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INSTRUMENTATION

_Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Wind Ensemble_ is scored for the following instrumentation:

- Piccolo
- 3 Flutes
- 2 Oboes
  - English Horn
- 3 Clarinets in B-flat
  - Bass Clarinet
- 2 Bassoons
  - Contrabassoon

- Soprano Saxophone
- Alto Saxophone
- Tenor Saxophone
- Baritone Saxophone

- Solo Tenor Saxophone

- 4 Trumpets in B-flat
- 4 Horns
- 3 Trombones
  - Bass Trombone
  - Euphonium
  - Tuba

- Timpani
- 4 Percussion
  - Pitched: Crotales, Glockenspiel, Vibraphone, Xylophone
  - Unpitched: Bass Drum, Bongos, Claves, Crash Cymbals, Snare Drum, Suspended Cymbal, Tam-Tam, Tambourine, Toms, Triangle, Wood Block

- Piano
PERFORMANCE NOTES

The score is a C score, and all instruments sound the pitch as written, except piccolo, contrabassoon, and mallet percussion instruments, where standard octave transpositions apply.

All trills are to be performed using the written note and a whole step above. The exception is when the trill is preceded by 1/2; in this case it is to be performed using a half-step above the written note.

Accidentals apply only to the note they precede and remain in effect throughout the entire measure. They are applicable only to the staff in which they are found, and octave transference is not used.

PERCUSSION MAP

This map is valid for all four movements, and the placement of an instrument in the map is static. In addition to this map, the instrument to be used is labeled to avoid confusion. Two instruments share one position within the map: the space above the staff can be either tam-tam or hi bongo.
ABSTRACT

This dissertation is in two parts. The first part is an original composition, “Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Wind Ensemble.” The second part is a comparison of two major works of the twentieth century: *Concerto for Orchestra* by Béla Bartók and *Concerto for Orchestra* by Witold Lutosławski.

“Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Wind Ensemble” is a work in four movements. The first movement is in an incomplete sonata form, as the second theme group does not appear in the recapitulation. The second movement has a traditional tertiary form, with the middle section comprised of a brass chorale. The third movement is a loose melodic retrograde. Within this context, the instrumentation and harmonization are not bound to the retrograde principles that are applied to the melodic material. The second theme group from the first movement returns in the fourth movement, and completes what is an interrupted recapitulation. The overall form of the fourth movement is tertiary, and the soloist takes a cadenza before the return of the opening material. The primary scalar material for the first three movements is derived from the set G-C#-D-D#-E-F#-G-A-Bb. This scale is modified in the last movement to C-(C#/D)-Eb-E-F-G-(Ab/A)-Bb, where the pitches inside the parentheses are freely substituted.

The Concerti for Orchestra of Béla Bartók and Witold Lutosławski were written within ten years of each other, but at very different points within the careers of their respective composers. Comparisons are made in three areas: how each work fits within the twentieth-century genre of a *Concerto for Orchestra*; how each composer used external musical sources for compositional material, focusing specifically on folk music; and the forms and techniques used in both works.
PART ONE: AN ORIGINAL COMPOSITION,
“CONCERTO FOR TENOR SAXOPHONE AND WIND ENSEMBLE”
Score in C

I. MODERATO; ALLEGRO
III. SCHERZO
IV. CAPRICCIO
PART TWO: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CONCERTI FOR ORCHESTRA
OF BÉLA BARTÓK AND WITOLD LUTOSŁAWSKI
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Considerations

The second part of this dissertation is a comparison of two important works of the twentieth century, and both works bear the title *Concerto for Orchestra*: one written by Béla Bartók near the end of his life, and the other written by Witold Lutosławski near the beginning of his career. These works were premiered eleven years apart, and both composers approached the orchestra as a virtuosic entity. Bartók’s total musical output was a huge influence on Lutosławski.¹

On the surface, it is easy to assume Bartók’s Concerto for Orchestra had a direct influence on that of Lutosławski, especially given Lutosławski’s stated adoration of Bartók’s music.² Several authors make this claim without offering specifics.³ Others say Bartók’s Concerto had little to no influence on Lutosławski’s Concerto. Both Steven Stucky and Charles Rae are in the latter category. Stucky states:

> It is easy to suppose that Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra* must have been deeply influenced by the well-known Bartók work of the same name. .... aside from the obvious coincidence that both composers’ works contain a chorale, one can search in vain for clear traces of Bartók in the actual musical text of the Lutosławski concerto. What is in fact more interesting are more significant is the crucial difference between the methods of the two composers.⁴


Stucky is correct in that any comparison of these two works must highlight the differences in approach that these composers take in regard to usage of materials.

Areas that will be addressed in this comparison include how both composers used folk music, structural and compositional technique, and what constitutes a *Concerto for Orchestra*. Folk music was vital for both Bartók and Lutosławski during the time each wrote their respective *Concerto for Orchestra*. For Bartók, the investigation of folk music was a lifelong passion, and he is considered one of the founders of ethnomusicology. Lutosławski used folk music as source material in his compositions in the period after World War II, culminating with *Concerto for Orchestra*. Works bearing the title of *Concerto for Orchestra* start appearing in the twentieth century. The title of *Concerto for Orchestra* implies that certain technical and structural elements exist in the work. Thus, why both Bartók and Lutosławski chose the title *Concerto for Orchestra* and whether the works of both composers fit in this category will be analyzed. The compositional methodologies must be examined in order to detect if any non-coincidental relationships exist between the two works.

1.2 Background for Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra*

Bartók left his beloved Hungary in 1940 for the United States to escape the advancing influence of the Germans. Bartók was not active in the Hungarian resistance, but rather left Hungary in order to keep his family and manuscripts safe from the imminent war. Eventually, Bartók felt artistically isolated in the United States, to the point that he contemplated returning to

---

5 Cooper, 4.

6 Nikolska, 38.

7 Cooper, 16.
his homeland. In a letter to his son Béla dated June 20th, 1941, Bartók wrote, “In these circumstances, we should then have to return to Hungary, no matter how the situation develops there…if things are bad everywhere, one prefers to be at home.”

Shortly after Bartók arrived in the United States and gave a concert tour, he began working at Columbia University, transcribing and annotating a vast collection of Yugoslavian folk music recordings. Unfortunately, this position was only temporary, with funding ending in December 1942, and Bartók’s failing health halted his concert performances in January 1943. He collapsed in February of that year after delivering a lecture at Harvard, and feared he would never appear in public again as he cancelled all future bookings.

The financial situation for Bartók and his wife, Ditta, became grim as his health prevented concert income and his pension and royalties from Hungary were severed when the United States entered World War II. Ditta sought help from several of Bartók’s acquaintances. A former pupil of Bartók, Ernő Balogh, contacted ASCAP, who gave Bartók a stipend to cover medical costs. Bartók’s fellow Hungarian expatriates violinist Josef Szigeti and Fritz Reiner

---


10 Ibid., 97-98.

11 Cooper, 18.

12 Stevens, 97.

13 Cooper, 18.
approached Serge Koussevitzky and pursued him to commission a new work for the Koussevitsky Music Foundation from Bartók.\textsuperscript{14}

Bartók had not composed since arriving in the United States.\textsuperscript{15} The last piece he composed in Hungary was \textit{String Quartet No. 6}.\textsuperscript{16} A period of four years of compositional inactivity elapsed between the quartet and \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}.\textsuperscript{17} When he received the commission from Koussevitzky, this gave him a new vigor.\textsuperscript{18} The symptoms of his illness went into temporary remission.\textsuperscript{19} Bartók began work on the \textit{Concerto for Orchestra} on August 15, 1943.\textsuperscript{20} Work progressed quickly, and the composition was finished on October 8, 1943.\textsuperscript{21} Bartók’s \textit{Concerto for Orchestra} was one of his last completed major works, and as such, has had an enduring legacy.

1.3 Background for Lutosławski’s \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}

Lutosławski was an exile in his own land. The influence of the Soviet Union in Polish politics extended to suppression of artistic freedom. Lutosławski’s previous work for orchestra,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 19. The foundation was created in honor of Serge’s late wife, Natalie Koussevitzky.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 18.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 81.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} \textit{Béla Bartók Letters}, 326.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Benjamin Suchoff, \textit{Bartók: Concerto for Orchestra: Understanding Bartók’s World} (New York: Schirmer Books, 1995), 115.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Benjamin Suchoff, \textit{Béla Bartók: A Celebration} (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2004), 107.
\end{itemize}
his First Symphony, was declared “formalistic” by the government ministry.\textsuperscript{22} In describing his situation, Lutosławski states,

\begin{quote}
I was not being persecuted, but the performance of my First Symphony during the Chopin Competition in Warsaw in 1949 caused a scandal. Włodzimierz Sokorski, Minister of Culture, said that such a composer should be run over by a tram-car… They described the First Symphony as ‘formalistic’; the meaning of that was – and still is – incomprehensible to me.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

The political climate forced Lutosławski to write consumer music. Short works for children, simplistic chamber works, and works for amateurs comprise the majority of his compositional output during this period.\textsuperscript{24}

Lutosławski did not hate this work; he saw it as a patriotic duty to help rebuild Polish culture after the devastation of World War II.\textsuperscript{25} In writing these applied music compositions, Lutosławski took the view that this work helped him develop his musical vocabulary, despite the work not providing an opportunity for artistic growth.\textsuperscript{26} With the exception of the \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, he views his output from this period as being utilitarian in nature: written for specific purpose, but with little aesthetic value.\textsuperscript{27}

Lutosławski was never forced by the political regime to use folk music, as he had used folk music themes before the war. After working with them for his consumer music for such an extended period of time, he began to develop a bitter viewpoint of his compositional output from

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{22} Nikolska, 39.
\item\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 39-40.
\item\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 37.
\item\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 38.
\item\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 39.
\end{footnotes}
the period. Lutosławski stated about his *Concerto for Orchestra* and this period in general, “The
Concerto is written according to the formula ‘I write as good as I only can’, for I was not yet able
to write as I wanted to [write].”

When Witold Rowicki commissioned Lutosławski to write a work for orchestra in 1950,
Rowicki had recently founded the National Philharmonic Society (Poland). This orchestra was
young, both in terms of how long it had existed and the age of its personnel. The commission
gave Lutosławski the occasion to write a serious work in a large-scale format. The serendipity
afforded Lutosławski the opportunity to explore a new technique in dealing with folk music that
involves transforming the source material instead of direct quotation.

The *Concerto for Orchestra* is the only work from this period that he considers worthy of
continued performance, despite the fact that there is little of his personal language contained
within it. However, many of the techniques Lutosławski used in his *Concerto for Orchestra*
would serve as the basis for his development and maturation as a composer.

1.4 Historical Backgrounds Compared

The circumstances surrounding the creation of these works encapsulate the surface
similarities that become differences under closer scrutiny. Both composers wrote their work in a
state of exile. Bartók’s exile was physical and self-imposed, as he chose to leave his homeland
before the raging war in Europe reached Hungary. Lutosławski’s exile was more insidious, as it

---

28 Ibid., 40.
29 Ibid., 39.
30 Stucky, 49.
was caused by the influence of the Soviet Union on the politics and culture of Poland during the post-World War II era.
CHAPTER 2. THE GENRE OF CONCERTO FOR ORCHESTRA

2.1 Historical Forerunners of the Concerto for Orchestra

The development of the concerto for orchestra as a genre has roots in the evolution of instrumental performing ensembles starting in the Baroque Era. Throughout the course of history, several musical forms emerged that focused attention on ensemble performance and shared virtuosity. The first of these instrumental forms is the *concerto grosso*.

The *concerto grosso* is a work that has at its core two separate groups of performers. These groups have some characteristic that distinguishes one from the other. Most often this distinction is made by the size of the two ensembles, but it could be as simple as different instrumentation.¹ This harkens back to a tradition from the Renaissance of double choirs separated by physical space as well as call-response nature of the responsory used during some canonical hours and certain parts of the Mass. While there is a difference between the two groups in terms of size or instruments, they are relatively equal in terms of musical treatment. In a *concerto grosso*, the smaller group is referred to as the concertino or concertante and the larger group is the ripieno.

