities for the Czechs were “institutions that actually symbolized national culture.” In short, these institutions constituted an attempt to respond to people’s desire for the establishment of “national music.”

## **2.2. The Czech Nationalist School and Hussite Chorale — The Musical Realization of Political Ideologies in the “National Revival”**

Composers of the Bohemian School, such as Bedřich Smetana (1824–1884) and Antonín Dvořák (1841–1904), responded to political activity with great sensitivity and initiated the struggle for cultural and spiritual independence. The 15<sup>th</sup> century Hussite revolution formed the basis of this spiritual culture—during this period, there was a revival of the loud Hussite style of singing chorale (Protestant hymns). The politically nationalist thought of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, which regarded the Hussite revolution as the heart of Czech history, would eventually become linked to the celebration of Hussitism. Indeed, “the national tones expressed

through music sounded strongly as a representation of politically motivated demands.”<sup>11</sup> Thus, the Hussite chorale theme, *Ktož jste boží bojovníci* (‘Those who are Warriors of God’), incorporated the spirit of the Hussites, who were essential to the Czech political nationalism. Since this period, the Hussite chorale melody has consistently served as a symbol, a type of code in the works of the Bohemian School, throughout the long genealogy of Czech music. Smetana and Zdeněk Fibich (1850–1900) obviously did not merely create national music for marginal areas. Instead, they created music that also represented European music. Moreover, they aimed to actualize the musical art of Bohemia to include the “function of modern art” for the Czechs, who were at the center of Western Europe. It can be said that Smetana held to the concrete expression of the symphonic poem while conjuring the image of being both “modern and Czech.” He concentrated all his energy into “connecting the nationalistic image and symbolic content to the progressive European music of the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>12</sup>

The nationalistic program was displayed in Smetana’s masterpiece, *Má Vlast* (‘My Fatherland’; 1874–1879). This cycle of symphonic poems includes historical memories of myths, legends, natural beauty, and the Hussite revolution, which was the linchpin of the National Revival. The political program of the National Revival was incorporated into the fifth piece, *Tábor*, and the sixth, *Blaník*. The aforementioned medieval Hussite chorale *Ktož jste boží bojovníci*, which was sung loudly on the battlefield to intimidate enemy crusaders, was their “motto theme” (lyrics: *Those who are Warriors of God / obey God’s laws / pray for God’s protection / Believe in God, and thou hast already achieved victory with God*). These poems that praised God resounded strongly among the devout Protestant Hussites, and the echo of the chorale serves as a symbol of the Czech National Revival: “The entirety of the cycle is based on the Hussite chorale. *Tábor*’s land is the primary base for the Hussites, namely the Hussite town. This symphonic poem expressed the Hussites’ determination and willpower; there is no doubt that this chorale was frequently known to be the most powerful. Moreover, their tenacity in battle, fearlessness, patience, and uncompromising attitude were all emphasized at the end of this symbolic poem. This composition is not divided by the small phrases, and it praises the strong character, greatness, and honor of the Hussites.”<sup>13</sup> Smetana cast the people of his fatherland in these powerful words, particularly in the fifth piece, *Tábor*.

Around the same time, the most active international Czech composer, Dvořák, was also exploring the role of the artist in the midst of a nationalistic conflict. During this period, he composed the *Husitská Overtura* (‘Hussite Overture’; 1883) and the Seventh Symphony in F minor (1883–1884). The latter work maintained a close connection to the *Husitská Overtura*, which had been completed in September of the previous year. Moreover, to praise the spirit of Czech Protestant reformer Jan Hus, this symphony was in harmony with the *Husitská Overtura*, and it was closely related to the Hussite chorale and the 13<sup>th</sup> century Czech plainsong *Svatý Václav* (‘St. Wenceslas’); a chorale praising the 10<sup>th</sup> century king Václav I, who was enshrined as the saint of Czech’s national protection after his death. This symphony also strongly engendered the spirit of enthusiastic and tragic national resistance. Dvořák also returned to the shining history of the founding of the Czech nation, as well as to the myths and the democratic spirit of Hus. He attempted to grasp the roots of the Czech national spirit through his rich expression of Slavonic color in the form of “absolute music,” which primarily consisted of purely instrumental music. In the case of Dvořák, however, the value of his musical works and the “true value of Czechness” rests in the imagination evoked in the quality of sound, rather than in the content of the title or the ideas in the pieces.<sup>14</sup>

As noted by the British musicologist Jim Samson, works such as the Hussite chorale constitute “musical gestures that have had strong historical repercussions, were clearly valuable for nationalistic composers.”<sup>15</sup> This chorale melody also directly highlighted the democratic aspects of the medieval period of the Hussite war, while inarguably providing a metaphor for the spirit of National Revival, which was reinforced spiritually through the reclamation of the Hussite era at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Dating from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Czech nationalist musical phenomenon is characterized by two tendencies, which paralleled the development of European art music during the same period. One tendency represented a movement toward modern art music, as reflected in Smetana’s Czech national operas, as well as in his more concrete “program music,” which was aligned with the “European progressive program.” The other trend was more inclined toward the sounds of folk music (including the elements of program music), strongly reflected in Dvořák’s “absolute music.” The phenomenon, thus, invigorated the argument supporting the value and interpretation of “Czech national music.” In other words, the political leaders of that time developed sincere arguments about whether any type of cultural identity could be shared through music. Prominent questions concerning the role of art music and the formation of a nation (i.e., the idea and its value of creating nationalistic music in a modern nation) was about to be determined by social and political norms, beyond the musical aesthetic elements.

### 3. Disputes Surrounding “Nationality,” Aimed at Independence

#### 3.1. Intervention by Political Parties with Regard to Czech National Music

##### — Progressive or Conservative?

Smetana desired the creation of a “national music” that would be “Czech modern music,” and he attempted to transform this desire into a reality. At the time, however, the great majority in the Czech musical world simply denied the notion that “national music was created by quotes or imitations from folk songs.” Therefore, Smetana provoked animosity from conservatives (traditionalists), which made him a target of criticism. Notably, the argument surrounding the content of “national music” between the conservatives and Smetana, in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, developed in a way that it inevitably involved the political dimension.

