

The Fin-de-Siècle Symphonies of Zdeněk Fibich: Parallels and Contrasts with Contemporary Austro-Germanic Models

Patrick F. Devine

Introduction

Despite the pessimistic pronouncements of Richard Wagner, who saw Beethoven's Ninth Symphony as representing all that could be accomplished in the genre and the futility of further attempts to succeed the older composer's achievement,¹ and notwithstanding Hubert Parry's apologetic tone when he wrote in *Grove 1* (1889) that 'it might seem almost superfluous to trace the history of Symphony further after Beethoven',² the fate of the symphony experienced a diversified and healthy continuation in the nineteenth century. This might seem all the more surprising when one thinks of the strong opposition mounted by related forms such as the concert overture, symphonic poem and symphonic variations. By the 1890s composers had not wearied of this unique structure, and the range of attention it received across Europe and in America may be gleaned from the cross-sample of works listed in Table 1.³ While not all of these belong to the Austro-

¹ See Mark Evan Bonds, "Symphony", in: Stanley Sadie (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Vol. xxiv (London, 2001), p. 837 [hereafter *NGrove2*].

² Quoted in Mark Evan Bonds, "Symphony", *ibid.* A similarly despondent outlook was articulated by Felix Weingartner; see Nicholas Temperley, "Symphony", in: Stanley Sadie (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Vol. xviii (London, 1980), p. 455 [hereafter *NGrove1*].

³ The source for each composer is *NGrove2*. In each case the author(s) responsible for the work-list will be followed by the composer's surname and most familiar forename, then volume and page(s): Rolf Haglund, "Alfvén, Hugo", i, p. 365; Stuart Campbell, "Balakirev, Mily", ii, p. 517; Adrienne Fried Block, "Beach, Amy", iii, p. 14; Delmer D. Rogers, "Bristow, George", iv, p. 361; Paul Hawshaw, "Bruckner, Anton", iv, p. 478; Steven Ledbetter, "Chadwick, George", v, p. 421; Jean Gallois, "Chausson, Ernest", v, p. 541; Jennifer Spencer, "Cowen, Frederick", vi, p. 632; Bálint Vázsonyi, "Dohnányi, Ernő", vii, p. 426; Manuela Schwartz (with G. W. Hopkins), "Dukas, Paul", vii, p. 673; Klaus Döge, "Dvořák, Antonín", vii, p. 799; John Tyrrell/Judith A. Mabary, "Fibich, Zdeněk", viii, p. 763; Oldřich Pukl (with John Tyrrell), "Foerster, Josef Bohuslav", ix, p. 54; Boris Schwarz, "Glazunov, Aleksandr", ix, p. 940; Galina Grigor'yeva, "Glière, Reynold", ix, p. 946; Colin Matthews,

Germanic tradition, the majority nevertheless bear some relation, indirect if not apparent, to this hegemony. To summarise the information we have 62 works by 41 composers from 15 countries; thirteen of these bear titles, while the breakdown into keys favours minor tonalities: 25 major and 28 minor⁴. Interestingly in the latter group, the choice of e minor attracted not only Dvořák and Fibich but also Amy Beach, Mieczysław Karłowicz, Jean Sibelius and Alexander Zemlinsky. With the Symphony No. 2 in E flat, Op. 38 Hud 304 (1892–1893) and Symphony No. 3 in e minor, Op. 53 Hud 324 (1898) Fibich subscribes to convention with untitled works which adopt a four-movement plan.

This paper identifies some of the more well-known features which characterize a number of symphonies in the period discussed here. These are cyclic procedures, unorthodox tonal strategies, autobiographical content and nationalistic flavour. Each of these will be considered in turn.