One of the principle ideas of a *concerto grosso* is that of shared musical responsibility among unequal groups.² The *concerto grosso* emphasizes the concertino, and within this framework, individual soloists may have sections where they are featured prominently.³

---


² Ibid.

³ Ibid., 10-11.
However, the ripieno is not relegated to an accompanimental role, and participates in the development of musical ideas and structure.

During the Baroque Era, the evolution of the *concerto grosso* resulted directly from the methods that Arcangelo Corelli applied to the principle of ensemble alteration in his works. Corelli’s opus 6 is a collection of twelve concerti grossi that are typical of the early genre. The instrumentation is two violins and a violoncello in the concertante group (labeled *concertino* in the score) and two violins, viola, and basso continuo in the ripieno group.

Corelli used the concertante group as an extension of the ripieno grouping. The concertante is used to highlight certain aspects of the music, but when an individual performer is not featured, that performer’s part is a mirror image of the corresponding ripieno part. This is demonstrated throughout opus 6, no. 1. The work opens with the ensemble playing tutti for the first eleven measures. Measures twelve through fifteen consist of the concertante playing soli. When the tutti returns, the violoncello of the concertante is featured; the violins of the concertante perform the same music as the ripieno grouping.

Examination of Corelli’s fugue movements (found in No. 1, 5, and 7) shows how Corelli worked out his musical ideas. Corelli states the subject of the fugues in the concertante group. Thereafter, the movement is performed with the concertante joining the ripieno. By stating the fugal subject in the concertante, it receives a position of prominence. When the concertante group consequently joins the ripieno, Corelli makes both groups equal participants in the counterpoint. By doing this, Corelli makes it clear that the counterpoint of the fugue is of greater value, and he used the concertante to highlight the most important aspect of the counterpoint.

---

4 Ibid., 10.
Figure 2.1. Corelli, *Concerto Grosso*, op. 6 no. 1., movement 1, mm. 1-4.

Figure 2.2. Corelli, *Concerto Grosso*, op. 6 no. 1, movement 1, mm 16-19.
Other composers who further developed the *concerto grosso* during this time include Georg Muffat, Giuseppe Torelli, and Tomaso Albinoni.\(^5\) Antonio Vivaldi wrote approximately

---

forty concerti that can be classified as concerti grossi.\textsuperscript{6} In his opus 3 of 1711, Vivaldi is the first composer to use ritornello form in a cultivated manner.\textsuperscript{7} Ritornello form is a type of dialogue between orchestra and soloist or soloists wherein the ensemble plays a recurring musical idea. These repetitions serve as structural pillars, between which the soloist(s) play sections referred to as episodes, where musical development and elaborations occur.\textsuperscript{8}

Ritornellos do not need to appear in their entirety. In the third movement of the fifth concerto in opus 3 (RV 519), a ritornello opens the movement. It comprises two alternating measures using the tonic and dominant chords of A Major. The opening statement is eight measures long, and cadences on the downbeat of the ninth measure. This pattern returns six more times throughout the movement, but in various lengths. When it returns in measure thirteen, the original ritornello statement is reduced to four measures, and an additional nine measures of different material are added. In the third ritornello statement, starting in measure thirty-two, the ritornello is reduced to only four measures before the concertante group resumes the solo parts. The fourth statement is similar to the opening statement in length, but the movement has modulated from A Major to E Major, and thus the alternations of the chords are shifted to E Major and B Major. The remaining iterations of the ritornello are similarly modified.

\textsuperscript{6} Engel, \textit{Concerto Grosso}, 20.


\textsuperscript{8} Hutchings, “Concerto,” 243.
A variation of the concerto grosso emerged called the ripieno concerto (sometimes titled concerto a 4 or concerto a 5, depending on the size of the ensemble the composer used). These works were concerti for the whole ensemble, with any solo passages performed by a member of the section. Works in this form were written between approximately 1690 and 1740. Torelli wrote one of the first examples of this subgenre in 1692 with six concerti a quattro, which were published as part of his opus 5. Even more significant are his Concerti musicali a quattro, opus 6. In these works, he wrote a preface explaining how in the short sections marked ‘solo’, one instrumentalist is to perform, and at all other times, there should be three to four people per part. Vivaldi also wrote works in this style. Instrumentation that Vivaldi used in some of these

---


10 Ibid.


12 Ibid.
works includes the following groupings: violin, lute, and continuo; flute, oboe, violin, bassoon, and continuo; and strings with continuo.\footnote{Engel, \textit{Concerto Grosso}, 21.}

The most important Baroque \textit{concerti grossi} for the development of the concerto for orchestra as a genre were the six \textit{Brandenburg Concerti} of Johann Sebastian Bach. Bach knew the work of Vivaldi, as he did transcriptions of some of Vivaldi’s compositions.\footnote{Steven Zohn, “The Baroque Concerto in Theory and Practice,” \textit{Journal of Musicology} 26, no. 4 (Fall 2009): 573.} Bach’s compositions derived from Vivaldi’s work and became a more complex and sophisticated collection.

The second of the Brandenburg Concerti is a true \textit{concerto grosso}. The opening movement is in F Major, and Bach uses ritornello form. However, Bach modifies the form. Rather than long statements of the ritornello followed by elaborate solo sections, Bach creates an elegant counterpoint in his alterations by using shorter sections of the ritornello theme. In the concertino sections, Bach creates a secondary dialog, as the first four concertino episodes are all based on the same theme, and this theme is in a different part for each successive return. As a means of continuity, Bach has the instrument that played the theme previously continue on by playing a countermelody. After this exposition, Bach continues the dialogue between the ripieno and concertino until the end of the movement, adding two more themes to the concertino episodes to complete the movement.

The second movement is a stark contrast to the first. The key is shifted to D Minor, and the ripieno section is reduced to only continuo. In the concertino, the trumpet is omitted.\footnote{This was a common practice, since trumpets at the time (specifically clarino) were of fixed pitch, and thus could not play in the new key of the movement.} In
place of alterations, the concertino has lines written in imitative counterpoint. The counterpoint allows the participating concertino group members to work as an ensemble rather than a collection of soloists.

![Andante]

**Figure 2.5.** J.S. Bach, *Brandenburg Concerto No. 2*, second movement, mm. 1-7.

The final movement returns to the key of the first movement, and the trumpet returns in a brilliant passage that begins a fugue. The idea of the concertino working as a unit is carried over from the second movement, and the ripieno does not reenter until forty-seven measures into the movement. To prepare for the ripieno’s rejoining the concertino, the continuo is removed from measures 41-46. This further accents the return of the ripieno group.

![Tpt.]

**Figure 2.6.** J.S. Bach, *Brandenburg Concerto No. 2*, third movement, mm. 1-7.

One of the techniques Bach used that would be a foreshadowing of developments 300 years later is variation in the solo grouping within a work. In the Second Brandenburg Concerto, the solo group or concertino consists of flute, trumpet, oboe, and a violin. These four instruments
are often treated as individuals rather than a small group, and appear as soloists, in pairs, and as a trio in addition to the core quartet. Furthermore, the combination of two woodwinds with brass and violin was novel for its time.\textsuperscript{16}

Another innovation of Bach’s that would have future implications is introduced in the Third Brandenburg Concerto. The instruments specified by Bach do not have separate concertino and ripieno designations, but rather the entire ensemble is considered to be the concertino, similar to that of a ripieno concerto. The instrumentation Bach writes for is three violins, three violas, three celli, and bass with harpsichord. None of the parts are given the designation of \textit{principale, concertato} or \textit{concertanti}. This work is not a \textit{ripieno concerto}, as each part was originally intended for one performer (excluding the continuo part, which required two). What is significant is the degree to which Bach specified the individual parts, and the interaction of these parts. Bach treated the entire ensemble in a virtuosic manner that far exceeds that of previous \textit{concerti grossi} or \textit{ripieno concerti}.

With the end of the Baroque period and the dawning of the Classical period, the \textit{concerto grosso} gave way to a new form: \textit{symphonie concertante}.\textsuperscript{17} The \textit{symphonie concertante} usually had two or three soloists in the concertante, but on occasion had as many as nine.\textsuperscript{18} This form emerged not in German-speaking lands, but rather in Paris.\textsuperscript{19} From the 1760s until 1792, Paris

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Engel, \textit{Concerto Grosso}, 30.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Barry S. Brook, “The ‘Symphonie Concertante’: An Interim Report,” \textit{Musical Quarterly} 47, no. 4 (October 1961): 494.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
was one of the centers of the Western musical world. Musicians frequently traveled between their homes and Paris to perform and to find publishers.\textsuperscript{20} Several orchestras existed in the city apart from the orchestra attached to the Paris Opera. Paris had more composers and instrumental virtuosi during this period than any other city in Europe.\textsuperscript{21} These conditions, coupled with the principles cultivated by the Age of Enlightenment, created a demand for works that had a lighter character than a Germanic symphony and entertained the Parisian public by allowing the large number of virtuosi in Paris to demonstrate their skills.

Several factors distinguish the \textit{symphonie concertante} from the \textit{concerto grosso}. The dialogue between soloists and ripieno found in a \textit{concerto grosso} is reduced or eliminated in a \textit{symphonie concertante} to the point where the orchestra becomes primarily accompanimental in nature.\textsuperscript{22} The styles of the works have vastly differing qualities. The \textit{symphonie concertante} was usually lighter in character and mood, as evidenced by the almost complete lack of works written in minor keys.\textsuperscript{23} In contrast, approximately half of the known Baroque \textit{concerti grossi} are in minor keys.\textsuperscript{24}

\textit{Symphonie concertante} as a genre started to emerge in Paris circa 1770.\textsuperscript{25} The large portion of known works with the title \textit{Symphonie Concertante} and its variations were written

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\end{flushleft}
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\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{22} Brook and Gribenski, “Symphonie Concertante.”
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{24} Brook and Gribenski, “Symphonie Concertante.”
\end{flushleft}
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\end{flushleft}
between 1770 and 1790, with the majority of these being written for Paris audiences.\textsuperscript{26} The decline in the number of pieces starting in the 1790s is attributable to the French Revolution.

The French Revolution brought forth the fall of the aristocracy within Paris. This exacerbated a shift in musical patronage that started in the second half of the eighteenth century. Musicians began to find ways to support themselves outside of noble or church employment.\textsuperscript{27} This shift became a necessity, for after the Napoleonic Era, church and court positions became scarce.\textsuperscript{28} This led to the rise of the soloist as an artistic entity.

Within the new culture, touring soloists became more prominent. Concerti were no longer performed in small venues as a recital, but in large halls on orchestra concerts.\textsuperscript{29} The popularity of individual performers grew, as did demand for their virtuosic displays. Many works during this time were written for the sole purpose of virtuosic display, with little to no merit outside of technical demands.\textsuperscript{30} When the soloist did not compose these works, the composers were overshadowed and became secondary.

The person who led the change in how the public viewed soloists was Niccolò Paganini. In 1809, he left his post as a solo violinist to Napoleon’s sister, Elise Baciocchi, and began touring Europe to display his virtuoso technique.\textsuperscript{31} Others soon followed Paganini’s path. With

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 13.


\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 11.

\textsuperscript{29} Hutchings, “Concerto,” 251.

\textsuperscript{30} Plantinga, 177.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 174.
the decline of noble patronage, concerts became commercial endeavors.\textsuperscript{32} Star soloists sold out the theatre, and there was no place for music that took the spotlight off the featured virtuoso by requiring a shared stage among a group of performers who were not serving as accompanists.

Within the Romantic Era, concertos were primarily written for an individual soloist; works for multiple soloists became rare. While there are several famous exceptions, these double and triple concerti function along the same principles as those of works for soloist and orchestra.\textsuperscript{33} These works are essentially a Romantic Era version of the Classical \textit{symphonie concertante}, where the soloists are the primary element in the music. These multiple soloist concerti are a bridge between the solo concerto and the \textit{symphonie concertante}, and carry concertante writing into the twentieth century.