Incidentally, arguments surrounding the basic concept of “Czech music” had already appeared frequently in the 1860s and 1870s. As early as 1862, a dispute about “national music” had begun between Smetana and František Ladislav Rieger (1818–1903), who was Dvořák’s patron and a prominent figure in the conservative *Staročeši* (Old Czech Party; formally known as *Národní Strana* [the National Party]). At this time, F.L.Rieger stated the cliché: “It is far easier to write an opera based on historical subjects than it is to compose an opera based only on folk songs.” He then offered the criticism that “only his opera *Prodaná nevěsta* (‘The Bartered Bride’) gave off the slight feeling of the national character, and that expecting the work, Smetana’s operas were not at all written in the national style.” The exchanges between both sides evolved into a genuine argument, which would continue from 1870 to 1874.<sup>16</sup> During this disagreement, a conceptual rivalry was evident between the notion of “progress,” advocated by composers such as F. Liszt of the New German School, and its antithesis, the notion of “conservation,” advocated by J. Brahms’ faction. In the end, a remarkable difference between the two sides was evident in the scathing criticism that was displayed.

Smetana's focal point was "anti-folk music," and that of the anti-Smetana faction ranged from "anti-Wagnerism" to "copied German music."

As advocated by Smetana, the idea of national music can be understood in terms of the "Austro-Slavism" proposed by the historian František Palacký. In other words, it followed the notions of progressive nations, being more than simply a peripheral Czech musical expression, instead occupying a significant position at the center of European civilization. Moreover, it strongly expressed the idea of "national music" as being on the same level as "modern art." Smetana's works have been described as being "tied to the most progressive and rich ideas and thoughts, and as making the best use of the most progressive musical technique."<sup>17</sup> As noted by Zdeněk Nejedlý, "in contrast to the manner in which Dvořák was surrounded by a socially conservative environment in the fields of art music, literature, and politics, Smetana was surrounded by a truly progressive environment."<sup>18</sup>

The conflict between "progressives" and "conservatives" that surrounded Czech music advanced to the political scene, in which "progressivism" clashed with "conservatism." Intense arguments representing the two perspectives repeatedly flared up like a raging fire. The political realm of the 1870s was divided into two parties: the moderately conservative "Old Czech Party," represented by F. L. Riegel, and the radical "Youth Czech Party," which asserted that the Czech society should be democratized. The former party clearly expressed support for Dvořák, while the latter remained loyal to Smetana. The Youth Czech Party would eventually represent the Czech nationalist movement in the 1890s, in addition to supporting the expansion of suffrage. Thus, the Smetana-supporting radical Youth Czech Party defeated the Dvořák-supporting conservative Old Czech Party, at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. By winning the election, the Youth Czech Party further accelerated the democratic nationalist movement and created the path toward establishing a "modern nation." Moreover, the party's victory finally validated Smetana's music as true "Czech national music."

### 3.2 Intensification of the Conflict on the Eve of the First World War

The musicologist, historian, philosopher, and politician Zdeněk Nejedlý (1878–1962) began criticizing Dvořák around 1901.<sup>19</sup> His attacks peaked in the 1920s and 1930s, and he continued to voice them until his last days. During October 1911, these criticisms transformed into an intense argument, which persisted until 1914. Against the backdrop of the turbulence that preceded the First World War, there was a strange increase in foreign and domestic praise for Dvořák, overlapping with Nejedlý's criticism. For example, on December 15, 1912, many of Prague's daily newspapers reported an incident in which a combined whirlwind of joy surfaced from German settlers and Czech traditionalists who supported Dvořák, demanding to "play more Dvořák!" This occurred upon the conclusion of the "Dvořák Festival," which was held in 1912 mid-August (14 and 15) at the royal theater in a health resort in the German territory of Pyrmont. In response, young journalists who were "Smetana supporters" and followers of Nejedlý issued the stirring parole, "We had enough of Dvořák!"<sup>20</sup> Such confrontational situations were not just restricted to the musical world; they also developed into a genuine political conflict between the radicals and the conservatives.

The Nejedlý group was formed around this time, along with a "radical group," whose primary members were J. Bartoš, O. Zich, and V. Helfert (until 1929); it centered on the journals *Smetana* and *Czech Culture*. In opposition to this group, a conservative group represented by F. L. Riegel (who had been involved in repeated disputes since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century), received the support of such journals as *Dalibor* and *Music Review*. An

argument championing Dvořák, thus, developed throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Published in articles and books, it was presented by the central critics of the movement: O. Šourek, K. Hoffmeister, J. Löwenbach, and Vítězslav Novák (and, after 1929, by V. Helfert, who had crossed the floor to the conservative group, was also involved).

#### 4. Significance and Role of the “Bohemian School” in the Rebirth of Czechoslovakia

In early October 1918, the rapid disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was accompanied by the declaration of the Czechoslovak Republic, issued in Prague on October 28. On May 27, 1920, T. G. Masaryk was elected the Republic’s first president, in accordance with the constitution (he retired in December 1935). After gaining its independence, the first Czechoslovakian republic was predominantly anti-Catholic, and the religious reformer Jan Hus was established as the “patron saint” of the new nation. During this period, the Czechs shifted their attention toward intellectual activity and reforming their lifestyles. The effort to regain the spirit of “national culture” was primarily glorified. In addition, the promotional program for the cultural policy sponsored by the “Music Department of the Ministry of Education” was announced to the public. This program focused on the prospect of Czechoslovakia as a democratic nation, promoting and popularizing democratic education and introducing new artistic fields. This cultural policy adopted the acronym “*MŠANO* (*Ministerstva Školství a Národní Osvěty* [Ministry of Education and National Adult Education]) program.” The content of this policy was multifaceted. It attempted to promote a “progressive direction” with regard to the fundamental reformation of the musical lifestyle in an independent nation. It also organized spiritual training and all musical activities outside schools, in addition to establishing a system for musicians, improved musical standards, and constructing a new concert hall. Finally, it supported research in musicology at universities and established a nationally funded musical research center, which aimed at educating the masses.<sup>21</sup>