Cyclic procedures

In the history of the genre cyclic works originate with Beethoven's Ninth and develop through Berlioz to the high Romantic period, when works such as Tchaikovsky's Fourth Symphony (1878), Bruckner's Eighth Symphony (1887; 1890) and Franck's Symphony in d minor (1889) provide contrasted examples. Two Czech works intensify the processes which operate in these. Fibich's Second Symphony has gained a certain notoriety as the first Czech cyclic symphony,⁵ pipping Dvořák's Ninth Symphony to the post by several months. These two works offer a tantalising opportunity by which we can measure how each composer approached a similar strategy. Table 2a lists the principal themes for the

"Holst, Gustav", xi, p. 654; Ian Denley, "Humperdinck, Engelbert", xi, p. 843; J. Peter Burkholder (with James B. Sinclair & Gayle Sherwood), "Ives, Charles", xii, p. 695–696; Jennifer Spencer, "Kalinnikov, Vasily", xiii, p. 325; Michael Murphy, Jim Samson, "Karłowicz, Mieczysław", xiii, p. 382; Malcolm Macdonald, "Magnard, Albéric", xv, p. 586; Peter Franklin, "Mahler, Gustav", xv, p. 626; John C. G. Waterhouse (with Folco Perrino), "Martucci, Giuseppe", xvi, p. 10; David Fanning, "Nielsen, Carl", xvii, p. 894; Geoffrey Norris, "Rachmaninoff, Serge", xx, p. 716; John Williamson, "Reger, Max", xxi, p. 97; Reinhold Sietz, "Reinecke, Carl", xxi, p. 158; Marina Frolova-Walker, "Rimsky-Korsakov, Nikolay", xxi, p. 415; Yves Krier, "Ropartz, Joseph Guy", xxi, p. 666; Carmen Ottner, "Schmidt, Franz", xxii, p. 536; Christopher Hailey, "Schreker, Franz", xxii, p. 642; Fabian Dahlström, "Sibelius, Jean", xxiii, p. 340; Kari Michelsen, "Sinding, Christian", xxiii, p. 418; Jonathan Powell, "Skryabin, Aleksandr", xxiii, p. 492; Jeremy Dibble, "Stanford, Charles", xxiv, p. 282; John Tyrrell, "Suk, Josef", xxiv, p. 686; Edward Garden, "Taneyev, Aleksandr", xxv, p. 66; David Brown, "Taneyev, Sergey", xxv, p. 70; Roland John Wiley, "Tchaikovsky, Piotr", xxv, p. 173; Ronald Crichton/José Bowen, "Weingartner, Felix", xxvii, p. 241; Antony Beaumont, "Zemlinsky, Alexander", xxvii, p. 785.

⁴ Mahler's Third and Fourth Symphonies straddle both major and minor tonal descriptions; see Peter Franklin, "Mahler, Gustav", in: *NGrove2*, Vol. xv, p. 626.

⁵ See John Tyrrell, "Fibich, Zdeněk", in: *NGrove1*, Vol. vi, p. 522 and Věra Šustíková, *Zdeněk Fibich 1850–1900* (Michaela Freemanová and David Freeman, trans.) (Prague, 2000), p. 27.

purpose of my analysis in the comparison which is presented in Table 2b. Results demonstrate that while the nature of Fibich's material is generally more rhythmic and cellular (i.e. using few notes), Dvořák's is more extended and memorable in melodic terms. An over-reliance on the initial dotted figure in Fibich's symphony becomes tiresome by the end of the work, despite some relief when other themes are developed instead; in contrast Dvořák finds ever new ways of modifying, distorting and colouring his material so that the resulting sound is never monotonous but always varied.

Tonal schemes

In its key-plan Fibich's Second Symphony employs a tertiary relationship which calls to mind Dvořák's Fifth Symphony of 1875. In each work keynotes in individual movements articulate an augmented triad, and the parallel is illustrated in Table 3.

In the opening movement of Fibich's symphony minor keys are relatively rare, and this aspect is compensated for in the slow movement, where the central section exploits a palette of minor colour, from D flat minor to c minor. The Scherzo in G departs from convention in the first section of the movement in its binary form and choice of the subdominant C in place of dominant D for the subsidiary theme; this passage features a return of material from the first movement.⁶ In the Finale Piece No. 132 from the *Ná-lady, dojmy a upomínky* [Moods, Impressions and Reminiscences] is quoted in full in the distant key of B major during the development section;⁷ otherwise the tonal scheme is not unusual.