Along with the demise of concertante-style works and the rise of virtuosic solo concerti in the Romantic Era, the orchestra began to change. New timbres were being introduced, and advances in technology created instruments that were able to play chromatically with little to no compromise in sound quality. As composers began to experiment and include these new instruments, the standard instrumentation for orchestras evolved.\textsuperscript{34}

The expectations for instrumental resources at the end of the Classical Era can be seen in the first four symphonies of Ludwig von Beethoven. The instrumentation of these works calls for pairs of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, horns, and trumpets, as well as timpani and strings.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 179.

\textsuperscript{33} The most famous examples of multiple soloist concerti after 1800 are Beethoven’s Triple Concerto, opus 56, and Brahms’s Double Concerto, opus 102.


\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Symphony No. 3} uses three horns, and \textit{Symphony No. 4} calls for only one flute.
Beethoven uses this same instrumentation set for two of his later symphonies, No. 7 and No. 8. Beethoven expanded the orchestra with his *Symphony No. 5*. He added piccolo, contrabassoon, and trombones in the fourth movement. Before Beethoven, trombones were used primarily to reinforce choral parts in liturgical settings or in operas. With *Symphony No. 9*, Beethoven set a precedent for expanding forces one could use in an orchestral setting by including the instruments he used in the finale of *Symphony No. 5*, and adding to this additional horns, percussion, as well as a full choir in the final movement.

Works such as *Symphonie Fantastique* by Hector Berlioz demonstrated new directions in instrumentation, such as offstage performers. Despite an environment of experimentation, the grouping and types of instruments that emerged as standard instrumentation was set in the middle of the nineteenth century. The tuba was the last major addition, supplanting the ophiclide and serpent. Instruments such as saxophones, Wagner tubas, cornets, and flugelhorns all were invented in the nineteenth century, but failed to find a permanent place in the orchestra. Often, newly invented instruments were used as a novelty or to invoke a special sound.

Music was growing in complexity, necessitating the rise of the baton conductor as the ensemble leader. As with performers, there emerged a separation between the composer and the
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38 Ibid.


40 Ibid.
art of the conductor. While there are many examples of musicians who were adept at both trades, each evolved in specialization to the point where a person could pursue conducting as a career. As with the soloist, some conductors became the prominent feature of the concert experience. One of the reasons this could happen is that by the end of the nineteenth century, “Orchestral precision had come to equal pianistic virtuosity.”41

Within this new context, composers began to search for ways to use the orchestra beyond what was available in symphonies, concerti accompaniment, and in the opera house. In search of new means of expression, composers turned to another new genre: tone poems.

Tone poems, also know as symphonic poems, are works that use an extra-musical poem or program and attempt to invoke a specific series of images.42 These works are usually written for orchestra. Tone poems allowed composers to experiment with different combinations and uses of instruments within the orchestra, including requiring newly-invented instruments in their works. Often the use of new instruments or novel instrumentation was done in search of a sound to define or depict a character. Tone poems offered composers a method to have concertante writing, though in a much more limited manner than that of the symphonie concertante. A work that displays these traits is Don Quixote by Richard Strauss.43

Strauss was extremely specific with the instrumentation he used in Don Quixote, to the point that he specified the number of players within each string section. He also uses wind and brass sections that are expanded from the standard Romantic Era orchestra. Within the


42 Harvard Concise Dictionary of Music, s.v. “Symphonic Poem.”

43 The full title of this work is Don Quixote: Fantastic Variations on a Theme of Knightly Characters.
composition, several techniques point toward the formation of the concerto for orchestra. Inside of the specific framework of the instrumentation list, Strauss has sections where individual violas have unique parts that are not soloistic in nature. At rehearsal number 22 (in Variation II), the twelve viola members are distributed across six staves, and are further subdivided into individuals.

Piccolo, 2 Flutes, 2 Oboes, English Horn, 2 Clarinets in Bb (II doubles on Eb Clarinet), Bass Clarinet, 3 Bassoons, Contrabassoon

6 Horns, 3 Trumpets, 3 Trombones, Tenor Tuba in Bb, Bass Tuba

Timpani
Percussion: Cymbals, Bass Drum, Snare Drum, Triangle, Tambourine, Wind Machine

16 Violin I, 16 Violin II, 12 Viola, 10 Cello, 8 Double Bass

Figure 2.7. Strauss, *Don Quixote*, instrumentation list.

![Figure 2.8. Strauss, Don Quixote, rehearsal number 22, mm 1-5.](image-url)
The piece begins with an introductory section that is followed by a set of variations. The variations loosely follow a symphony concertante format. The concertante members are the solo cello and viola. However, the symphony concertante style is not used throughout the work, and this concertante grouping often fades into the orchestra. This is reminiscent of the ripieno concerto, and the connection is furthered by the fact that the solo cello and viola are members of their respective sections, and not listed as separate soloists. Other soloists emerge from the orchestra, such as the bass clarinet and tenor tuba at rehearsal number 14 and the bassoons at the end of variation nine (between rehearsal numbers 64 and 66).

As a result of the nature of a tone poem, the concertante groups were never defined and did not use fixed instrumentation. Often, these works were demanding of the orchestra members in technique and musicality, and like the concerto grosso and symphonie concertante, tone poems had a short period of prominence. The height of the tone poem’s popularity occurred from the late 1840s until the 1920s.44

The twentieth century brought a period of relative stability with the orchestra in terms of instrumentation. This was brought about due to orchestras increasingly performing music from previous generations.45 With this stability also came a consistency in orchestral personnel not seen since the late Classical period.46 The conditions were right for the return of concertante-style music that allowed the members of an orchestra to be featured. Combined with trends in the early twentieth-century music to reject the exorbitance of the Romantic period and to look to the


45 Kreitner, “Instrumentation and Orchestration.”

46 Spitzer, “Orchestra.”
Baroque and Classical periods for inspiration, music in the textural setting of a \textit{concerto grosso} returned. Pieces in a true \textit{concerto grosso} manner with fixed concertante groupings began to appear starting in the first decades of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{47} The limitation of a small, separate group of soloists was soon dismissed, and composers began writing works where the entire ensemble is featured in a concertante style.

Several minor composers have used terms similar to \textit{Concerto for Orchestra} as titles before it grew into one of the important large ensemble genres during the twentieth century. While there is a piece with the title \textit{Orchester-Konzert} by H. Triest in 1878, the first work within the modern concerto for orchestra framework was written by August Halm in 1910.\textsuperscript{48} Around this same time, Max Reger was resurrecting the \textit{concerto grosso}, with \textit{Konzert im alten Stil für Orchester} in 1912. This work acknowledges its historical lineage by quoting from Bach’s \textit{Brandenburg Concerto No. 2}.\textsuperscript{49} In this work, Reger uses the call-response dialogue technique from the Baroque \textit{concerto grosso} in a conversation between the winds and strings.

Paul Hindemith wrote the first successful concerto for orchestra in 1925.\textsuperscript{50} In this work, the original concepts of a concertante and orchestra conversation are explored. Within the work, there are several instances of concertante writing. What is notable is that the instrumentation used in the concertante sections is different each time. In the second movement, the two groups are the strings and the winds. The roles of concertante and ripieno are not fixed to either group, and the fluid concertante is an important aspect of the genre.

\textsuperscript{47} Engel, \textit{Concerto Grosso}, 47.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
In addition to the works by Bartók and Lutosławski, the concerto for orchestra is a genre that many composers of the modern era have explored. Roger Sessions and Steven Stucky both wrote Pulitzer Prize-winning works that bear *Concerto for Orchestra* as the title. Other composers who have written a concerto for orchestra include Elliot Carter, Michael Tippett, Karel Husa, and Jennifer Higdon.

2.2 The Genre of Concerto for Orchestra Defined

The *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* defines a concerto as “an instrumental work that maintains contrast between an orchestral ensemble and a smaller group or a solo instrument, or among various groups of an undivided orchestra.” The modern concerto also has associated with it an implication of virtuosity. In the solo concerto, the soloist is the performer tasked with the technical and musical display. The orchestra, while important to the music, is in a subservient role. In a concerto for orchestra, the orchestra is tasked with the virtuosic performance. The contrast that occurs is the shifting combinations of instruments and performers, each displaying their talents in differing ways. It is virtuosity demonstrated as an ensemble that is important. While there may be isolated individual solo sections, these are not consistently designated for any one instrument, section, or static group of instruments.

A very succinct and accurate definition of what a concerto for orchestra should be is given by Roberto Gerhard. In the program note for his *Concerto for Orchestra*, he states:

> Ensemble playing, the distinguishing feature of the concerto for orchestra, in fact here takes the place of the virtuosic soloist in the traditional concerto. As a result,
one of the composer’s tasks is to provide such varied instances of virtuoso teamwork as will show up the quality of the orchestra as an ensemble. Clearly, this takes us rather a long way from the formal pattern of the soloist concerto.\textsuperscript{53}

This method of demonstrating ensemble virtuosity harkens back to one of the forerunners of the concerto for orchestra in the \textit{concerto grosso}, specifically in the concertante. The difference between the two genres is that in a \textit{concerto grosso}, the concertante grouping is defined by the score and remains an immutable grouping, in that no additional members are added, whereas in a concerto for orchestra, the concertante is dynamic. The aesthetic merit of a work with \textit{Concerto for Orchestra} as its title is partially judged on the nature of this ensemble fluidity.

2.3 The Concerto for Orchestra versus the Symphony

The differences between a concerto for orchestra and a symphony are not clearly delineated. For example, the \textit{Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians} states that a symphony is “A term now normally taken to signify an extended work for orchestra.”\textsuperscript{54} By its very nature, a concerto for orchestra fits this definition. The distinction between the two forms can be found in the intent of the composer.

As previously mentioned, a modern concerto usually contains some virtuosic element, be it technical, lyrical, or interpretive. While many symphonies contain elements of ensemble and technical virtuosity, this is not the primary motivation for the composition. The concerto for orchestra relies more on the \textit{concerto grosso} model from the baroque and its demands on the

\textsuperscript{53} Roberto Gerhard, \textit{Concerto for Orchestra} (score) (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), quoted in Cooper, 33.

concertante grouping: this grouping becomes the whole ensemble. In some cases, the technical aspects of the ensemble are not more challenging than in a symphony, however, the shifting ensemble is much more elaborate. In these cases, the virtuosity comes from the shifting ensembles alone, as there are not set concertante and ripieno personnel. The works Concerti for Orchestra of Hindemith and Kodaly are of this technique.

Lutosławski wrote four works that bear the title Symphony in addition to his Concerto for Orchestra. In a conversation about this work, Lutosławski stated, “Moreover, it gives the orchestra and the conductor an opportunity to show their virtuosity.” Bartók addresses the question succinctly with his “Composers Note.” He states: “this symphony-like orchestra work is explained by its tendency to treat the single instruments or instrument groups in a ‘concertant’[sic] or soloistic manner.” It is clear from both Bartók’s and Lutosławski’s descriptions of their works that these compositions were indeed considered concerti by their writers.

2.4 The Definition of Concerto for Orchestra As Applied to Bartók’s Work

Bartók’s Concerto for Orchestra calls for an orchestra of the highest quality. There are instances where the concertante-style exposes the performance of the orchestra’s various members. In addition, there are sections that require the orchestra to demonstrate its skill performing as a unified ensemble. In Bartók’s Concerto for Orchestra, the ideas of concertante-style writing and virtuosic ensemble performance are often linked.

____________________

55 Nitshka, 40.

56 Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, 148.
3 Flutes (III doubles on Piccolo), 3 Oboes (III doubles on English Horn), 2 Clarinets in Bb and A (III doubles on Bass Clarinet), 3 Bassoons, (III doubles on Contrabassoon)

4 Horns in F, 3 Trumpets in C, 3 Trombones, Tuba

Timpani
Percussion: Triangle, Side Drum, Bass Drum, Cymbals, Tam-Tam

2 Harps
Strings

Figure 2.9. Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, instrumentation list. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

Bartók specifically mentions three areas where virtuosity is combined with concertante writing: the brass fugue in the first movement, the perpetual motion of the final movement, and the instrumental melodic pairs of the second movement.\(^57\) These places Bartók specifically mentions as well as others support Bartók’s work being justly titled Concerto for Orchestra.