##### 4.1 Revival of “National Culture” and “Socialization” of the Arts

Otakar Hostinský (1847–1910) was a professor of aesthetics at the University of Prague in 1892. Throughout his lifetime, he championed Smetana as a pioneer of Czech modern music. As early as 1903, prior to the country’s independence, he closely observed the social origins of arts against the prevailing nationalist trend. Regarding the true nature of art, he made statements to the effect that “an individual piece of artwork is a medium for the expression of the creator of the piece. At the same time, the whole artistic activities are a representation of the best evidence for the spirit of the age and national character.” He proposed that “art should be socialized” by popularizing it within the general public.<sup>22</sup> This line of reasoning gained acceptance in Bohemia, subsequently leading to the gradual realization of a new stream of thought, stating that “the nation and culture should be identified, and above all music is the ultimate expression of Czech culture.”

Vladimír Helfert (1886–1945), a student of O. Hostinský, published a book entitled *Naše Hudba a Český Stát* (*Our Music and the Czech State*) in February 1918, when independence was imminent. This book was a recollection of the past and existing Czech music, in which the author reflected on the lack of self-awareness specifically regarding the Czech culture. In short, Helfert acknowledged that this notion of culture was



actually more “characteristic of Germany” than it was of “Czech.” Helfert also attempted to actualize a “socialization of art” and a “reform of musical life” within the new democratic state. Furthermore, he dreamed of helping the Czech audience to truly understand the worth of Smetana’s music. He regarded “Czech modern music” after Smetana as “a true creation of what was particular to Czechs and on the same level as literature and sculptural arts.” In addition, he strongly asserted that, to promote “Czech music as national culture,” it was first “necessary to be aware that Smetana is an ancestor of Czech modern music.” The true intention behind this proposal was not to treat music as a simple “recreational fantasy,” but to “emphasize social and political functions that were implicit in Smetana’s music.” By doing this, he concluded that “music was the ultimate factor of a national culture that was developed through a widespread sense of self-awareness within society.”<sup>23</sup> Thus, “Smetana was established as a figure of the national culture” when Czechoslovakia was formed. This process attempted to create “a more modern nation and high culture” by emphasizing the social and political significance and functions implicit in works of art.

#### **4.2 Nejedlý’s Guiding Principle — Establishment of Smetana as a Figure of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Czech Nationalist School**

Early 20<sup>th</sup> century witnessed discussions concerning “a Czech national music,” centered on the continued scathing “criticism of Dvořák,” and on “the passionate championship of Smetana by the new generation’s leader, Zdeněk Nejedlý.”<sup>24</sup> These arguments occurred during a time of transition from the Hapsburg Empire to modernization accompanied by the development of an industrial society and political liberation.

Along with the advent of the new age, a movement emerged that questioned the true state of genuine “national music.” During this time, the notion of “Czech national music” was accompanied by an increased tendency to require “critical classification of evaluation,” based largely on evaluations focusing on Smetana and Dvořák. Therefore, the basic opinions on the “national music” of the new era were enunciated. Arguments replete with ideological perspectives were developed as significant points for determining the “national style” with regard to the establishment of “Czechness” in music, which would be truly supported by proper ideals. Nejedlý was the pioneer in conveying critical, controversial, and sharp ideas. He had already made explicit statements regarding his basic opinions about “Czech music” through his study entitled *Czech Musical History* (1903), and he had begun to regard Smetana’s music as the most appropriate choice for the Czech national music. In his view, Smetana had introduced the spirit of “National Revival” and “Hussites” as primary elements in the formation of traditional Czech music. Moreover, according to the Nejedlý’s explanation, no other music could match *Má Vlast* (‘My Fatherland’) in expressing the strength and beauty of his homeland. Smetana was a composer who had expressed his own national philosophy and personal political convictions. A true follower of Romanticism, Smetana held a strong belief in the glorious past of the National Revival. He, therefore, attempted to base all six pieces of *Má Vlast* entirely on historical poems. As observed in notions relating to the “spiritually uplifting poems of the tenacious Hussites that were recited in the fifth piece, *Tábor*,” Smetana also aimed to create “compositions that had modern, Czech, and also folkloristic aspects.” To accomplish this aim, he “pursued an aesthetics for the program music that was based on the ideological spirit of the National Revival.”<sup>25</sup> Nejedlý, thus, championed Smetana for reasons of politics and patriotism.

Furthermore, Nejedlý acknowledged the risk that conservative tendencies (such as “musical folklorism,”

which was based on the imitation and quotation of folk songs) might be interpreted as “exoticism” (having an Eastern timbre) in other countries. He warned about the strong exotic feeling expressed in Dvořák’s music, which had been particularly inspired by Moravian folk music. The aspects that the Czechs emphasized in their assessments of Dvořák and Smetana differed from those stressed by audiences in Western Europe. Nejedlý expressed his basic opinion about “Czech music in the new era,” as follows:

The exoticism in the Romantic era has frankly become the Slavonic national music. However, it is simply art music with a Slavonic timbre, and abroad, it is merely understood easily as secondary art. However, Smetana is entirely different. First, he repudiates the line of thought that states, “national music is created from folk music”; instead he attempted to create national music from “poetic programs.” That is nothing but the new national music. In other words, to create “progressive” national music, “poetic program” is a more essential element than “folk music.” Accordingly, Smetana, whose mission was to compose national operas that foster patriotism, was surely an “ancestor of Czech national music”; whereas Dvořák is nothing more than a simple “conservative formalist (excerpt).”<sup>26</sup>

Thus, Nejedlý communicated the idea that Czech music connected to the lineage of Smetana, Fibich, and J. B. Foerster, represented the progression of Czech music. Conversely, he criticized conservative composers (such as Dvořák, Janáček, Novák, and Suk), who did not follow this lineage. He also clearly distinguished between Smetana as a poet and Dvořák as a formalist. Although Nejedlý’s assertion contained many points that might subject him to criticism, his thinking almost never wavered throughout the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Continually refusing to make dualistic evaluations, he ultimately emphasized the style of progressive program music demonstrated by Smetana as the form that Czech national music should take. This was undoubtedly a decisive factor in the temporary decline of assessing Dvořák as the ancestor of national music.