Fibich's Third Symphony begins with a chord of C major, followed directly by the opening movement in e minor. This draws a parallel with the Symphony No. 1 in g minor of 1891–1892 by Carl Nielsen, which also sets off from a chord of C before the eventual establishment of the home tonic, g minor. With his unorthodox gesture Fibich may have wished to draw the listener's attention to the relationship between e minor and C throughout the symphony, firstly as an advance signal for the key of the slow movement, C major, secondly for the climactic point of reprise in the Finale,⁸ and thirdly in a corresponding role for F major in the A major Scherzo.⁹ One further detail is worth noting here. Ten bars before the end of the first movement, tonic E major harmony is preceded by the mediant

⁶ Compare Fibich: Symphony No. 2 III, bar 49 with I, bar 64.

⁷ Compare Fibich: Symphony No. 2 IV, bar 109 with the *Ná-lady, dojmy a upomínky* [hereafter *Ndu*], Piece No. 132 Hud 311/132 (1892).

⁸ See Fibich: Symphony No. 3 IV, bar 208 in c minor.

⁹ F is the first chord in the departure from the tonic A at the start of the movement (see Fibich: Symphony No. 3 III, bar 9) and also the chord which precedes the tonic in the final cadence (see *ibid.*, bars 159–161). F also alternates with A in a climactic passage; *ibid.*, bars 85–88.

chord,¹⁰ and this progression of chords a major third apart (i.e. G sharp to E) provides a satisfying symmetry to the opening major third (i.e. C to E). The resultant augmented triad C-E-G# recalls the augmented triad illustrated in Table 3 for the Second Symphony.

In the first movement a wide range of tonalities (from E flat minor to F sharp major, i.e. a span of 12 key-signatures) in the exposition and development sections contributes to a fluid soundworld, and a monothematic application of the principal theme with its versatile accompaniment figures represents a much more subtle and effective handling of material than is the case in the composer's preceding symphony. The entry of wind and brass chorale phrases is one more bold stroke.¹¹

Recitative-like contributions and quotations of two pieces from the *Nálady, dojmy a upomínky* (Nos. 208 and 53) add a distinctive touch to the slow movement,¹² and for the reprise the initial music is replaced by a new thematic idea.¹³ The introductory bars of the Finale incorporate a submediant pedalpoint, yet one more indication of the significance of the note C in this symphony.¹⁴

Autobiographical content

Both Fibich symphonies draw on his piano diary, the *Nálady, dojmy a upomínky*,¹⁵ and in this context Gustav Mahler serves as a contemporary composer who resorted to the same idea of self-quotation in his early symphonies. Equally relevant if in a different way, Tchaikovsky's Sixth Symphony of 1893 expresses in an almost graphic way his ongoing troubled personal circumstances. With its title 'Život' ['Life'] the Symphony No. 3 in D, Op. 36 of 1894 by Josef Bohuslav Foerster, described by Anselm Cybinski as 'inward-looking' in tone,¹⁶ may be added to this category. Nevertheless the extent to which Fibich indulges in the recycling of his material may well be unique for his time.

¹⁰ See Fibich: Symphony No. 3 I, bars 391–392. I am indebted to David Beveridge for alerting me to this connection.

¹¹ See Fibich: Symphony No. 3 I, bar 184.

¹² Compare Fibich: Symphony No. 3 II, bar 1 with the *Ndu*, Piece No. 208 Hud 319/208 (1895), also Fibich: Symphony No. 3 II, bar 37 with the *Ndu*, Piece No. 53 Hud 311/53 (1893).

¹³ See Fibich: Symphony No. 3 II, bar 73.

¹⁴ See Fibich: Symphony No. 3 IV, bars 25–31.