The fugue of the “Introduzione” occurs in measures 316 through 396. This is in the middle of the development section of the first movement, and uses as its subject a theme that was sounded by the trombone during the exposition.\(^58\) One of the unique aspects of this fugue is that the brass sections are its only participants: the remainder of the orchestra adds interjections, but do not contribute to the development of the fugue. The members of the trumpet and trombone sections have highly individualized parts, as opposed to homophonic-style writing usually found for brass instruments in passages of this length. The brilliance of the brass tone creates a musical character that helps drive the fugue to its cadence at measure 396.

\(^{57}\) Ibid.

\(^{58}\) See Chapter 4.2 for a more complete discussion about form.
Bartók calls the motion in the fifth movement similar to a “perpetuum mobile.” 59 From its introduction in the second violins at measure 8 until measure 44, the sixteenth-note motion does not cease. When it resumes in measure 52, it is started by the celli and is shared with the woodwinds as well as the upper strings. The underlying sixteenth-note rhythm drives both the exposition and the recapitulation of the final movement, serving as the primary thematic material in the opening section and as an undercurrent to the melodic development in others. One music reviewer wrote, “There were places where the whole string choir had to be so many Heifetzes” in regards to the demands on the strings. 60 This section is one of many reasons why Bartók rightfully titled his work *Concerto* rather than *Symphony*.

The best example of passing virtuosic display that also demonstrates concertante writing is found in the second movement, “Giucco di coppie.” There is a succession of five independent sections, which Bartók called “chains.” 61 A different pair of instruments sounds each chain. The chains have the character of dances, and each set of pairs demonstrates a high level of ensemble technique. After a chorale in the middle of the movement, each section is repeated, with additional instruments added to further intensify the passage. These additions allow the

---


previously independent chains to integrate new elements upon their repetitions. Starting with the bassoons, pairs of instruments are given a theme and proceed to play at a consistent pitch interval. The concertante grouping changes with each successive chain, starting with oboes, followed by clarinets, flutes, and finally trumpets.

![Figure 2.11](image)

Figure 2.11. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, second movement, (a) mm. 25-30 and (b) mm. 180-186. *Concerto for Orchestra* by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

The chorale that is interjected to the middle of the movement is a dialogue between brass and snare drum that is performed with the snares off, creating a field drum sound. The drum provides a structural framework for the movement, as it is used at the very beginning, the very end, and in the middle section. The snare drum that opens and closes the movement adds a new member to the concertante group: unpitched percussion. In this movement, the snare drum enhances the chains by laying a rhythmic foundation and functions as a counterpoint to the homorhythmic chorale in that it is unpitched and rhythmically active.

The idiom of the wind and brass sections functioning as a concertante is brought back in the fourth movement, “Intermezzo Interrotto”. The form is A B A’ C B’ A”, where the C section is the interruption. In each of the A sections, the melody is played initially by the first oboe, who
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62 Cooper, 44-45.
returns consistently as a soloist. After the initial double reed sound, other woodwinds enter to develop the melody. When also considering the accompaniment that is placed in the strings of long-sustained notes in the upper strings and pizzicatos in the lower strings, it is clear that Bartók wrote these sections in a concertante style with the winds serving as the primary group. The dialogue that commences in the B section enhances this idea. Starting in measure 50 is a stretto at the interval of a quarter-note between the Violin I and English Horn. This is carried through until measure fifty-seven, where a brief duet between the violas and English Horn transition back to the Oboe I solo line.

![Figure 2.12. Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, fourth movement, mm 50-57.](image)

Bartók demonstrates his virtuosity as a composer as well as the virtuosity of the performing ensemble in the fugue present in the development section of the “Finale.” Benjamin Suchoff describes this section as “the art of the fugue merged with the spirit of the folk dance.” The fugue spans the entirety of the development section of the last movement, and its subject is taken from one of the themes of the exposition (Figure 3.11). The first time the subject is played in the fugue, it is ornamented with acciaccaturas (Figure 3.5).

---

63 Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 169.
Bartók used several interesting applications of stretto technique. In measures 317 through 320, Bartók has the strings play the head of the subject in stretto, starting with the double bass. Each entrance is a diminution of the previous entrance that rises in pitch level chromatically and ascends in instrumentation. After the violins play the shortest of these entrances, the woodwinds take over the remainder of the subject melody. Bartók uses a similar process in measures 325 through 333, but this time, he inverts the subject head motive. To compliment this, Bartók starts with the short stretto with long values in the high strings and progresses lower with each diminution. To show that the two ideas are interconnected, Bartók recalls the same woodwind instrumentation that finished the subject in measures 321 through 324, this time starting a minor seventh lower and with the elements of the melody inverted.

Figure 2.13. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, fifth movement, (a) mm. 317-321 and (b) mm. 325-329. *Concerto for Orchestra* by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

Figure 2.14. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, fifth movement, (a) mm. 321-324 and (b) mm. 329-332. *Concerto for Orchestra* by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.
2.5 The Definition of Concerto for Orchestra As Applied to Lutosławski’s Work

In Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra*, the demonstration of ensemble virtuosity is most prevalent in the perpetual motion of the second movement. At rehearsal 25, the strings are divided and pass amongst its members the running sixteenth-note gesture underneath the piccolo and xylophone. This idea is then moved into the clarinets at measure 224, and transferred to the flutes in measure 228. While harkening back to the perpetual motion of the Baroque era, the execution of these more modern ideas requires precision. What differentiates this section from that of a symphony is that the virtuosic demands for the ensemble do not ease during the movement.

Figure 2.15. Lutosławski, *Concerto for Orchestra*, second movement, mm. 216-224. *Koncert Na Orkiestrę* by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.

Figure 2.16. Lutosławski, *Concerto for Orchestra*, second movement, (a) mm. 224-225 and (b) mm. 228-229. *Koncert Na Orkiestrę* by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.
When the perpetual motion subsides in the “Arioso” section at measure 311, its character of spirit is retained. The brilliant timbre of the brass sections, particularly the trumpet fanfare, propels the music. Additionally, the orchestral interjections that were established during the “Capriccio Notturno” sections continue in the “Arioso,” but in an elongated form.

The “Capriccio” returns at measure 343. The perpetual motion is further complicated in a brief coda at the end of the movement. Similar to the first movement, the orchestra fades away, this time leaving only the percussion and contrabass sections playing at an extremely soft dynamic. The precision and concentration required of the performers throughout this entire movement is demanding.

This movement also functions in a concertante manner. When the movement begins, the murmuring strings (Lutosławski gives the indication of mormorando in the score) have a melody that is played at a fast tempo, which obscures the fact that a melody is present. Inside of this murmuring melody are quick interjections, which represents the opening of a dialogue between the various sections of the orchestra. At rehearsal number 22, the dialogue is clear, as the flutes pick up the sixteenth-note motion, and now the strings interject short melodic fragments between the flute runs. The shifting of instrumentation of the perpetual motion line and the interjection line demonstrate Lutosławski’s concertante writing.

The third movement also contains prominent examples of concertante writing. The first half of the movement is a passacaglia. Though the pitches do not change, Lutosławski varies the

---


65 Nikolska, 44.
instrumentation for fifteen of the eighteen statements. Within this framework, Lutosławski interposes thirteen melodic episodes that are independent of the ground. The striking issue with these events is that they are offset from the ground by varying intervals. This creates a series of continuous and overlapping melodies. Lutosławski would later call this procedure “chain technique.” Each of the episodes gives Lutosławski a chance to feature different sections of the orchestra.

3 Flutes (II & III doubles on Piccolo), 3 Oboes (III doubles on English Horn), 3 Clarinets in Bb and A (III doubles on Bass Clarinet), 3 Bassoons, (III doubles on Contrabassoon)

4 Horns in F, 4 Trumpets in C, 4 Trombones, Tuba

Timpani
Percussion: Side Drum with Snares, 3 Side Drums without Snares (Low, Medium, High), Tenor Drum, Bass Drum, 3 Cymbals, Tam-Tam, Tambourine, Xylophone, Glockenspiel

2 Harps, Piano, Celeste
Strings

Figure 2.17. Lutosławski, Concerto for Orchestra, instrumentation list. Koncert Na Orkiestre by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.

Throughout the work, the ensemble is asked to perform several difficult passages. These passages allow the orchestra to demonstrate its ensemble cohesion and adeptness. One such section occurs at the end of the first movement. A portion of the Violin II section holds an artificial harmonic for forty-eight measures at a dynamic of pianissimo. This presents issues of intonation, as the resultant note is high, exposed, and sounded in lower octaves by the piccolo, French horn, and celesta. A similar event happens at the end of the passacaglia. The full Violin I

66 Statements one and eighteen are skeletal versions of the full ground.

section plays the last statement of the melody using natural harmonics. This section is completely exposed, as there is a minimal accompaniment underneath, comprised of pizzicato celli, double basses, and a sustained piano chord.

2.6 Comparison

The works in question of Bartók and Lutosławski have some commonalities. The size of the orchestra both composers call upon is similar, with Lutosławski using all the instruments Bartók did, plus two additional brass players, percussion, and keyboard instruments. Both works require a high level of skill from each member of the orchestra, and both works have examples of concertante writing. This is to be expected, since most compositions within a particular genre incorporate similar concepts, and the genre of concerto for orchestra is not an exception.

Any work bearing the title *Concerto for Orchestra* must allow the orchestra to demonstrate an aspect of its technical prowess. There are several virtuosic orchestral techniques that are shared by these two works; one is perpetual motion. Both composers use the string sections to shoulder the majority of this particular technique, but do also use the other sections.

In addition to virtuosic technique, both works call upon the concept of concertante playing, where one group of players is featured prominently. In a concerto for orchestra, the concertante group is dynamic, and both composers exploit this idea in their respective second movements. Bartók accomplishes this in how the pairs of instruments perform successive sections with minimal accompaniment, and how the style and governing harmonic interval are unique to each instrumental pairing. Lutosławski combines the previously mentioned perpetual motion with a dialogue between the various groups that participate in the motion. As with Bartók, the accompaniment is sparse in order to expose the overlying concertante groupings, often with strings as one group and matched pairs of woodwinds as the other.
While there are some shared conceptual structures, Bartók and Lutosławski often use these traits for differing purposes. Bartók used the perpetual motion in his work in the last movement to drive the work to its stirring conclusion. Lutosławski used it to create a quiet murmuring effect while also evoking the character of a nocturne. Bartók used concertante style with sustained exposed writing for specific sections and soloists more than Lutosławski did in his *Concerto for Orchestra*.

The commonalities found within the two *Concerti for Orchestra* do not show a direct influence of Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra* on Lutosławski’s: rather, it can be seen that these elements can be expected in many works that bear the title *Concerto for Orchestra*. The fact that both of these masters used similar techniques in certain aspects of the composition with regard to virtuosity signifies the rightful place these two works have as superb examples within the modern genre of the concerto for orchestra.
3.1 External Music

Since the time polyphony took shape in Western Art Music, the practice of appropriating previously composed music for inclusion in new pieces has been widely used. From organum to cantus firmus Mass settings to modern direct quotations, borrowing and building on previous material allows for the creation of new works of art for which some audiences already have an innate understanding based on familiarity with the reused material.

Folk music is a common source of previous music material for Western composers. Bartók is known to have had a deep admiration for folk music, as he and Zoltán Kodály collected, transcribed, and published thousands of folk melodies from Eastern Europe.\(^1\) These two men were instrumental in the advancement of the field of ethnomusicology.\(^2\) Bartók looked not only to collect and quote folk melodies, but to also develop a new musical language whose harmony and counterpoint was based on the natural evolution of these indigenous rural songs.\(^3\)

Lutosławski’s approach to folk music before his *Concerto for Orchestra* was to directly quote and use folk melodies, but with a harmonic content that is purely Lutosławski’s own.\(^4\) In his *Concerto for Orchestra*, he pursued a different course of action in how he used folk music materials.
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\(^1\) Suchoff, *Bartók: A Celebration*, 244.

\(^2\) Ibid., 235.