### 4.3 The Influence of Bohemian Political Thought

The notion that “Czech national music ought to be progressive” became prevalent during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As mentioned above, against this background, it has been assumed that there was a strong relationship between this widespread idea and the victory of the Youth Czech Party in the 1890s. Progressive thought and a progressive value system were obviously also perceived as having an impact, due to the rise of the bourgeoisie at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The awareness of the “modern age” was surely introduced as a type of enchantment with “social progress” in the fields of politics, economics, technology, academic thought, and the arts, along the lines of bourgeois reasoning. At the same time, Nejedlý’s outlook during this period was based on the following:

As Czechs were Slavs who were positioned farthest to the Western Europe, they received western culture and music from their historical infancy. In addition, Czech musicians worked together with Czech political, social, and cultural life and maintained close contact with the development of Western music. Historically, in the Czech lands, the medieval songs by the *troubadour* of France or the *Minnesänger* (minnesinger) of Germany flourished; moreover, J. Hus’ religious chorale was formed by

anticipating the German Protestants. In particular, their songs differed from those of the so-called Eastern part such as Ukraine and the Southern Slavic lands, and so on. They were largely impacted by Western European folk music, which was characterized as having regular cyclical forms and instrumental music written in major keys. Therefore, it was assumed that they had no elements of exoticism.<sup>27</sup>

In other words, “the independent national culture and history of the Czech people should be positioned within the whole of the European civilization, and they should not be considered as the marginal national culture and history,” as the traditions of the Czech nationalist movement had been for a long time. The progression of Bohemian political thought after F. Palacký is reflected in Nejedlý’s words, as mentioned above.

The philosopher T. G. Masaryk, who was elected as the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic, was a theoretical supporter of Czech nationalism, known for asserting the importance of the Czechs’ national culture. In essence, he was a strong advocate of “independence within the cultural sphere of Western Europe,” appraising Smetana’s operatic works as “a musical celebration of the Czech nation that was already intrinsically liberated.”<sup>28</sup> He persisted to the end in his attempt to position the Czech culture within European civilization, and his ideals and message still survive as a reflection of the basic direction of the progress of Czech modern music.

## 5. Moravian Cultural Nationalist Movement during the First Republic

The conflict between “conservation” and “progress” emerged in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and its aftermath continued till the period of the first republic (i.e., the interwar period, 1918–1938). Nejedlý’s clear definition of “Smetana as the father of Czech music” had a strong impact, extending beyond the world of music and into the entire society. In contrast, Dvořák’s music was considered conservative after his death, and it was not clearly estimated as “Czech national music.” Therefore, arguments that championed him domestically caused further controversy in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, “Moravian elements” and “Slavonic spirituality” thrived in Dvořák’s music. According to the next-generation folk idealist Leoš Janáček (1854–1928), who was born in Moravia, Dvořák’s music emulated the “Slavonic style of expression in the new era.” Thus, his compositions promoted the progression of “pan-Slavism” that had emerged in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In particular, the “true Slavonic national music,” which was based on eastern Moravian folklore, was advocated, bearing fruit in the new movement.

### 5.1 Legacy of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Czech Music — Symbolization of “Slavonic National Independence” and Reorganization of Modern Music

A re-evaluation of Smetana, resulting from Nejedlý’s proposal, provoked a strong backlash from Moravian composers. In particular, Janáček argued that the “Bohemian idioms” (i.e., musical art with a strong inclination toward western music) within Smetana’s music threatened Moravian *lidovost* (folk characteristics) and, most importantly, endangered the ideals of “pan-Slavism.”

Consequently, in the lineage of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Czech music, “Moravism”<sup>30</sup> emphasized this type of

“Moravian regionalism.” The Moravian idioms started to function as the driving force behind the creation of music in the new era. As this occurred, it attracted the attention of the avant-garde during the interwar period, and assimilated into mainstream Czech music. The “Czech identity” that Janáček sought during this period clearly did not emerge from the context of “Bohemian political thought.” Instead, it existed in the notion of “Czech music as the Slavonic nation,” consistent with the progression of “pan-Slavism.” According to Janáček, while the Western Classic and Romantic musical styles were being rejected, the source of Czech music for the Western Slavonic nation was alive in the Moravian musical culture. He particularly admired the Slavonic intention that ensued from the trend toward realist thought in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The national sentiment shared by the Slavs and the desire for protection from the Great Russia developed into a shared notion of “Slavism,” which had various nuances. This sentiment also inspired the young composer’s sensitive spirit, planting in his mind the fundamental notion of being a musician. It is, therefore, believed that the remarkable tendency toward realism that is displayed in his music was more strongly influenced by the new school of Russian music than it was by anything else. A similar trend can be observed in various works of Russian realist literature beginning in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Against this background, Janáček’s brand of “Slavism” positions him as a passionate devotee of Russia.

Although Janáček, who was from the edge of Moravia, followed the direction of Slavonic music that conformed to Dvořák’s 19<sup>th</sup> century Romanticism, he ultimately attempted to surpass these methods to create modern music that would be appropriate for the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The compositions of Janáček were no longer reflected 19<sup>th</sup> century Romanticism, which was perceived as “exoticism.” Instead, it was structurally reclassified as eastern Moravian “folklorism of music.” By connecting this music to the avant-garde style of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Janáček sought to achieve a fundamental restructuring of a real Slavonic national acoustic sphere. His new principle of formation was exemplified in gems gleaned from his later years, including *Concertino* (1925) and *Sinfonietta* (1926), and it was sublimated through concrete and structural reorganization. The latter orchestral work *Sinfonietta* offers a particularly interesting example; with its original fanfares written for the athletic festival sponsored by the famous gymnastic organization *Sokol*, this work draws heavily on the notions of “protecting a young nation and defending the independence that was finally won.” *Sinfonietta* was initially dedicated to the Czech military, under the title *Military Sinfonietta*.