¹⁵ Fibich Symphony No. 2 I: *Ndu* Nos. 154 and 341; II: *Ndu* Nos. 132, 341 and 149; IV: *Ndu* No. 132; Symphony No. 3 II: *Ndu* Nos. 208 and 53.

¹⁶ See Anselm Cybinski, liner notes for CD Foerster: Symphonies Nos. 3 and 4 (Osnabrück Symphony Orchestra/Hermann Bäumer, 2008; MDG 632 1492-2), p. 5.

Relationship to works of the Vienna–Prague–Berlin axis

Although one is reminded of Brahms and Tchaikovsky by occasional features in Fibich's symphonies,¹⁷ the most marked influence comes from the symphonic oeuvre of Anton Bruckner. Whether or not these influences are consciously emulated is not important, as the Czech composer sounds sufficiently distinct so as never to suggest a direct connection with the Austrian. Nevertheless quite a number of traits could be pointed out, including the use of tremolando-type openings, chorale phrases for wind and brass, the combination of a theme with its own inversion, arrangement of the orchestral forces in blocks, ornamental triplet figures and sequential falling sevenths. The specific locations are given in Table 4.

Nationalistic flavour

History has judged Fibich's music to be less Czech than Smetana's or Dvořák's,¹⁸ and anyone seeking native melodies or folk dances such as the furiant in these two symphonies will be disappointed. However, on a more local level the composer taps into certain elements and gestures which are attributed to the two older composers; these include the familiar use of parallel thirds in woodwind instruments over a static string support. Table 5 supplies the evidence, and I argue that contrary to received opinion this music *does* sound Czech at times, if largely by association. In any case I leave the final verdict to you the reader!

Table 1: Symphonies written/begun/completed/revised in the decade 1890–1900

Composer	Country	Symphony No.	Key	Date	Op./cat. No.
Alfvén (1872–1960)	Sweden	1	f	1897	7
		2	D	1897–8	11
Balakirev (1836/7–1910)	Russia	1	C	(1864–6; r1893–7)	–
Beach (1867–1944)	America	'Gaelic'	e	1894–6	32
Bristow (1825–1898)	America	<i>Niagara Symphony</i>		1893	62
Bruckner (1824–1896)	Austria	9	d	1887–96	WAB 109
Chadwick (1854–1931)	America	3	F	1893–4	

¹⁷ Compare for example Fibich: Symphony No. 3 I, bars 130–134 with Brahms: Symphony No. 2 I, bars 78–81; Fibich: Symphony No. 3 II, bars 130–136 with Brahms: Symphony No. 2 I, bars 478–479 and Symphony No. 1 II, bars 27–28; Fibich: Symphony No. 3 IV, bars 208–214 with Tchaikovsky: *Romeo and Juliet*, bars 334–341.

¹⁸ See for example John Tyrrell, "Fibich, Zdeněk", in: *NGrove I*, Vol. vi, p. 521.

Chausson (1855–1899)	France		Bb	1889–90	20
Cowen (1852–1935)	England	6, 'Idyllic'	E	1897	
Dohnányi (1877–1960)	Hungary	1	d	1900–01	9
Dukas (1865–1935)	France		C	1895–6	
Dvořák (1841–1904)	Bohemia	9, 'Z nového světa' [From the New World]	e	1893	95; B178
Fibich (1850–1900)	Bohemia	2	Eb	1892–3	38
		3	e	1898	53
Foerster (1859–1951)	Bohemia	2	F	1892–3	29
		3, 'Život' [Life]	D	1894	36
		4, 'Veliká noc' [Easter]	c	begun 1898 ¹⁹ ; completed 1905	54]
Glazunov (1865–1936)	Russia	3	D	1890	33
		4	Eb	1893	48
		5	Bb	1895	55
		6	c	1896	58
Glière (1874/5–1956)	Russia	1	Eb	1899–1900	8
Holst (1874–1934)	England	'The Cotswolds'	F	1899–1900	8
Humperdinck (1854–1921)	Germany	<i>Maurische Symphonie</i>		1890; rev. of <i>Maurische Suite</i>	EHWV 87.1
Ives (1874–1954)	America	1		c1898–c1901, etc.	1
		2		1899–1902, etc.	2
Kalinnikov (1866–1900/1)	Russia	1	g	1894–5	
		2	A	1895–7	
Karłowicz (1876–1909)	Poland	<i>Symfonie odrodzenie</i> [Rebirth Symphony]	e	?1900–1902	7
Magnard (1865–1914)	France	1	c	1890	4
		2	E	1893	6
		3	bb	1896	11
Mahler (1860–1911)	Austria/ Bohemia	2	c – Eb	1888–94	
		3	d/F – D	1893–6	
		4	b/G – E	1892, 1899–1900	
Martucci (1856–1909)	Italy	1	d	1889–95	75
		2	F	1899–1904	81
Nielsen (1865–1931)	Denmark	1	g	1891–2	7
Rachmaninoff (1873–1943)	Russia	[1 st mvt only]	d	1891	–
		1	d	1895	13
		[sketches only]		1897	–
Reger (1873–1916)	Germany	Sym. mvt	d	1890	–