\(^3\) George B. Stauffer, forward to Suchoff, *Bartók: A Celebration*, x.

\(^4\) Nikolska, 37.
Composers have also referenced previously written works, drawing from both other composers as well as self-borrowing. It is worthy to reflect on Bartók’s use of non-folk materials as he treats much of this material in a similar manner as he does the folk music sources.

The use of folk music as a source of inspiration and material for Bartók has been well documented by many authors.\(^5\) This is no different in Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra*. The folk melodies that serve as framework sources for Lutosławski in his *Concerto for Orchestra* are also well documented.\(^6\) Much of Lutosławski’s work during the 1940s and 1950s is, as he describes it, “functional music” and uses folk music as a source for musical material.\(^7\)

The following examples do not document every use of outside musical source material. Rather, they examine several prominent cases in order to compare the methods of the two composers.

### 3.2 Lutosławski’s Usage of Folk Material

Lutosławski used folk melodies as "‘rough stuff’ for a large baroque-like construction."\(^8\) This is a major distinction that separates Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra* from the rest of the works in his folkloric period.\(^9\) Lutosławski does not directly quote any of the folk melodies
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\(^6\) A non-exhaustive list of these materials can be found in Stucky, 50. See also, Zofia Lissa, “Koncert na orkiestrę Witolda Lutosławskiego,” *Studia muzykologiczne* 5, (1956): 241-245.

\(^7\) Rae, 19.

\(^8\) Nikolska, 39.

\(^9\) Stucky, 49.
he used in his *Concerto for Orchestra*.\textsuperscript{10} Instead, they serve as a framework to fashion melodic material.\textsuperscript{11} This gives the music a character based on the folk music, but allows Lutosławski to write music that is within his own compositional style.

Lutosławski originally started using folk melodies in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{12} His method of composition was to use the melodies, but create harmonies and contrapuntal elements of his own devices that often would contradict the melody itself.\textsuperscript{13} In the *Concerto for Orchestra*, he takes this to another level in that the melodies themselves are transformed. He often keeps the intervallic content almost exactly the same as the original quoted melodies, but modifies the meter and rhythmic aspects to alter the character of the melody.

The first melodic gesture of Lutosławski’s work begins with the folk tune *A czyje to kuniki* (*Whose Are These Little Horses*).\textsuperscript{14} Lutosławski uses this melody and its variations to build his own. The pitches of the first cello statement match exactly the original melody transposed into D Minor, in an almost perfect rhythmic translation from 3/8 to 9/8. However, the time signature change does create a shift of accent, and slightly modifies the feel of the melody. Lutosławski makes the melody his own by how he handles the repeated statements and adds in the variations. The constant in the original folk melody and its variations is the first measure. Lutosławski has the variations added to the melody with each successive statement until the full statement is sounded in measure 8.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid. \textsuperscript{10}
\item Ibid. \textsuperscript{11}
\item Nikolska, 37. \textsuperscript{12}
\item Ibid. \textsuperscript{13}
\item Rae, 38. \textsuperscript{14}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
A more elaborate demonstration of Lutosławski’s re-appropriation of folk material in a distinct manner is the passacaglia of the third movement. The folk melody that serves as the basis for the ground of the passacaglia is a cy mi to dziwna zona (And Your Wife Is Strange to Me). When the original folk melody is transposed into the key of D Major, the first thirteen pitches of Lutosławski’s ground are the same as the folk melody (repetitions excluded), with the exception of the third note of the ground being raised (see Figure 3.4). Both the source melody

\[\text{Figure 3.1. } A \text{ czyje to kuniki}^{15}\]

\[\text{Figure 3.2. Comparison of (a) a czyje to kuniki to (b) original statement of first theme of Lutosławski’s Concerto for Orchestra, first movement, mm. 2-3. Koncert Na Orkiestrę by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.}\]

\[\text{Figure 3.3. Full statement of first theme, Lutosławski, Concerto for Orchestra, first movement, m. 8. Koncert Na Orkiestrę by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.}\]

\[\text{15 Stucky, 50.}\]

\[\text{16 Ibid., 54.}\]
and Lutosławski’s melody imply a hybrid of Lydian and Ionic modes. However, the character of the original melody is transformed by both Lutosławski’s usage and alterations.

![Figure 3.4. Comparison of A cy mi to dziwna zona (transposed) and the Passacaglia ground in Lutosławski’s Concerto for Orchestra, third movement, mm. 426-433. Koncert Na Orkiestrę by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

The most significant alteration is the rhythm. The shift to a triple meter from a duple meter creates a fundamental change in the character of the melody. In Lutosławski’s hands, the melody gains a drive, and is able to support the weightiness of the passacaglia. The ground undergoes a registral transformation, climbing from its origins in the contrabass and harps, and ending in the high tessitura of the violins. It is heard eighteen times (including the first and last iterations which are reductions of the full theme), and gives birth to a compositional method that Lutosławski would use in some of his later works: interlocking chains of melodies.

The variations allow Lutosławski to create, “[B]aroque genres [that] are folklore-tinctured, which results in fairly novel patterns.” The use of folk melodies as a core of thematic material used in a radically transformed manner gives the work a quality that is “easy to perceive” and is original.19

17 Ibid., 50.
18 Nikolska, 40.
19 Ibid.
3.3 Bartók’s Usage of Folk Music Sources

Bartók incorporates folk music traits into all aspects of his music. He infuses folk music’s implied harmony, rhythmic elements, and even structural relationships within his own music. However, he rarely quoted it directly. These methods give Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra* a musical vocabulary that is distinct and original. When Bartók arrived in New York, he was offered a one-year position at Columbia University to transcribe and analyze a large collection of Serbo-Croatian recordings the university had in its collection. Many characteristics found in these recordings have been incorporated into Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra*.

Bartók went beyond quoting folk music pitch content by incorporating non-melodic elements. For example, in “Giuoco delle coppie,” Bartók uses a replication of a particular two part singing technique found in Dalmatian folk music. In this method, the singers sing in major seconds. When played on sopels (a type of oboe), the melody is inverted in minor sevenths. The seconds do occasionally “denigrate” into minor thirds, but the minor sevenths remain true. When each pair of winds presents their respective “chain” passages, this principle is used in that a different interval for each group is used, and remains throughout. For the clarinet section from measures 45-56, the minor seventh is used. The violin II and viola sections reinforce this;

20 Cooper, 59.
21 Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 1.
22 Cooper, 17.
23 Dalmatia is a region found on the coastline of the Adriatic Sea in present day Croatia and small parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as Montenegro.
25 Ibid.
26 Bartók used the word ‘chain’ to describe the different passages of each pair. See “Composer’s Note,” Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 148.
they mimic the minor seventh interval in measure 54. The trumpets (muted) have the major second as their interval from measures 90-119.

In addition to using the Dalmatian harmonization, the remaining three chains of the second movement share a connection with folk music in structural design. The sources of the structural underpinnings are of Serbo-Croatian origin. The opening chain, performed by a pair of bassoons in sixths, is based on a kolo, which is a type of round dance found in the western Balkans. The oboes then perform a theme based on tambura (a string instrument found in Croatia and northern Serbia) motif. The flute duet is the fourth chain section, and the kolo association is revisited, this time with the connection primarily in the rhythm of the melodic line.

During the time Bartók was living in the United States, he was trying to work with the New York Public Library to publish his collection of Romanian folk music. In the first volume, Bartók states his thoughts on the structure of dance music played on bagpipes. In measures 188-256 of the “Finale”, the timbre of the bagpipes is imitated by the winds. The first oboe highlights the main line in the clarinet, and the second oboe, bassoons, and cello mimic the drone

28 Ibid., 139.
29 Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 143.
30 Ibid., 141.
32 Ibid.
pipes.³³ In addition to recreating the timbre, Bartók reinforces the connection to bagpipe music by using melodies in a manner that is indicative of Romanian melodies.³⁴

During the development section of the “Finale”, Bartók uses a theme borrowed from Duke Bluebeard’s Castle.³⁵ To add the character of bagpipes to the theme, Bartók inserts acciaccaturas, which is a technique found in bagpipe melodies found in northern ethnic Hungarian regions.³⁶ The acciaccaturas are used in various places throughout the development section.

![Figure 3.5. Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, fifth movement, mm. 269-271. Theme with acciaccaturas. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

Another link to Bartók’s work with Romanian music is in the third movement. Bartók called this movement a “lugubrious death-song.”³⁷ The theme that appears in the second section of the movement shares a rhythmic relationship to non-diatonic funeral songs from Romania.³⁸ The Romanian funeral songs often consist of isorhythmic segments, and it is characteristic of these melodies to have long sustained notes at the ends of phrases.³⁹ Bartók’s theme fits this
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³³ Suchoff, Concerto for Orchestra, 175.
³⁵ See 3.4, Non-Folk Music Sources.
³⁶ Suchoff, Concerto for Orchestra, 178.
³⁷ Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, 148.
³⁸ Suchoff, Concerto for Orchestra, 150.
³⁹ Suchoff, Bartók: A Celebration, 112.
model well, as the line consists of moving eighth notes followed by a sustained note at least two beats in length. Reinforcing the brooding trait of this theme is the orchestration. Bartók has this played by the violas on the IV string, creating a dark and mournful color.

Figure 3.6. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, third movement, mm. 62-72. *Concerto for Orchestra* by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

Bartók also used rhythmic ideas from Slovak folk songs. In the fourth movement, Bartók’s opening theme is a mix of 2/4 and 5/8 meters. The pattern Bartók uses is similar to Slovak music, particularly music that is 7/8 meter. Another characteristic of Slovak music is heavy usage of the Lydian scale. Bartók’s theme is E Lydian, but he obscures this by using both G and G# in the harmony. The theme is clearly of Bartók’s own design. Its metric structure and Lydian scale show Bartók’s skill at creating melodies that are of his own voice but contain musical elements of Eastern European folk music.

3.4 Bartók’s Usage of Non-Folk Music Sources

At three distinct places within his *Concerto for Orchestra*, Bartók pulls musical material from his opera, *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*, written in 1911. The first instance is at the beginning
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40 Downey, 404.
41 Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 159-160.
42 Stevens, 129.
of the work. The second occurrence is within the third movement, and third occasion is in the last theme of the exposition of the final movement.

The opening of both *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle* and *Concerto for Orchestra* contain the exact same pitch set; F#, C#, B, E, and A. This set is both a collection of fourths as well as a symmetrical pentatonic scale. Throughout *Concerto for Orchestra*, interlocking fourths serve as a seminal idea and are drawn from the opening of the work.\(^{43}\) Even though the usage in *Concerto for Orchestra* is in direct relationship to *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*, the origin of this scale in Bartók’s music stems from his fieldwork in his 1907 collection of Hungarian folk music.\(^{44}\) In *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*, this opening motif is used as the “Darkness” theme.\(^{45}\) Its usage in *Concerto for Orchestra* is connected to *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*. In both works, the orchestration is similar; Bartók uses strings. Additionally, both melodic gestures are in 3/4 meter. The theme in *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle* is comprised of dotted-half notes, and in *Concerto for Orchestra* the rhythms incorporate dotted half-notes at the beginning and end of the line. This idea returns in the third opening of the third movement of *Concerto for Orchestra* as well. The opening gesture returns at the beginning of the third movement, and then transitions to another reference by Bartók to *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle* as well as a theme that pervades much of Bartók’s work: ‘night music’.

‘Night music’ in the work of Bartók is designed to invoke nocturnal sounds of nature. Bartók wrote works that used ‘night music’ starting in 1908, with No. 12 from *Fourteen

\(^{43}\) Cooper, 66.


\(^{45}\) Cooper, 37.
A more prominent example appeared in 1926, when Bartók gave a concert of his own music including the fourth movement from *Szabadban* (Out of Doors) titled “Az éjszaka zenéje” (“The Night’s Music”). Bartók’s son Béla gives this account: “The Night’s Music perpetuates the concert of the frogs heard in peaceful nights on the Hungarian Great Plain.” Some of the techniques used to create ‘night music’ include a combination of short melodic fragments (often a single repeated note), active vertical sonorities (tremolos, trills, or glissandi), and sweeping arpeggios. The melodic fragments are kept in the same register with the same

---


orchestration, so that the each interjection is readily identifiable by its character. The dynamic levels always have a quiet section, and the tempo is usually slow.