As explained by the Czech musicologist Jiří Fukač, *Sinfonietta* transcended the blessing of the formation of an independent nation on October 28, 1918. It also “expressed the introspective independence of the composer himself,” while adding to the magnificent scenery of “My Town, Brno.” Interpreting the fanfares played by two tubas as a sort of “sign (metaphor)” that symbolizes fundamentally celebratory aspects and the great delight, a semantic elucidation could see this as symbolically entrusting the “national independence” to this flourish, thus resurrecting “the town of Brno [...] through the reverberation of the sound of fanfares.” In any case, the piece projects a type of conceptual significance. The composer works to construct “the acoustic sphere of Moravia in the new era of the 20<sup>th</sup> century,” based on the motif of the fanfares, in accordance with his new theory of formation.<sup>31</sup> Janáček stated, “I hope my music is the closest to the spirit of the Czech nation. My final work and the wind suite *Mladí* (‘Youth’), *Concertino*, and *Sinfonietta* are the light of a new spirit.”<sup>32</sup> His musical works were constructed as appropriate modern music for the “Slavs’ new nation.” Most prominently, he attempted to incorporate a pure Moravian sound into the new compositional system, just as true “Czech national music.”

## 5.2 “Moravism” as Ethno-Nationalism and a Pathway to the Avant-Garde

The musical idioms of “Moravism” emphasized programmatic aspects, along with the folkloristic sound that had originated in Moravian folksongs. The direction of “Moravism” returned to reasoning that Moravia’s folklore represented “the spiritual culture of the Czechs as the Slavonic nation.” This actually originated in the ideals of “pan-Slavism,” which valued everything Slavonic. In contrast, the people of Moravia accepted Bohemian culture as Western European (i.e., Germanic national) culture.

The Moravian musicologist Jiří Vysloužil perceived the remarkable direction taken by “Moravism” as a matter of cultural nationalism. As explained by J. Vysloužil, “progressive Czechs who live in Moravia are closely connected to the elevation of political, national, and cultural awareness due to social awareness groups.”<sup>33</sup> In other words, in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the deliberate connection between the classic/romantic style and Moravian folk music blossomed through the music of Pavel Křížkovský (1820–1885) and Dvořák (both of whom were considered conservative by Nejedlý). Moreover, this music progressed in the much more modernistic direction of New Classicism, New Romanticism, and Impressionism, under V. Novák (1870–1949), who was a pupil of Dvořák. Novák clearly attempted to express metrical and tonal (harmonious) characteristics derived from the style of eastern Moravian folklore. However, the music based on the folklore of this region persists in being essentially “functional music,” which is closely attached to the natural and social environment of the region, as well as to the Czech national culture and lifestyle.

Vysloužil considered that the true development of “Czech national music” originated with Janáček, whose music was of a caliber equivalent to that of Smetana and Dvořák, according to the Western musical framework. More specifically, Vysloužil viewed Janáček as a composer aiming to establish “true Slavonic modern national music.” Thus, the statist nationalism of the 20<sup>th</sup> century gradually began to be discussed as “regional nationalism” or “ethno-nationalism,” which attempts to “subdivide nationalism.”<sup>34</sup> Essentially, Janáček identified the Czechs’ identity as Slavs in eastern Moravian folk songs to pursue its “true beauty.” Finally, “Moravian nationalism” was released from Western European Romanticism through the thorough concentration of expressions and stylizations of aboriginal folkloristic idioms. Moravian nationalism was actually able to combine the principles of avant-garde music that had been discovered in elements of Moravian folk songs with the compositional principles of the 12-tone technique of the *Neue Wiener Schule* (i.e., Second Viennese School). This compositional method was adopted by the “Moravian avant-garde,” a group led by Alois Hába (1893–1973),<sup>35</sup> a student of V. Novák. While this group attracted sharp social criticism, it made free use of atonality, non-thematic style, and microtonal music. Moreover, it approached the Expressionism of the *Neue Wiener Schule*.

## 6. Conclusion

While providing a broad view of the lineage of Czech music at the turn of the century, the Czech musicologist Jan Ráček made the following statement concerning the relationship between music and political ideology:

Until the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there was a sense of patriotic enthusiasm that fought for the Czech national cultural and spiritual independence. It also did this through music and ideology, which aimed to revive the national culture by publishing the nationalistic disputes that went along with patriotism. However, this enthusiasm or ideology faded in 1920, and it was replaced by a concentrated pursuit of pure idioms of Moravian folk music especially in musical mode theory. Thus, from the Czech independence (1918) to the exhausted era under the Nazi occupation, the nationalistic conflict was almost unimportant.<sup>36</sup>

The rivalry between Western European culture and Slavonic culture, which was encountered at the crossroads of Europe, ultimately created a complex structure of nationalism, which was subsequently entangled with political nationalism. This was exemplified in the movements of national “Bohemianism” (as represented by successive administrations of the first republic) and the “Moravian regionalism” (which emphasized the Slavonic culture), in the form of both cultural and political nationalism. However, the conservative position approved the “line of thinking that viewed folk culture and nationalism in the same light,” characterizing the initial form of nationalism as such. This conservative position appeared to have been temporarily eliminated by “the creation of a progressive Czech cultural world that was formed in the midst of Western European culture.” Nevertheless, the rebirth of a new musical method would ultimately emerge from the conservative folk culture of the new world of Moravian music in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which ushered in an even more progressive world of avant-garde music in Europe.