¹⁹ I am grateful to Jiří Kopecký for this information; correspondence by Foerster in 1898 to his wife in Hamburg makes reference to the fact.

Reinecke (1824–1910)	Germany	3	g	c1895	227
Rimsky-Korsakov (1844–1908)	Russia	2, 'Antar', 3 rd version		1897	9
Ropartz (1864–1955)	France	1, 'sur un choral breton'	a	1894	
		2	f	1900	
Schmidt (1874–1939)	Austria	1	E	1896–9	
Schreker (1878–1934)	Austria		a	1899	1
Sibelius (1865–1957)	Finland	1	e	1899	39
Sinding (1856–1941)	Norway		d	1880–90	21
Skryabin (1872–1915)	Russia	1	E	1899–1900	26
Stanford (1852–1924)	Ireland/ England	5, 'L'Allegro ed il pensieroso'	D	1894	56
Suk (1874–1935)	Bohemia		E	1897–9	14
Taneyev, A. S. (1850–1918)	Russia	1	A	1890	
Taneyev, S. I. (1856–1915)	Russia	Symphony for children's insts		?1895	
		4 [orig. as 1]	c	1896–8	12
Tchaikovsky (1840–1893)	Russia	6, 'Pathétique'	b	1893	74
		7 [unfinished]	Eb	1892	
Weingartner (1863–1942)	Austria	1	G	1899	23
Zemlinsky (1871–1942)	Austria	[1] [fragment]	e	c1891	–
		[2]	d	1892–3	–
		[3]	Bb	1897	–

Observations:

Total of 62 works;

Total of 41 composers;

Total of 15 countries: Russia (10 composers), Austria (6), America, Bohemia and France (4 each), Germany (3), England (2), Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Poland and Sweden (1 each);

Total of 14 unnumbered works;

Total of 13 works with titles;

There are 55 known keys:

25 major: E (5 symphonies), D, Eb and F (4 in each), Bb (3), A and C (2 in each) and G (1);

28 minor: d (8), e (6), c (5), g (3), a and f (2 in each), bb and b (1 in each).²⁰

Composers not listed above but represented by the decade 1880–1889 include Arensky, Borodin, Brahms, Bruch, Debussy, Fauré, Franck, Goldmark, d'Indy, Lalo, Lyapunov, Mascagni, Parry, Rubinstein, Saint-Saëns, Smetana and Richard Strauss (17).

²⁰ See footnote 4.