In Duke Bluebeard’s Castle, ‘night music’ is used during the opening of the Sixth Door, which reveals the “Lake of Tears,” filled with still and lifeless waters that “were brought by sorrowful weeping.” To invoke ‘night music’, Bartók combines dissonant sudden gestures with irregular interjections of simple melodic fragments. In this instance, Bartók uses an arpeggio that is primarily an A Minor chord in the clarinet and celesta, with short melodic interjections of two notes a semitone apart. In the related section of “Elegia” in Concerto for Orchestra, Bartók reuses the clarinets, but this time with a transformed version of the “Lake of Tears” arpeggio. The flute and harp participate in the arpeggios that form a static ostinato texture. Also contributing to the static harmonic texture are the strings. The first violins are divided and play either a tremolo or a trill, and the rest of the string section hold a long note, which is eventually transformed into an unmeasured tremolo, except in the contrabass. Superimposed over the vertical sonorities, the oboe plays a melodic line dominated by semitones. Above this, the piccolo plays a solitary B natural as a countermelody to the oboe.

49 Schneider, 82.

50 Danchenka, 22. The exception to the slow tempo is the presto in the second movement of Piano Concerto No. 2.

51 Suchoff, Bartók: A Celebration, 112.

52 Schneider, 81.

53 Suchoff, Concerto for Orchestra, 151.
Figure 3.8. (a) Duke Bluebeard’s Castle, Rehearsal Number 99 and (b) Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, Third Movement, mm. 12-15. Bluebeard’s Castle, Op. 11, © Copyright 1921 by Boosey & Hawkes, Inc. Copyright Renewed. English Translation © 1952 by Boosey & Hawkes, Inc. Reprinted by Permission. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

Figure 3.9. Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, Third Movement, m. 10-11. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

Figure 3.10. (a) Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, Third Movement, mm. 10-11 and (b) mm 14-15. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.
In the “Finale”, Bartók makes another reference to *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*. When the trumpet states the last theme of the exposition starting at measure 201, both pitch and rhythmic elements are incorporated in this melody, which will become the subject of the fugue that occupies the development section of the movement. The pitches of this theme are a transposition of the opening Darkness theme set, with one short note added towards the end of the theme. This changes the scale from pentatonic at its beginning, to Mixolydian at its cadence, indicating that a transformation occurred from the “Introduzione” and “Elegia” to the “Finale”.

![Figure 3.11. Bartók Concerto for Orchestra, fifth movement, mm. 201-11. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

The rhythmic element of this theme comes from the end of *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle* and the Seventh Door motive. The Seventh (and final) Door opens at the end of the opera. In the opera, Bartók uses a similar repeated note pattern, first in the clarinets, then in Bluebeard’s line. This theme would serve as the subject for the fugue that comprises the development section of the movement.

![Figure 3.12. Seventh Door Motive from Duke Bluebeard’s Castle, (a) two measures after Rehearsal [21], (b) Rehearsal [22]. Bluebeard’s Castle, Op. 11, © Copyright 1921 by Boosey & Hawkes, Inc. Copyright Renewed. English Translation © 1952 by Boosey & Hawkes, Inc. Reprinted by Permission.](image)
When Bartók commenced work on his *Concerto for Orchestra* on August 15, 1943, he started with the third movement. This coincided with a period of bad health for Bartók, stemming from myeloid leukemia, to which he would eventually succumb. Bartók wrote in his program for *Concerto for Orchestra*, “The general mood of the work represents...a gradual transition from the sternness of the first movement and the lugubrious death-song of the third movement to the life-assertion of the last one.” This progression can be seen in the particular sections Bartók chose to reference from *Duke Bluebeard’s Castle*. The “Death” motive of the first and third movements gives way to the “Seventh Door” motive in the last movement. Since Bartók does not end with the “Seventh Door” in the original version, he creates a situation where he uses the recapitulation of the “Finale” to further transform the character into the positive energy he describes in his program note.

Perhaps the most unusual usage of borrowed material is in the fourth movement. Measures 75-120 are the interruption part of the “Intermezzo Interrotto.” Bartók originally wrote that this movement was the only one with an external program, but removed this statement from the final draft of his notes for the first performance of the *Concerto for Orchestra*.

There is some debate as to the significance of the usage of the source material. Determining the source of Bartók’s usage is the key to understanding the Bartók’s unmentioned program for the movement. The ultimate source of the material is linked to “Chez Maxine” from
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56 Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 148.
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Franz Léhar’s 1905 operetta *The Merry Widow*.\(^5^8\) This tune was also used as one of main themes in Shostakovich’s Seventh Symphony, also known as the *Leningrad Symphony*.

![Figure 3.13. (a) Franz Léhar, *The Merry Widow*, No. 4, mm. 32-36 (b) Dmitri Shostakovich, Symphony No. 7, first movement, after Rehearsal 19, 10-14, (c) Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, fourth movement, mm. 76-80. Symphony No. 7 in C Major, Op. 60 by Dmitri Shostakovich. Copyright © 1942 (Renewed) by G. Schirmer, Inc. Reprinted by Permission. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

When the *Leningrad Symphony* came to the United States, Arturo Toscanini and Koussevitzky both tried to be the first conductor to perform the work.\(^5^9\) Bartók heard the work performed on a radio broadcast on July 19, 1942, with Toscanini conducting the NBC Symphony.\(^6^0\) Bartók’s son Peter states that he remembers listening to the Shostakovich *Symphony* on the radio with his parents, and that during this time, they became aware of the theme that signified the advance of an army.\(^6^1\) The case has been made that Bartók was quoting the Lehár operetta.\(^6^2\) Both Peter and the Hungarian conductor Antal Dorati have stated emphatically that Bartók was quoting Shostakovich.
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\(^6^2\) Suchoff: *Concerto for Orchestra*, 158. The argument for the Lehár song is based largely on earlier recollections of Peter Bartók, which are contradicted in his book, *My Father*. The
Dorati states that Bartók showed him the fourth movement and said:

The big, overblown Leningrad Symphony of Shostakovich is no good. While I was doing my piece, suddenly I thought of the Leningrad. It made me very angry. I put that into the Concerto and then laughed at the Russian work.\footnote{Antal Dorati, “Bartókiana (some recollections),” \textit{Tempo} 136 (March 1981): 7.}

Peter supports this viewpoint, and wrote:

[A]lthough there is a strong resemblance, the Lehár there is not identical to that found in the \textit{Intermezzo Interrotto}, whereas the latter follows that of Shostakovich closely up to a point. Under the circumstances, following the precedent with the Shostakovich symphony, it would seem unlikely Béla Bartók had forgotten about his prior observations and, though sheer coincidence, happened to borrow the same theme from \textit{The Merry Widow}.\footnote{Peter Bartók, 177.}

Bartók’s version matches Shostakovich’s version pitch for pitch (with one ornamentation in Bartók’s) and the same temporal structure (See Figure 3.13). It is for these reasons that the case for Bartók quoting from Shostakovich rather than directly from the cabaret song becomes stronger.

After the premiere, Koussevitzky asked Bartók to revise the ending to make it longer.\footnote{Suchoff, \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, 194-195.} Bartók reworked the last four measures and added twenty more. In this revised version of the end, the “Interotto” is recalled by the glissandi in the horns and the trombones. Also, the vertical structure of the final chord is changed. The original has a root position F Major chord with a strong presence of root in the upper voices. The revision features the third and fifth of the chord in the upper voices, consistent theme of both versions is that Béla Bartók was unhappy with Shostakovich for using a banal theme so many times.

\footnote{Suchoff, \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, 194-195.}
indicating an imperfect ending. Additionally, the polyrhythm created by the combination of triplets, quintuplets, septuplets and the glissandi are found nowhere else in the work, and in fact strengthen the allusion to the musical commentary of the “Interotto”. The revised ending also has a melodic gesture in the brass that recalls the borrowed “Seventh Door” motive from Duke Bluebeard’s Castle that appeared in the fugue of the final movement.

Figure 3.14. Bartók, Concerto for Orchestra, fifth movement, mm. 616-621. Concerto for Orchestra by Béla Bartók, © Copyright 1946 by Hawkes & Son, Ltd. Reprinted by Permission.

Finally, in a letter Bartók wrote to Wilhelmine Creel from December 17, 1944 (just over two weeks after the premiere), Bartók writes:

Koussevitzky is very enthusiastic about the piece, and says it is ‘the best orchestra piece of the last 25 years’ (including the works of his idol Shostakovich!). At least this is his personal opinion - - -. He will play it in New York in Jan.

This letter shows Bartók’s knowledge of the esteem that Koussevitzky had for Shostakovich. Bartók also had a high level of respect for Shostakovich. Given the alterations to the ending, two possibilities exist: Bartók brought back earlier material, or he repurposed the material, originally a parody of Shostakovich, and now making a similar commentary about Koussevitzky.
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3.5 Comparison

The comparison of how Bartók and Lutosławski used external music sources reveals the most striking differences between the methodologies of the two composers within their respective Concerto for Orchestra. Although both men drew from folk music in their Concerto for Orchestra, the treatment of the source material in the finished product was vastly different for each composer. While Lutosławski directly quotes folkloric sources in other works he wrote during this period, he does not do that in his Concerto. Rather, the material serves only as a kernel from which other material is spun and woven. The use of folk material for Lutosławski for musical aspects other than melodic generation does not occur in his Concerto for Orchestra, as he relied on the techniques associated with the Baroque period for his formal structure and his own language for the harmonic content.

Bartók was a pioneer in the field of ethnomusicology, and his work in this discipline is deeply ingrained into his compositional technique. Like other ethnomusicologist composers of his time, such as his fellow Hungarian Zoltan Kodaly, Bartók sought out methods to infuse the essence of folk music into his work.71 His Concerto carries the vestiges of the external sources in not only its melodic material, but also within its harmonic, structural, and orchestration techniques. Bartók fuses these heterogeneous elements into a unified and eloquent musical language.

The reasons for each composer to use folk music sources are quite different. Lutosławski’s reasons for using folk music and for his folk music period in general were a matter of personal choice and survival as a composer.72 During this time period, he wrote what he
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71 Stevens, 129.
termed ‘applied music’: music for amateurs, children’s works, students, and other commercial music entities, since he could not write the music he wanted. Bartók’s use of folk music was out of profound respect and a life-long investigation of folk music that allowed him to take the characteristics of folk music and synthesize them into a unique form that is distinctly Bartók.
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CHAPTER 4. TECHNIQUE AND FORM

4.1 Musical Form

Standard models, whether adhering to or varying from, give the composer a framework on which to build a musical structure. Investigation into the forms used by composers in the movements of their works allows musicians to better understand the composer’s intentions and the significance of particular sections. The forms used by Bartók and Lutosławski are based in traditional forms, and both composers saw fit to radically transform the standard model for some movements of their respective Concerti for Orchestra, while at other times follow the formulas of tradition closely. Some of these forms originated in the Baroque period, and derive their origins in contrapuntal technique.

Bartók and Lutosławski use contrapuntal technique extensively. Bartók uses counterpoint effectively in his fugal developments and the use of stretto is pervasive in his *Concerto for Orchestra*. Lutosławski incorporates a passacaglia into his third movement, a distinct contrapuntal form that gives a stable underpinning to the events that change within it. He also weaves contrapuntal ideas throughout the rest of the work, especially in the development sections in the second half of the third movement.

4.2 Technique and Form in Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra*

Bartók states in his program note what his concepts of the formal structures are for his *Concerto for Orchestra*. He views the outer movements as “written in a more or less regular sonata form.” The second movement is ternary, and the third movement is through-composed. The fourth movement is similar to either a rondo or ritornello form, but does not fit easily within
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1 Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 148.
the standard definition of either of these forms. The forms and techniques Bartók used are inextricably connected to the virtuosity inherent to the work.