The cultural nationalism of the Czechs, especially when forming a modern nation, inspired significant consideration regarding the proper way of forming a national culture. This truly nationalistic issue was thus addressed according to two perspectives. The first was “Czech culture in the middle of progressive Western Europe,” and the second was a “reconstruction of Slavonic culture centered on Moravian folklore.” At the same time, this cultural nationalism also emphasized the importance of the roles and functions assumed by “art music” in the changing society at the turn of the century. It is particularly notable that the politicians of the time also had a strong interest in the musical activities of the composers Smetana and Dvořák, and they exchanged sincere arguments regarding the musical culture of the Czechs. In other words, the content represented through Czech musical creation, along with its interpretations, reflects the pride of a small nation that was fundamentally positioned at the center of European civilization. At the same time, this art music clearly became a symbolic expression of Slavonic national identity. Throughout approximately 300 years of domination by the Hapsburg Empire, the originally Slavonic people clearly continued to exist as “Czechs in the middle of Western Europe.” Moreover, this history apparently determined the future course of Czech music and culture. Anchored to an identity perceived as a “Slavonic culture in the middle of Western Europe,” these art forms were patterned after Bohemian political thought, manifesting in both an evolving musical creation and its acceptance.

## Notes

1. Siehe, Carl Darlhaus, “Über die Idee des Nationalismus in der Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts,” *Colloquia Musicologica Idea Národnost a Novodobá Hudba (Nationality and Modern Music) Brno 1972/73*, ed. by Rudolf Pečman, Brno 1979, S.429. As noted by the German musicologist C. Darlhaus, nationalism is a notion that

gained dominance as a Romantic movement throughout Europe in the period between the French Revolution and First World War. According to the German philosopher J. G. Herder, it was strongly associated with the notion of *Volksgeist* (folk spirit), which was proposed enthusiastically. In response, the indigenous “folklore music” was elevated from a “regional phenomenon,” to being praised as a new “national spiritual fruit.” In this way, the “nationalism of music” was interpreted as an aesthetic symbol, simultaneously being understood as a phenomenon that evoked “exoticism” from various Western European nations. (*Ebenda*, S.426 und 429ff.)

2. F. Palacký wrote *A Czech National History of Bohemia and Moravia*, Vol. 1 in 1836 (all five volumes were completed in 1867 in German; they were also published in Czech from 1848 to 1876). In this work, Jan Hus’ (c.1370–1415) 15<sup>th</sup> century Reformation was treated as being at the heart of Czech history. Palacký attempted to place the Czechs at the center of European civilization by recording their glorious history. The “Austro-Slavism” advocated by Palacký has been interpreted as “acquiring autonomy within the Austrian Empire.” Czech liberalists, who received the support of nobles opposed to the centralization of power by Austrian Empire, did not seek total Czech independence. They aimed to become a self-governing state under the protection of Austrian Empire or to become a federal state of the Empire. They advocated the stabilization of their small nation within the empire. (See *Encyclopedia of Eastern Europe*, ed. by Takayuki Itou [Heibon-sha, 1993], pp.372-73, p.523, and p.661.)
3. See Tadayuki Hayashi, “Czechs at the Crossroads of Europe,” in *Eastern European Nations and Cultures*, ed. by Shingo Minamizuka (Sairyu-sha, 1990), p.78. Incidentally, the small Czech nation in Central Europe reflected those geographical conditions. The folk music that is fundamental to their culture also reveals a striking regional difference between Bohemia and Moravia. In short, Western European culture has remained closely connected since the medieval period, and therefore, Bohemian folk songs have a strong inclination toward the Western style. In contrast, the history of eastern Moravian folk songs is heavily influenced by Byzantine hymns. Just as there is a strong unity with the Eastern region, the Czechs preserved elements of both the Slavic and Western European cultural spheres by existing between them.
4. With regard to the Hussite revolution, “T. Itou, ed., *op. cit.*, pp.421-22” has more details. “The Hussite war” ranged from 1419 to 1436, and the Czechs’ national movement bore the burden. This movement constituted a rebellion by the Hussites. These anti-Catholic Bohemians inherited the dying wish of their leader, Hus, who had preached to the nobles and petty bourgeoisie at Prague’s Bethlehem Chapel in 1402. In 1409, Hus was installed as president of Prague University, but was martyred in 1415. The unrivaled Hussite forces, “Those who are Warriors of God,” smashed the German Catholic crusaders five times. This remarkable military success was said to have inspired Czech national pride.
5. For information on the “National Revival” by the Czechs, see Joseph F. Zacek, “Nationalism in Czechoslovakia,” in *Nationalism in Eastern Europe—Past and Present*, ed. by P. F. Sugar & I. J. Lederer (Rikimizu-shobou, 1990), pp.143-45. The “National Revival” indicates the history of the Czechs from 1770 to 1848, emphasizing the “new contact between the cultural and religious spirit of the Hussite era.” The cause has been attributed to the reaction against the centralization of power by Joseph II and the policies of tolerance by his system in Vienna. Either of these would have been after-effects of policies set forth by the Hapsburg Empire, which were thought to have influenced the Czech Cultural Revival movement.
6. *Ibid.*, pp.137-38 & p.150.
7. See T. Hayashi, *op. cit.*, pp.84-85.
8. This article is revised and translated as per my monograph of the same title, in *Shisou*, Dec. 2007, No.1004,