Table 2a: Principal themes in two Czech symphonies from the decade 1890–1900

[I, II etc. = movement; Eb = E flat major; e = minor; /257 = upbeat to 257]

Fibich: Symphony No. 2 (1892–3)	Dvořák: Symphony No. 9 (1893)
I: Allegro moderato	I: Adagio. Allegro molto
Key: Eb; Total no. of bars: 283	Key: e; Total no. of bars: 452
Theme 1, bar 1, key: Eb	Theme 1, bar 24, key: e
Theme 2, bar 39, key: Bb	Theme 2, bar 91, key: g
Theme 3, bar 64 (bassline), key: Bb	Theme 3, bar 149, key: G
II: Adagio	II: Largo
Key: B; Total no. of bars: 112	Key: Db; Total no. of bars: 127
Theme 1, bar 1, key: B	Theme 1, bar 1, key: E
Theme 2, bar 36, key: ab	Theme 2, bar 7, key: Db
	Theme 3, bar 46, key: c#
	Theme 4, bar 54, key: c#
	Theme 5, bar 90, key: C#
III: Scherzo. Presto	III: Molto vivace
Key: G; Total no. of bars: 671	Key: e; Total no. of bars: 300
Theme 1, bar 1, key: G	Theme 1, bar 13, key: e
Theme 2, bar /257, key: c	Theme 2, bar 68, key: E
	Theme 3, bar /176, key: C
IV: Finale. Allegro energico	IV: Allegro con fuoco
Key: Eb; Total no. of bars: 310	Key: e; Total no. of bars: 348
Theme 1, bar 1, key: Eb	Theme 1, bar 10, key: e
Theme 2, bar 18, key: Eb	Theme 2, bar 44, key: e
Theme 3, bar 39, key: Bb	Theme 3, bar /68, key: G
Theme 4, bar 57 (bassline), key: Bb	Theme 4, bar 92, key: G
Theme 5, bar 109, key: B	Theme 5, bar 106 (bassline), key: G

Table 2b: Cyclic elements in these two symphonies

[I, II etc. = movement; T = Theme; k/c = key or chord; Eb = E flat major; eb = E flat minor]

Fibich: Symphony No. 2 (1892–3)	Dvořák: Symphony No. 9 (1893)
II	II
Bar 109, k/c: B movement I, Theme 1	Bar 96, k/c: A movement I, Theme 1, Theme 3 + movement II, Theme 2

III	III
Bar 49, k/c: C I T3	Bar 154, k/c: e Bar 166, k/c: ab I T1
Bar 107, k/c: 7 th chord I T1	Bar 253, k/c: F Bar 261, k/c: Db I T1
Bar 263, k/c: c Bar 271, k/c: c I T1	Bar 269, k/c: f# Bar 273, k/c: f# I T1
Bar 384, k/c: c I bars 33–34	Bar 281, k/c: E I T3 + III T1
Bar 633, k/c: G Bar 643, k/c: G I T1	
Bar 653, k/c: G I T1	
IV	IV
Bar 46, k/c: g Bar 55, k/c: c I T1	Bar 154, k/c: F Bar 160, k/c: F# II T2 + III T1 + IV T1
Bar 99, k/c: f# I T1 + IV T4	Bar 190, k/c: diminished 7 th I T1 + IV T1
Bar 107, k/c: B I T1	Bar 267, k/c: E I T1 + I T3 + IV T4
Bar 109, k/c: B I T1 + IV T5	Bar 275, k/c: diminished 7 th I T1
Bar 132, k/c: B II bars 9–12	Bar 299, k/c: e II T1
Bar 135, k/c: B I T1	Bar 313, k/c: e II T2 + III T1
Bar 145, k/c: C I T1	Bar 333, k/c: E I T1 + IV T1
Bar 150, k/c: Eb I T1 + IV T4	
Bar 182, k/c: c I T1	
Bar 188, k/c: f I T1	
Bar 230, k/c: Eb I T1, I T3 + IV T1	
Bar 248, k/c: Ab I T1 + IV T2	

Bar 263, k/c: Eb I T1 + IV T5	
Bar 279, k/c: Eb III bars 91–100	
Bar 295, k/c: Eb I T1	

Observations:

- II: Fibich's quotation is a very soft statement of the opening of movement I Theme 1 at the end of the movement.
By contrast Dvořák recalls movement I T1 and T3, and combines both with II T2 in a climactic moment near the end of the central section of the movement.
- III: Fibich refers to 3 themes from I in all 3 sections of the movement (i.e. scherzo, trio and coda). Unusual is the return of I, bars 33–34 at bar 384 in III.
Dvořák uses 2 themes from I, limiting their appearances to the quiet link into the trio and to the coda section.
- IV: Here Fibich chooses to quote or allude to 2 themes (I T1 and T3) and 2 passages (II, bars 9–12 and III, bars 91–100) from earlier in the symphony. I T1 is combined with each of the 4 main themes in the course of the finale. This reference to I T1 may be either the rhythm of the first 5 notes or following sighing figure. At one point both elements may be seen (IV, bar 188).
Dvořák presents no less than 5 themes in his application of the cyclic principle (I T1 and T3, II T1 and T2, III T1). However, none of these occurs in the exposition of the movement, as if their return were kept in reserve for a powerful accumulation later in the movement. Perhaps the least expected quotation is that of the introduction to the slow movement, which makes a dramatic entrance at IV, bar 299 and concludes with a striking Phrygian cadence.

Table 3: Tonal design in two Czech symphonies
[I, II etc. = movement]

Fibich: Symphony No.2 (1892–1893)	Dvořák: Symphony No. 5 (1875)
I: Key: Eb	I: Key: F
II: Key: B	II: Key: a
III: Key: G	III: Trio: Key: Db
IV: Key: Eb; Eb + G + B=augmented triad	IV: Key: F; F + A + Db=augmented triad

Table 4: Instances in Fibich's Second and Third Symphonies which point to the possible influence of Anton Bruckner
[I, II etc. = movement]

Fibich: Symphony No. 2 (1892–3)	Context	Bruckner
III		
Bars 85, 87	Ornamental triplet figures	Symphony No. 2 IV, bars 33–50
Bars 173–174	Sequential falling 7 th s	Symphony No. 7 III, bars 9–11
IV		
Bars 285–294	Block arrangement of orchestral forces	Symphony No. 5 I, bars 331–345
Fibich: Symphony no. 3 (1898)		
I		
Bars 3 etc.	Tremolando	Symphony No. 2 I, bar 1
Bars 184–189	Chorale phrases for woodwind and brass	Symphony No. 5 I, bars 18–21 and IV, bars 175–178 ²¹
Bars 213–215	Combination of theme and inversion	Symphony No. 7 I, bars 281–284

Table 5: Instances of Czech ingredients in Fibich's Second and Third Symphonies
[I, II etc. = movement]

Fibich: Symphony No. 2	Earlier Examples	Context
I		
Bar 54	Dvořák: Symphony No. 1 I, bar 129	Solo direction for timpanist
Bars 85–86, 226–227	Voříšek: Symphony in D I, bars 82–83	Tonal sidestep at the end of a section
Bars 99 and 102	Smetana: <i>Prodaná nevěsta</i> [The Bartered Bride] overture, bars 369–390	Parallel 3 ^{nds} in woodwind (etc.) over static harmony

²¹ These passages represent the most typical examples and feature brass instruments exclusively. Passages for woodwind and brass are less frequently met, but instances occur in Bruckner: Symphony No. 4 (1878/1880) IV, bars 351–356 and Symphony No. 8 (1887) IV, bars 293–296.