Within Bartók’s first movement, a nested form can be extracted from within the sonata form: a ritornello form is superimposed on the sonata form framework. The entrances of the ritornello are at measures 76, 231, 386, and 488, and are initially articulated each time by the strings. However, this use of ritornello form is significantly altered from the version used by composers of the Baroque period. Rather than a simple restatement of the theme for each return, Bartók develops the theme. The resultant form can be seen in Table 4.1.

| Table 4.1. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, first movement, formal scheme. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| **Sonata Form**                | **Ritornello Form** |
| Introduction                   | 1-75             | Introduction       |
| Exposition                     |                  | 1-75               |
| Theme Group 1                  | 76-148           | Ritornello 1       |
| Theme Group 2                  | 149-230          | Episode 1          |
| Development                    |                  | 149-230            |
| Part 1                         | 231-271          | Ritornello         |
| Part 2                         | 272-312          | Episode 2          |
| Part 3                         | 313-395          | Ritornello         |
| Recapitulation                 |                  | 386-395*           |
| Theme Group 2                  | 396-487          | Episode 3          |
| Theme Group 1                  | 487-521          | Ritornello         |

* Condensed statement

As Bartók stated, the sonata form is modified from the textbook version, but only slightly. In the recapitulation, the second theme group precedes the first theme group. This allows the ritornello idea to follow the standard alteration format. In addition to the recapitulation having the themes in reversed order, both themes do not appear with the same frequency.

---

2 Cooper, 75.
tonal center. The first theme is centered on F, but the second theme is centered on G. However, the second theme does show transformation when it returns in the recapitulation, as it was presented with a tonal center of B in the exposition.

The form of the second movement is straightforward: A B A'. The details of the technique used in the second movement are discussed in Chapter 2. What makes this section stand out, apart from the virtuosic writing, is how Bartók described the method he used. He called each melodic group a “chain.” \(^3\) The initial chains are sections that are independent in their musical content, but are adjacent in their placement within the movement. The chorale that comprises the B section is approximately the same length as chain segment e (trumpets). Usually, this would be too short to merit a new section designation, but the character and musical content set it apart from the outer parts of the movement.

Table 4.2. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, second movement, formal scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>123-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>a'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>252-263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the third movement, titled “Elegia,” Bartók inverts the ternary form proportions used in the second. The outer sections are comprised of Bartók’s ‘night music’, and the inner section

\(^3\) Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 148.
is another succession of chains. This time the inner section is significantly longer than the outer two sections. The inner section is a small-scale ternary structure.

Table 4.3. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, third movement, formal scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>a 34-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b 62-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a' 86-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>101-128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This B section recalls material from the introduction of the first movement, and uses its thematic material as the source for the chain segments. The chains are built differently in this movement, as they involve the whole orchestra in their development. Bartók composed this movement first, and with his state of mind and health, it is clear he was expressing the pathos of his situation.\(^4\) In *Concerto for Orchestra*, Bartók uses ‘night music’ in combination with the opening motives to create an exquisite and haunting elegy.

The fourth movement has an assorted range of musical moods. It begins with a melody in the oboe that is in complete contrast with that of the previous movement. It is light and airy rather than dark and lamenting. Bartók uses sparse instrumentation in each A section to reinforce these qualities. The B theme is based on a song from an operetta popular in Hungary between the two World Wars.\(^5\) The text of the quoted song, translated, is “You are lovely, you are most beautiful, Hungary.”\(^6\) The interruption is a parody, with the whole orchestra participating in the

\(^4\) Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 125.

\(^5\) Cooper, 56.

\(^6\) Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 156.
mocking and implied laughter. The interplay of these three elements is reminiscent of musical imagery indicative of tone poems.

The formal structure is based on the rondo form. The A section does behave as if it is the principal section in a rondo. The A section alternates with the other sections of the movement, and each time it returns, it is similar in instrumentation and pitch level. However, since the return of the A section immediately after the interruption is omitted, this movement cannot be called an authentic rondo.

Table 4.4. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, fourth movement, formal scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>42-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>61-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption</td>
<td>75-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td>119-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A''</td>
<td>135-151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final movement, like the first movement, is in an irregular sonata form. The first theme group is based on Romanian instrumental music. The Romanian folk music Bartók is emulating does not have an underlying structure, but is a series of motives that are repeated by the performers (either bagpipe or violin and flute) *ad libitum*. Bartók captures the spirit of this technique by using instrument groupings and melodic elements in a continuously varying progression. Perpetual motion is the unifying element of the first theme group. The second theme

---

7 Ibid., 155.

8 See 122.

9 Suchoff, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 166.
group is based on a collected bagpipe melody.\textsuperscript{10} This theme becomes the subject of a fugue that comprises the entirety of the development section.\textsuperscript{11}

Bartók modifies the sonata form significantly in the recapitulation. When the recapitulation begins at measure 384, the perpetual motion returns. However, the order and orchestration of the melodies from the exposition are reconstituted, keeping the spirit of the Romanian folk musicians’ technique. The pitch level has also shifted from A in the first statement of the exposition to F-sharp in the recapitulation, and thus the recapitulation does not signify a return to the same tonal center. After the first theme group returns, there is a transitional section, which leads not to the second theme group, but to a second development.

When a composer writes a second development section, it is traditionally placed in a coda. Bartók changes this and uses the opening horn call as the primary material as well as material from the first and second theme group. Bartók uses a variety of contrapuntal techniques thought the second development, such as inverted imitation and both small-scale and large-scale strettos. When the second theme group finally appears at measure 556, the tonal center is shifted to F, marking a return to the tonal center of the first movement.

Bartók displays a high level of compositional craft in his use of counterpoint. The development sections of both outer movements contain novel fugues, motivic imitation is found throughout the entire work, and strettos demonstrate Bartók’s command of his musical material. By expertly synthesizing folk music and applying highly developed Western Art Music practices, Bartók created a cohesive masterpiece out of two disparate musical systems.

\textsuperscript{10} See 138.

\textsuperscript{11} See Figure 3.11 for the theme and page 122 for its use in the fugue.
Table 4.5. Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, fifth movement, formal scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Horn Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Theme Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Theme Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the original version, Theme Group 2 is mm. 556-606, and there is not a coda.

4.3 Technique and Form in Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra*

The forms used by Lutosławski in his *Concerto for Orchestra* were influenced by those found in the Baroque. These forms are readily apparent, with the exception of the last half of the third movement. Lutosławski had a desire to shift the dramatic weight of his music from the beginning movement to later movements.\(^\text{12}\) *Concerto for Orchestra* marks one of Lutosławski’s first forays into adjusting dramatic weight.

The first movement of Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra* has the surface appearance of arch form. One of the unusual things about Lutosławski’s usage of this form is that the sections are shorter the first time than they are during the repetition. This is a microcosm of Lutosławski’s experimentation with placement of dramatic weight: by making the later sections of longer duration, more impact is afforded to them.

The arch form is articulated by how Lutosławski handles the orchestration. The opening section begins with the theme in the violoncellos, and begins widening the spectral range using

\(^{12}\) Rae, 38.
ascending instrumentation through the strings and woodwinds, with each successive entrance a perfect fifth higher than the previous. The instrumentation reaches its widest point at the conclusion of the section in measure 39. When the A section returns as a coda, the process is revised: a single flute states the melody, and entrances now are at the interval of perfect fourth down, until the fourth iteration, which is in the English horn. To show the progression of the music made through the movement, as the melody is limited to only treble voices culminating with the last entrance in the chalumeau register of the clarinet, the swath of instrumentation reaches its pinnacle when the lower instruments join with sustained pedal points.

The first movement can also be viewed as having a modified ritornello form superimposed on the arch structure. The scheme is inverted, so that the ritornello does not open and close the movement, but rather it comes after an introduction, proceeds to alternate with the episodes, and then the movement closes with a coda that brings back the opening material.

Table 4.6. Lutosławski, *Concerto for Orchestra*, first movement, formal scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arch Form</th>
<th>Superimposed Ritornello Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>40-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>52-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'</td>
<td>64-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'</td>
<td>75-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b&quot;</td>
<td>100-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td>124-172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lutosławski’s second movement is a scherzo and trio. The orchestration technique of perpetual motion is used extensively in the Capriccio sections. The character of the capriccios is light and evokes the quietness of night, yet has an energetic drive.\(^{13}\) By contrast, the Arioso

\(^{13}\) See 126-127.
section is rousing and brash. The trumpet section plays a distributed melody that has a fanfare quality, with fortissimo orchestral interjections. This melody is then passed to the horn section, and the orchestral interjections transform into an accompaniment. The last statement of the theme is sounded by the flute and clarinet as the character changes and shifts back to the quiet murmuring of the capriccio.

![Sheet music of the trumpet section](image)

Figure 4.1 Lutosławski, *Concerto for Orchestra*, second movement, mm. 311-317. *Koncert Na Orkestre* by Witold Lutosławski, © Copyright 1956. Reprinted by Permission.

**Table 4.7.** Lutosławski, *Concerto for Orchestra*, second movement, formal scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capriccio 1</td>
<td>173-236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capriccio 2</td>
<td>237-307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>308-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arioso</td>
<td>311-340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>341-342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capriccio 3</td>
<td>343-417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first half of the final movement is a passacaglia. The first statement of the ground is in skeletal form, sounded by the Double Bass and Harp I. The ground is played eighteen times, and undergoes a similar treatment with regard to orchestration as did the opening and closing sections of the first movement: beginning in the low registers, it widens as it ascends, and after
Table 4.8. Lutosławski, *Concerto for Orchestra*, third movement, “Toccata e Chorale”, formal scheme compared to tradition sonata form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Sonata Form</th>
<th>Form in “Toccata e Chorale”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>563-569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1A</td>
<td>570-597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1B</td>
<td>597-622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2C</td>
<td>623-642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>643-680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Group 2</td>
<td>681-726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>726-735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>736-787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>788-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>802-833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>834-851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td>Theme Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>852-875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restatement (incomplete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>876-902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>903-921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>922-938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>939-956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reaching its zenith, it contracts until only the highest voice (violin harmonics) remains. The passacaglia has thirteen episodes.\(^\text{14}\) Each one has a unique character and instrumentation.

The second half of the movement is the “Toccata e Chorale”. Lutosławski considered the “Toccata e Chorale” to have a sonata structure.\(^\text{15}\) The form of the “Toccata e Chorale” can be viewed as inspired by sonata form rather than as a variation of it. He modified the form in a fashion akin to the way he used folk music: taking certain elements, reshaping these elements for his use, and discarding what he did not want. Lutosławski did not include a recapitulation in the “Toccata e Chorale,” but rather inserts a second development section where the themes from the exposition return in approximately the same position that they would have been used in a traditional sonata.

4.4 Comparison

The area where the *Concerto for Orchestra* of both Bartók and Lutosławski share striking similarities is in form and orchestration. However, within these similarities also exist major differences. Both composers use structures based on historical predecessors, but with significant changes in some movements. In addition to structural similarities, Bartók and Lutosławski use similar orchestrational techniques as well as evoking similar characteristics out of their respective works, but with different outcomes.

The technique common to both works that is the most straightforward to identify is the use of chorales: Bartók uses a chorale in his second movement; Lutosławski in his third movement. Bartók’s chorale has a calming effect on the character of the second movement, and

\(^{14}\) Both Stucky and Rae refer to the episodes as variations. Stucky lists only twelve variations.

\(^{15}\) Stucky, 56.
has the character of a Bach chorale.\textsuperscript{16} The instrumentation is simple in that it employs brass with a snare drum counterpoint. The chorale is used to balance the rhythmic and melodic activity of the Bartókian chains, and maintains a meditative quality.

Lutosławski’s chorale is also intended to have a calming character (Lutosławski wrote \textit{poco calmando} in the score), and both composers use their chorales for moments of repose. However, Lutosławski’s chorale differs from Bartók’s chorale in several aspects Lutosławski’s chorale is not confined to brass, but has statements in the woodwinds, brass, and strings. The counterpoint to the chorale is a melody first played in the flute, and Lutosławski integrates elements of the chorale into the structure of the movement. Lutosławski also builds throughout the chorale to spur the drive to the climax of the work whereas Bartók used his chorale as a structural counterpoint to melodic chain combinations.