- pp.189-207.
9. “Pan-Slavism” is defined as “the ideological movement that aims at unifying all Slavic-speaking nations together.” This movement emerged during the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, around the time of the national excitement of various Western and Southern Slavs (previously cited work edited by T. Itou, *op. cit.*, pp.398-99). In particular, because the declaration at the “Slavonic conference,” which was held in Moscow in 1867, was highly evocative of the nature of this pan-Slavism, Bohemian Germans came to feel uneasy about Czech intellectuals. Indeed, Bohemia came to be seen as something that should “be incorporated into the unified German empire that was based on grand German ideals” (see J. F. Zacek, *op. cit.*, p.150).
  10. For detailed arguments for the *Sokol*, see “J. F. Zacek, *op.cit.* p.149 & p.191.” The same organization that was started in 1862 would become an important weapon in the national movement service, and it was transformed into a grand “patriotic/national demonstration.”
  11. Carl Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts (Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft Bd.6)*, Wiesbaden: Athenaion; Laaber: Laaber-Verlag Maber-Buscher, 1980, S.31. The “political motif” symbolized in Smetana’s operas composed in the 1860s was described through the themes of “a history of the founding of the nation of Bohemia” and “a fight for freedom.” Soon after his return from Sweden, he composed the three-act opera *Branboři v Čechách* (“The Brandenburgers in Bohemia”; 1862–1863). This opera is a grand, national drama describing the Czech people’s resistance to the violence of their oppressors. In addition, the opera *Dalibor* (1865–1867) is a three-act dramatization of the libretto by J. Wenzig. It develops a high sense of tension, with a magnificent and fearless Czech hero. The celebratory drama *Libuše* by J. Wenzig describes the myth of the founding of the Czech nation, celebrating its past and future glories. Returning to Smetana’s youth, his patriotism was stirred up through his participation in the revolutionary movement in Prague in 1848 (June 11). In the same year, he composed the piano work *Marsch der Prager Studenten Legion* and the chorus *Píseň svobody* (‘Song of Freedom’).
  12. Jim Samson (trans. by Yukio Miyake), “The East of the Central Europe, the Conflict for the acquisition of the National Identities,” *European Music and Society 9, The Late Romantic Era II-the End-19<sup>th</sup> Century [Man and Music, The Late Romantic Era, From the Mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century to World War I, ed. Jim Samson, London 1991]* (Ongakunotomo-sha, 1996), p.21.
  13. Bedřich Smetana, *Dopisy Smetanovy (Smetana’s Letters)*, ed. by Karel Teige, Praha 1896, p.78.
  14. On this subject, see Otakar Šourek, *Život a dílo Antonína Dvořáka Díl 4 (Life and work of Dvořák 4)*, Praha: Státní nakladatelství, 1957(1934), p.272. For further details of Dvořák’s music, see also, Hisako Naito, *The Great Composers: Life and Works Antonín Dvořák* (Ongakunotomo-sha, 2013 [1<sup>st</sup>, 2004]).
  15. Jim Samson, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
  16. For detailed arguments for this subject, see Zdeněk Nejedlý, “B.Smetana a kulturní politika F.L.Rieger (B.Smetana and cultural politician F.L.Rieger),” *Česká Kultura* 2, p.108. Also, Z.Nejedlý, “Smetana-Dvořák,” *Prager Rundschau*, č.3,5,5, 1934, in: Jaromír Dvořák ed., *Zdeněk Nejedlý. O Bedřich Smetanovi (On Bedřich Smetana)*, Praha: Československá Academie Věd, 1980 (1913–14), pp.309.
  17. Antonín Sychra, “Reasliismus Bedřich Smetany (Realism of Bedřich Smetana),” *Hudební Rozhledy*, roč.1, č.8-9, 1949, p.186.
  18. Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Zpěvohry Smetanovy (Smetana’s Operas)*, Praha: Státní nakladatelství politické literatury (2. vyd., Praha 1954), 1954 (1908), p. 215.
  19. In 1901, Z. Nejedlý wrote a book *Z. Fibich: A Progenitor of Melodrama*, in which he severely criticized Dvořák’s



- music as being nothing but light dilettantism. In Nejedlý's monograph *Dvořák's Rusalka*, dated May 25 of the same year, he criticized Dvořák's music again, arguing that his opera *Rusalka* deviated from the musical drama of the Neo-Romanticism. He further regarded Dvořák's conservatism as a decisive defect for an artist (*Rozhledy II*, č.8, pp. 205-9, in: Robert Smetana ed., *Z.Nejedlý—O.Ostrčil Korespondence*, Praha: Academia, Československá Akademie Věd, 1982, p.81.).
20. Otakar Šourek, 1957(1934), *op. cit.*, p.271.
  21. Robert Smetana ed., *Dějiny České Hudební Kultury (The History of Czech Musical Culture) 1890–1945, II: 1890–1918*. Praha: Academia, Československá Akademie Věd. 1972, p.63-64.
  22. Otakar Hostinský, "O Socializace Umění (On the Socialization of Art)," in: H. Hrazilová ed., *Otakar Hostinský. Studie a Kritiky (Study and Criticism)*, Praha: Československý Spisovatel, 1903, p.184.
  23. See Vladimír Helfert, *Naše Hudba a Český Stát (Our Music and Czech State)*, Praha: Hudební epištoly, knihovna, 1918, in: F. Hrabal ed., *V. Helfert, O Hudební Tvořivosti (On the Musical Formation)*, Praha: Editio Supraphon, p.31, 34, 50, and 53.
  24. Z. Nejedlý known as a political leader, was also active as a minister of education from 1948, and he protected enthusiastically Smetana's music as a follower of O. Hostinský and Z. Fibich. Beginning in 1905, he lectured on musicology in Prague University and, beginning in 1919, he served as a regular professor of musical history at Prague University. In his musical bibliographies, he emphasized the political and patriotic sides of Czech music, especially through his study of Smetana, the Hussites, and the Hussite chorale. In 1929, he entered in the Czech Communist Party and after the Second World War, he became a member of the government, as well as of the party's Central Committee, where he advanced cultural and educational policies (he served two terms as minister). From 1952 to his death in 1962, he served as the president of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
  25. See Zdeněk Nejedlý, "Smetanova Má Vlast (Smetana's My Fatherland, cycle of sym. poems)," *Program 2. koncertů strany národní sociální*, Rudolfin, 1914, p.2, in: Jaromír Dvořák ed., *Zdeněk Nejedlý. O Bedřich Smetanovi (On Bedřich Smetana)*, *op. cit.*, 1980, p.325.
  26. Zdeněk Nejedlý, "Smetana-Dvořák," *op. cit.*, 1934, in: Jaromír Dvořák ed., *ibid*, 1980, pp.309-313. And see also *Note 10*, in particular concerning the "national opera."
  27. Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Bedřich Smetana. Ars.*, Bd. I. Praha: Orbis, 1924, p.12.
  28. *MASARYK 1925*, in: Antonín Sychra, "Realismus Bedřich Smetany (Realism of Bedřich Smetana)," *op. cit.*, 1949, pp.171-172. Masaryk worked as a member of the Austro-Imperial Parliament of Youth Czech Party, from 1991 to 1993.
  29. The interwar crusades were initiated by O. Šourek and V. Helfert beginning in 1929, (when he seceded from Nejedlý's group). In 1931, Helfert was appointed as a professor of musicology at Brno University. Especially, Helfert wrote the book *Česká Moderní Hudba (Czech Modern Music)* in 1936, and he appreciated Dvořák as a traditional "Czech muzikant" just like a *Cantor* (village teacher) or an organist, who had been active in Bohemia and Moravia, from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In other words, he praised Dvořák as the best composer of Czech modern symphony, having taken the early folklorism of music to the top, reaching the level of Smetana. Helfert thus advocated the new concept of Czech music, strongly supporting Dvořák's conservatism. On this subject, see Helfert, *Česká Moderní Hudba*, Olomouc, 1936, in: F.Hrabal, *V.Helfert, O. Hudební Tvořivosti (On the Musical Formation)*, 1970, pp.200-04.
  30. "Moravism"(defined by a Czech musicologist, J.Vysloužil), means "the movement which tries to express