Bars 118, 270	Dvořák: Symphony No. 1 I, bar 177	Mediant chord
II		
Bars 80–82	Smetana: <i>Prodaná nevěsta</i> overture, bars 17, 21	Use of raised 4 th degree in the scale
Fibich: Symphony No. 3		
I		
Bars 23–26	Smetana: <i>Má vlast</i> [My Country] ‘Vltava’, bars 24–35	Choice of key, light scoring and dominant pedal
Bars 48–50	Dvořák: Symphony No. 9 I, bars 135–137	Chromatic passage with augmented 6 th chord to the tonic 6–4 chord of a new key
Bars 74–81	Smetana: <i>Prodaná nevěsta</i> overture, bars 369–390	Parallel 3 ^{rds} in woodwind (and strings) over a tonic pedal and static harmony
Bars 100–102 (also 82–85)	Dvořák: <i>Slovanské tance</i> [Slavonic Dances], Op. 46 No. 1, bars 90–92	Climbing descant (or chromatic rise) towards the relative minor
Bars 196–198	Smetana: <i>Prodaná nevěsta</i> overture, bars 369–390	Drone 5 th and parallel 3 ^{rds}
Bars 220–222	Dvořák: Symphony No. 8 II, bar 13	Linear augmented 2 nd intervals
Bars 400–401	Smetana: <i>Má vlast</i> ‘Vltava’, bars 426–427	Final cadence for tutti <i>ff</i> after a quiet approach
III		
Bars 1–8	Smetana: <i>Slavnostní</i> <i>Symfonie</i> [Festive Symphony] III, bars 1–8	4-bar units with I-(#)IV– V–I progressions
Bars 46–48	Smetana: <i>Má vlast</i> , ‘Vyšehrad’, bars 52–54	Alternation of chords I and V
Bars 78–84	Smetana: String Quartet No. 1 II, bars 55, 58–59	Polka-like stamp with alternating tonic and dominant bassline
IV		
Bars 123–126	Smetana: <i>Valdštyňův tábor</i> [Wallenstein’s Camp], bars 53–68	Passages of diatonic harmony, often emphasising primary chords

Zdeněk Fibichs Fin de Siècle-Symphonien im Vergleich zu zeitgenössischen österreichisch-deutschen Modellen

Zusammenfassung

Zdeněk Fibichs (1850–1900) Symphonien Nr. 2 und 3 sind ausgereifte Werke, die während der letzten acht Lebensjahre des Komponisten entstanden (1892/3 und 1898). Sie entstammen damit einer anderen Schaffensperiode als seine erste Symphonie (1877–1883). Ihrer Entstehungszeit gemäß thematisieren sie Aspekte wie zyklische Struktur, autobiografische Inhalte und nationalistische Untertöne. Als viersätzig, titellose Werke folgen sie zwar generell den Gattungskonventionen, doch deutet bereits der unorthodoxe Beginn der dritten Symphonie auf ein Abgehen von der Tradition hin. Dies signalisiert eine neue Entwicklung in Fibichs Schaffen, die sich durch eine verstärkte Auseinandersetzung mit Aspekten der Tonalität auszeichnet. Dieser Beitrag untersucht, inwieweit die Symphonien als typische Produkte der Achse Wien–Prag–Berlin angesehen werden können, benennt aber auch andere, entlegenere Einflüsse. Die Frage, zu welchem Grade die Kompositionen „tschechisch“ klingen (ein Problem, das auch viele andere Werke Fibichs betrifft), wird hier in der Tendenz eher positiv beantwortet.

Übersetzt von Wolfgang Marx

Fibichovy symfonie z období fin de siècle: paralely a kontrasty s dobovými rakousko-německými vzory

Shrnutí

Symfonie č. 2 a 3 Zdeňka Fibicha (1850–1900) vznikly během posledních osmi let skladatelova života (1892–1893 a 1898). Jde o zralá díla svým charakterem již poměrně vzdálená první Fibichově kompozici tohoto typu – Symfonii č. 1 z let 1877–1883. Formální ustrojení, autobiografický obsah a nacionální ladění obou děl odpovídá dobové kompoziční praxi. Ačkoliv skladby formálně vycházejí z tradice klasického čtyřvětého sonátového cyklu, neobvyklý úvod Symfonie č. 3 již naznačuje odklon směrem k důkladnějšímu zvažování otázek tonality. Předložená studie řeší otázku, do jaké míry obě kompozice představují typický produkt hudební kultury na ose Vídeň–Praha–Berlín a do jaké míry byly inspirovány vlivy mimo zmíněnou oblast. Pozornost je rovněž věnována přítomnosti specifického českého charakteru v hudbě obou symfonií.

Přeložil Jan Blüml

Keywords

19th century symphony; Zdeněk Fibich.