The term ‘chain’ is one that both composers used to describe a compositional technique. Bartók’s usage is for successive sections that are not necessarily related in musical content, but are connected through the unbroken progression of the music. There is not, however, a requirement of interaction between the sections in Bartók’s chains.

Lutosławski’s use of the term ‘chain’ is quite different from Bartók’s. Rather than adjoining the links, they are overlapped. In Lutosławski’s \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, the interval of overlap is three measures. The purpose of Lutosławski’s technique in later compositions is to obscure the structural divisions of the form.\textsuperscript{17} In Lutosławski’s \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, the process of the passacaglia defines the form of the music where the chains are used, but the

\textsuperscript{16} Cooper, 48.

\textsuperscript{17} Rae, 202.
construction of the ground used and the nature of the episodic connection links contributes to a dissimulation of the phrase structure.

The passacaglia is an example of a contrapuntal form. Both Bartók and Lutosławski used contrapuntal forms prominently in their work. Bartók included fugues in the development sections of the outer movements of his work. Lutosławski crafted the forms contained within his *Concerto for Orchestra* based on Baroque models.\(^\text{18}\) He reinforced the connection to the Baroque with the titles he chose for the movements, especially the third movement’s title of “Passacaglia, Toccata, e Corale.”

An interesting relationship to Baroque forms is how the opening movements of both works can be viewed as having a ritornello structure. After the introduction, it is easy to see the connection of the structure Bartók created with that of ritornello form. The first theme group of the sonata structure serves as the ritornello music. The return of the second theme before the first theme during the recapitulation creates a form where a dialogue of alternation occurs. The ritornello returns after the episodes of the second theme group and parts of the development. Each time the first theme returns, it is placed within the strings. It is not straight ritornello form as the theme is never duplicated exactly, but the connection can be made with a modern adaptation.

In Lutosławski’s work, the application of a ritornello framework requires modification to the original concept of what constitutes ritornello form. The ritornello is usually the opening section of a movement, but in Lutosławski’s work, it is the B section. The B section alternates between the other sections throughout the movement, and it has a readily identifiable theme. This theme is always found in a brass instrument, and is supplemented by a woodwind. At its core, the

\(^{18}\) Nikolska, 40.
ritornello’s purpose is to create a frame for the concertante or soloist by providing an identifiably consistent musical gesture. Seen in this spirit, the B sections of Lutosławski’s first movement constitute a ritornello.

Another form that both composers used in a modified fashion is the sonata-allegro. In Bartók’s case, it was a small modification to the recapitulation in the first movement in order to accommodate the superimposed ritornello form. Lutosławski’s transformation of a recapitulation in favor of a coda that functions as a second development section is quite radical. The first and second themes of the exposition are significantly altered, so much that the meter has changed from simple triple beat division to compound duple. The return of the chorale at the end of the coda does provide a level of closure, but it does not provide the comprehensive cohesion of structure found in traditional recapitulations.

As mentioned above, both works have chorales, and use them as structural elements. There are some other techniques that both composers use in terms of orchestral writing. Both composers use perpetual motion to display the virtuosity of the orchestra, but it must also be seen as a common orchestration technique, as both works use the perpetual motion idea to insert a rhythmic drive into the movements in which the motion is found.

For Bartók, the perpetual motion functions as the theme group more than any of the melodies that are in the exposition or development of his “Finale.” Bartók wrote that his last movement is an affirmation of life, and the perpetual motion is used in support of this. Lutosławski’s use is vastly different from Bartók’s. Lutosławski used perpetual motion in an inner movement, and specifically one that has a lighter quality. The marking mormorando

\[19\] Bartók, *Concerto for Orchestra*, 148.
(murmuring) and the pianissimo dynamic confirm a very different usage of this technique. Lutosławski creates a scherzo with nocturnal character.\textsuperscript{20}

Lutosławski’s evocation of night is starkly different than that of Bartók’s ‘night music’. Lutosławski’s night image, as mentioned previously, is light with a sprightly character as a result of the murmuring of the perpetual motion. Bartók’s ‘night music’ surrounds the “lugubrious death-song” of his third movement.\textsuperscript{21} While Bartók’s ‘night music’ is tranquil, it is designed to be reflective and contemplative.

Music that suggests night is one of many elements concerning structure and technique that both Bartók and Lutosławski use in their \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}. However, the music produced by Bartók and Lutosławski have different outcomes and do not show any direct influence of Bartók’s \textit{Concerto} on Lutosławski’s \textit{Concerto}. While both composers address similar concepts, their solutions and implementations diverge greatly.

\textsuperscript{20} Rae, 40.

\textsuperscript{21} Bartók, \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, 148.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

As a genre, the concerto for orchestra has become a significant and important structure in music of the twentieth century. Béla Bartók and Witold Lutosławski are two major composers who wrote in this genre, their works were written approximately ten years apart, and Lutosławski was heavily influenced by Bartók’s music. With these conditions, it is reasonable to expect to find similarities in the two works. The comparison of Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra* and Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra* reveals shared traits and techniques, but does not show a direct connection between the two works.

Works titled *Concerto for Orchestra* must have some element of virtuosity to be successful, be they technical, interpretive, or lyrical. They also must showcase the ensemble. This is usually done through a concertante style where the concertante group’s membership is dynamic; this creates a situation where ensemble virtuosity is paramount.

Bartók and Lutosławski use concertante-style writing extensively in their respective *Concerto for Orchestra*. In his second movement, Bartók makes it quite clear which members of the orchestra are featured in each section, or as he referred to them, each chain. The concertante instruments perform in a series of passages, and each passage has a different pair of wind instruments play a melody with a different governing intervallic connection. Each pair is sounded against a thin accompaniment background that features the pairs and displays their technical aptitude.

Lutosławski’s best example of concertante writing in relationship to the genre of concerto for orchestra is in the “Passacaglia” of his third movement. The instrumentation of the ground and the episodes are continually changing. Within the framework of the rhythmically-consistent drive of the ground, the episodes are allowed to function as independent musical elements. The
ground also provides evidence of progression, as the pitch level is continually rising from its lowest point in the contrabasses of the beginning, to its highest point in the harmonics of the violins at its end. All the sections of the orchestra participate at some point in the ground.

The technique Lutosławski developed in the passacaglia would reappear in some of his later works, specifically in Chain 1, Chain 2, and Chain 3. Chain technique for Lutosławski differs significantly from Bartók’s chains. In Lutosławski, the chains segments are not connected end to end, but instead are interconnected. This overlapping obscures the large-scale phrase structure, as there is an offset between the cadences of each chain segment. In Lutosławski’s Con certo for Orchestra, this offset is consistently three measures.

Chains were important means for both composers to incorporate concertante writing into their respective Concerti for Orchestra. Though the methods of chaining used by Lutosławski and Bartók are unrelated, both methods do clearly delineate places where instrumentation can shift. Within the context of the concertante, various ensemble subsets are created and showcased so as to reveal the dexterity of the orchestra as a performance entity.

Interestingly, both composers used perpetual motion as a vehicle to display virtuosity. Bartók used his in the fifth movement of his work, and Lutosławski in the middle movement of his. The motion in both pieces is not merely an effect, but carries melodic content as well. The musical result of the perpetual motion in each work is different. Bartók uses the motion to create rhythmic energy throughout the movement that drives to the final cadence. Lutosławski uses the motion in his work to create a lighthearted mood by imitating the murmuring sounds of night.

The topic of least similarity is how both composers treated external music sources, especially folk music. Folk music is germane to both works. However, both composers took very different approaches in how they used folk music sources.
Lutosławski used folk music as a means to an end. During this period he was writing commercial music, primarily for amateurs and children. He used folk music as a way to reach his audience, and because his own personal musical language was not yet developed to a point where he could express his ideas effectively.\textsuperscript{1} He was also working in a political climate in Poland where the cultural influence of the Soviet Union weighed on those who sought to innovate. Lutosławski knew that he was working in a language he would eventually abandon, but he viewed the activity of this period as compositional training.\textsuperscript{2} This is in complete contrast to Bartók.

For Bartók, folk music was a lifelong passion. He is one of the founders of ethnomusicology, and folk music elements can be found throughout his compositions. Bartók recognized that there were three methods for him to incorporate folk music into new works: unchanged or slightly altered quotation of existing folk melodies; imitation of folk music melodies without direct quotation; and fundamental construction that does not rely on melodies, but rather infuses “their essence in such a way that it pervades his music.”\textsuperscript{3} In his \textit{Concerto for Orchestra}, Bartók manages to use all three methods. He used pitch sets found in music he collected and invented melodies and themes that are similar to existing folk tunes. He also did quote almost verbatim a Romanian dance melody in the opening of the fifth movement, something that was actually quite rare for him to do.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} Nikolska, 41.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{3} Stevens, 129.

\textsuperscript{4} Cooper, 59.
The difference in folk music usage between the two composers is evident. Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra* was one of the last works of his folkloric period, spanning from the end of World War II to the middle of the 1950s. Lutosławski dismisses most of what he composed during this period as utilitarian. The *Concerto for Orchestra* is an exception, but the folk music framework he was working in did not fit his needs as an evolving composer. While he would shift his musical language to a different direction in subsequent works, he did develop several orchestral techniques and formal applications that appear in his later works. Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra*, by contrast, reflects the culmination of a compositional career.

Formal structure is where Bartók’ and Lutosławski’s works have the most in common. Both composers use chorales to offer moments of repose as well as serving as important structural elements. Bartók’s chorale appears in the second movement of his work between the chains groups. Not only does Bartók’s chorale offer a respite from the intensity of the chains, it also gives the snare drum (snares off so it becomes more like a field drum) a chance to make its presence known. The snare drum provides a unique counterpoint and interjects variety and rhythmic interest into an otherwise homophonic part of the movement.

Lutosławski’s use of a chorale occurs in his third movement. The function of the chorale is to bring elements of tranquility after the flurry of activity in the toccata. Lutosławski’s choice of instrumentation fluctuates within the chorale, as it initially starts with woodwinds and moves to trumpets and trombones, in contrast to Bartók’s chorale, which is scored only in the brass. The countermelody in Lutosławski’s work is more traditional, and is played by the flute the first time, and subsequently passed to a solo violin. Lutosławski’s chorale has one additional iteration during its initial statement, with further changes to the instrumentation. Its position within the structure is more ambiguous as it is part of a modified sonata form.
Both composers used modified sonata forms in their respective *Concerto for Orchestra*. Lutosławski’s modifications are such that it is more appropriate to label the form as sonata-esque. His modifications are similar to his use of folk melodies: both sonata form and folk melodies give Lutosławski material to start from, and then to drastically transform into a new vision. Bartók’s sonata forms are closer to the textbook model, but have variations as well. The sonata in the first movement of Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra* is closest to the traditional form, and the modification is to accommodate the superimposed ritornello form. The changes to sonata form Bartók uses in the “Finale” are more original. Bartók inserts into the recapitulation a second development section that relies heavily on contrapuntal techniques.

In addition to the large formal similarities, there is also a heavy dependence on contrapuntal structures. Bartók writes fugues in the development sections of both of his outer movements, and uses elements of stretto throughout the work. The “Passacaglia” section of Lutosławski’s third movement follows the technique of constant variation over a stable melodic idea. In Lutosławski’s case, the melody itself is stable, but the orchestration of its repetitions assists in the overall musical trajectory of the movement.

Did Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra* influence Lutosławski’s work? While both works have many elements in common, one cannot directly link any of the elements in Lutosławski’s score to Bartók’s. The similarities that do exist can be attributed to the overall influence Bartók had on Lutosławski rather than to a specific work, or linked to the fact that both works belong to the same genre and the use of congruent techniques is expected.

Both Bartók’s *Concerto for Orchestra* and Lutosławski’s *Concerto for Orchestra* are masterpieces of the twentieth century, giving any performing orchestra the opportunity to display ensemble virtuosity. The techniques used by both composers often have the same origins, but the
execution of the ideas are unique to each composer and show no discernable direct connections between the two works. Nonetheless, the differences between the two works highlight the skill and craft of both composers.
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