eminently the locality or the local color of Moravia, above all, especially using Moravian folk music,” as the musical idioms of Moravian composers. See Hisako Naito, *The Charm of Czech Music, Eurasian Selected Works* (Toyo-shoten, 2007), pp.191-229.

31. See Jiří Fukač, “Janáček in the Dance of ‘Categories’,” (trans. by Tomomi Tsugami), *Ongakugeijyutsu* 1988, p.24. See also, H. Naito, *A History of Czech Music—The Symbolic Representationalism of the National Tones* (Ongakunotomo-sha, 2002), pp.163-170, in particular, on the analysis of *Sinfonietta*.
32. Ludvík Kundera, “Janáčková Tvorba Klavírní (Janáček’s Piano Works),” *Musikologie, svazek 3*, 1955, p.324.
33. Jiří Vysloužil, “Die Mährische Richtung in der Tschechischen Musik (The Moravian Direction in the Czech Music),” *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University*, H16, 1981, S. 39.
34. For detailed arguments for the ethno-nationalism, see Stanley J. Tambiah, “Ethno-Nationalism-Politics and Culture,” (trans. by Masako Okamoto), *Shisou*, Jan. 1993, No.823, pp.50-63 [the source: Stanley J. Tambiah, “Ethnic Confliction in the World Today,” *American Ethnologist* 16. 2. 1989].
35. A. Hába established a department of microtonal music at the Prague Conservatory in 1923. In 1935, the society for contemporary music *Přítomnost* (The Present) was founded by a sector of the Czech avant-garde circle. This group attracted other Czech composers as well, who were also active in the communist proletarian movement, which was commanded by Vít Nejedlý (1912–45), a son of Z. Nejedlý. See Jiří Vysloužil, *Alois HÁBA, Život a Dilo (Life and Work)*. Praha: Panton 1974.
36. See Jan Racek, “Česká Hudba a Regionalismus (Czech Music and Regionalism),” *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University*, H5, 1970, p. 8. Under the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia (1939–45), the study of musicology and the creation of music were disturbed. Most of the Czech opera theaters in Prague and Brno were closed, and many works under the anti-Nazi themes were composed. The hard struggle with violent opposition to gain freedom was, thus, revived once again.

## 【和文要旨】

19世紀後半，ロシア，東欧，北欧等，ヨーロッパ周縁の国々では「国民楽派」と称される作曲家グループが顕著な活躍を見せ、16世紀以来，ハプスブルク家の支配下に置かれていた中欧の「チェコ」においても，民族固有の音楽を創造しようとする動きが活発化していった。

本論文は，主に19世紀末から20世紀初頭を中心に，20世紀，新時代をめぐる「チェコ音楽」の動向を「ナショナリズム」の視座から洞察し，近代国家成立のプロセスを通して，「国民音楽」の方向性，つまり「近代チェコ」の理念に最も相応しい芸術音楽の創造がどのように決定づけられたのかを明らかにするとともに，「音芸術の果たす役割とは何か」を歴史的に考察するものである。即ち，政治的にモチーフ化された「フス派のコラール（賛美歌）」の表現的機能性や，B.スメタナ及びA.ドヴォジャークら，「ボヘミア楽派」の創作を軸に政界を巻き込むかたちで展開していった「進歩派」と「保守派」の対立，そして新生国家の成立に向けて提唱された「チェコ国民音楽」の概念，並びに「チェコ国民楽派」の始祖としての「スメタナ像」の確立について詳述し，さらにその反動として生じた「ドヴォジャーク擁護論」，およびその汎スラヴ的思想の流れを汲む現代作曲家 L.ヤナーチェクによる「モラヴィア主義」の音表象と，更なる前衛音楽への再編を論点としながら，そのような「国民音楽」の創造をめぐる一連の動向を政治的思想と関係づけて跡づける。

近代国家の形成期にみるチェコ人の文化ナショナリズム，特に「ナショナリズムの音現象」をめ

ぐる動きは、こうして世紀の転換期という劇的に変容する社会の中で、いかにして「民族文化」の成立を達成できるかという国家的な課題に対し、何よりスメタナやドヴォジャークを鍵とするチェコ音楽文化の有りように、時の政治家たちも強い関心をいただき真摯に議論を交わす中で、「ボヘミアにみる進歩的西欧の地平でのチェコ音楽の創造」と「モラヴィアの民俗音楽に基づくスラヴ文化の再構築」という対立軸を通してより一層複雑な展開を誘引しながら、その後のチェコ音楽の歩むべき未来を決定づけていったと考えることができる。