

Conclusion

Premises of the publishing crisis – change of generation – new publishing initiatives in the field of musicological periodicals: *Muzyka*, *Studia Muzykologiczne*, *Rocznik Chopinowski*

The political reality of the 1940s throughout the country which comprised, amongst others, of the fight against the erstwhile Sanation era and promotion of the widespread centralisation and also contributed to a generational change – including in the academic centres. Important positions in scientific and artistic institutions, as well as editorial offices, were passed to representatives of the subsequent generation; as for the Polish musicological community, this applied primarily to the students of Adolf Chybiński. Concentrating all the major activities from the areas of both research and education as well as publishing in the capital city and subordinating the functioning of academic and cultural units to central decisions taken arbitrarily by MKiS, MN, and PIS, was at odds with the principle of self-determination of academic and creative communities, on which all the existing generation of intellectuals and artists had grown up. Combining weaker departments into larger units focused around selected universities resulted in a kind of brain drain and inevitable migration of both teaching staff and students from the liquidated institutions (in case of musicology, first from Wrocław, afterwards also from Poznań), or the takeover (sometimes under the guise of borrowing for reverses) of library and archival resources as well as equipment, as it was the case with resources of Wrocław musicology, given ‘as deposit’ to Warsaw, among others.

This situation also concerned taking over the position of editor-in-chief of what was then the only professional musicological journal – *Kwartalnik Muzyczny*. The first signal of the upcoming changes was the transfer of the title to the PIS and consequently entrusting the function as a leading magazine to the Institute’s representative. In the autumn of 1949, Chybiński wrote to Ludwik Bronarski that ‘from the New Year there will be an editorial change. The editor is to be Mr [Stefan] Jarociński, because *Kwartalnik* is being placed under the budget of the newly created Institute of Art. So let the professional musicologists rest!’¹

1 Chybiński to Bronarski from [Zakopane] 1 XI 1949, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski’s archive, p. 207. In other letters, the name of the director of the Department of Music at MKiS, Witold Rudziński was also mentioned.

On the one hand, he expressed the hope that *Rocznik Muzykologiczny* would be revived, but on the other, even though there were explicit signs ‘from above’ that the decision to close down *Kwartalnik* had already been made, in the last days of December 1949 he still saw many possibilities for further development of his journal. However, personal changes were only postponed a little bit and came about with the crisis related to the lack of new material which could be published. In the middle of 1950, after publishing two significantly delayed yet bulky issues devoted to Chopin, there was very little ‘raw material’ – as Chybiński called it – which could fill the planned volumes. In 1950, the editorial office managed to prepare one more issue, 29–30, but even though it was double, its contents and volume were very humble. However, Chybiński still hoped that he would at least be able to conclude that year’s issues. Nonetheless, this did not happen, and the history of *Kwartalnik Muzyczny* ended at that moment, and the last double issue, released under the banner of PIS, was signed anonymously by the ‘Editorial Committee.’ It is known that until the closing of issue 29/30 nothing changed personally and the old editorial staff finalised the work, but the materials had to be censored, however, by the Institute management: ‘both editions [number 28 and 29–30], although prepared, cannot be put to print due to checking the material at the Institute of Art. They’ve been there for three weeks.’²

In connection with top-down, significant reshuffling in the small group of Polish musicologists and the opening of new career perspectives to the young professionals, relations within the editorial department – between Chybiński and Chomiński – deteriorated during 1951. Chomiński, as well as several other pupils of the Lviv department, decided to adopt an attitude in relation to the system, which facilitated fruitful work in the field of musicology, certainly not against, but alongside the imposed ideological expectations of the state apparatus. In those years, a different choice could have led to complete exclusion from the profession, and Chomiński was already an experienced researcher, considering further academic and didactic plans, the author of accomplished publications, whose first and main admirer was Chybiński himself. It was not surprising then that when in 1950 he received a proposal for a position in PIS (which was also connected with taking over the management in the new musicological journal and the new series of musical editions,³ and thus the simultaneous takeover of

2 Chomiński to Łobaczewska from Wesola 11 II 1950, APCh.

3 The first volume of *Studia Muzykologiczne* appeared in the year 1953, and the first volume established by Chomiński in 1951 of the source-critical series *Monumenta Musicae in Polonia (Tabulatura Jana z Lublina* in a facsimile publication prepared

Chybiński's activity from the orbit of the two main areas of his interest), and later also at the newly created Institute of Musicology at UW – he did not hesitate.

Decisions made by Chomiński brought about a cooling of the long-term fond relationship between the master and his pupil, which is evidenced by his correspondence with the professor. Chybiński, who kept making publishing plans which he expressed in his letters to those whom he trusted, wrote to Chomiński with irritation:

I obviously can't write an opinion on any report or paper because I'm overloaded with work anyway. ... I really don't care anymore (with all the work that I have to do) whether we call something an analysis or a monograph. A monograph cannot be an analysis, and an analysis cannot be a monograph. How come these two terms are being confused!!! Therefore, I am going to resign from the position of editor of 'Analyze.' ... I cannot submit any paper to *Kwartalnik* just because of the lack of time. I'm too busy with my own work.⁴

A little earlier he evaluated the series brought into being by PIS, *Monumenta Musicae in Polonia*:

Thank you for the clarification on the 'monuments.' Now I am even more convinced of the correctness of my views, and I wish to loyally swear that I will fight against opposing views. I am still of the opinion that the publication of a 'series' of 'monuments,' in view of such a small inventory of our old music, will make us a laughing stock. ... are we supposed to publish works that have already been issued in WDMP? Why? For what purpose? How will the science benefit from the fact that we will once again issue Pękiel's, Mielczewski's, Zieleński's, Gorczycki's, Szarzyński's works, whom Italians and other Western nations have in abundance and certainly do not intend to print everything that remained after them?!⁵

All of his closest collaborators wanted to resolve the conflict, which was felt in an unfortunate manner by others; all the more so because in 1950 the professor had his 75th birthday, which his students and friends wanted to mark with special celebrations and a jubilee book. The misunderstanding dragged on; in autumn 1951 Tadeusz Ochlewski wrote: 'Warsaw have asked me to appease your anger towards Chomiński, because no one has the strength to fight and everyone is overloaded with work, and it is difficult to eliminate Chomiński, especially in the current situation in PIS.'⁶

by Krystyna Wilkowska-Chomińska in cooperation with Katarzyna Swaryczewska (Morawska), with a thematic catalogue and alphabetical index) was published in 1964.

4 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 320–321.

5 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 315–316.

6 Ochlewski to Chybiński from Cracow 27 IX 1951, AACCh-BUAM, fol. O-P, p. 142.

At the same time, Zofia Lissa continued to act in favour of the development of Warsaw musicology and its community therein. According to many – this was at the expense of other centres, although the appraisals of her decisions are today not clearly negative:

It is said that she eliminated the Wrocław department of musicology of Fr. prof. Hieronim Feicht. Well, this was required by the then centralisation. The whole nation was building the capital at that time. Hence, music libraries were imported to Warsaw, and not only from Wrocław. Zofia Lissa, however, did not forget about the Father Professor and took him into the Warsaw Institute of Musicology that she had established.⁷

As for the relationship between Lissa and Chybiński, all the post-war letters preserved in the Poznań and Warsaw archives exude the respect and concern that the former student showed her ‘dear and beloved Mr Professor.’ She consulted all important decisions influencing the current fate of musicology with him; she also confided to him about her most serious problems and trusted him with various secrets of the milieu. Even if these were merely acts of courtesy, they would undoubtedly allow Chybiński to understand the value of his opinions for subsequent generations.

A succession of unfavourable events in his professional life, the feeling that his academic career was in decline, as well as health problems made Chybiński feel very weak from the beginning of 1952. Even as late as in spring, he and his doctors still attributed this ‘physical exhaustion’ to being overworked. This condition and the growing uncertainty about the future of musicology in Poznań gradually discouraged him from taking any action. In April of that year he wrote with sadness to Ludwik Bronarski: ‘probably musicology will prove to be unnecessary for Poznań (according to opinions beyond Poznań), which somehow fits strangely with my – so to say – feeling of pedagogical satiety or fatigue.’⁸ And further: ‘I would like to move from Poznań to Cracow (my home town) or near Cracow or to some lovely town in the highlands, and who knows, maybe

7 Bilica 2008, 33. Lissa herself explained her decision to Chybiński: ‘I know that the Professor probably is displeased with me – about Fr. Feicht. I suppose that the Professor wanted to have him. In this case, two moments decided the matter: the fact that Warsaw musicology does not have any pure-blood historian and a historian of Polish music in particular. And so Fr. Feicht here has two roles; in addition, the fact that Warsaw is the capital and that the Minister of Education first and foremost cares about the correct positioning of the capital’s musicology,’ see Lissa to Chybiński from Warsaw 10 V 1951, AACH-BUAM, fol. K-L, p. 213.

8 Chybiński to Bronarski from Poznań 28 IV 1952, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski’s archive, p. 216.

to Zakopane, although, it may already be too high. I do not know when this will happen. I would like it as soon as possible.⁹ He did not undertake any new obligations, such as writing just ten entries for the Polish Musicians Dictionary planned and proposed to him by the PIS.¹⁰

In September 1952, Adolf Chybiński found himself in hospital where he underwent surgery. He did not return to health but did continue to make plans for the future. In the last of his extant letters that remained in the cavernous archives from the professor's correspondence, he wrote to Tadeusz Ochlewski: 'I will get out of hospital in 5–6 weeks. I suffer from hunger for work. And this really pleases me!'¹¹ He passed away on 31 October.

It is true that in the last years of his life, the professor was widely respected as one of the honourable seniors of Polish musicology and was invited to chair the most important community organisations, but due to his age, he found himself in more and more situations in which his pupils subtly and slowly relegated him to the margins of academia to pursue their own professional plans. However, it needs to be emphasised that until the very end (despite some misunderstandings) and clearly due to the respect they had for their teacher, they tried to pretend that all their actions were still centred around the professor. Scattered all over Poland, they took every opportunity to meet the professor: and it was Father Feicht, who while on a short vacation in Olcza in Podhale in September 1947 visited Chybiński, who always stayed in Zakopane in the summer, and it was Zofia Lissa who took the professor in her Warsaw apartment at ul. Madalińskiego;¹² the feeling of attachment, which most of them probably held for their mentor, can be expressed by the words that Stefania Łobaczewska wrote in 1950: 'I was thinking about how nice it is to belong to the "Lviv School" of prof. Chybiński, and adore our Professor just as we all do! I felt it more strongly now than ever,'¹³ and which we can supplement with another quote from Lissa's letter: 'Stefa [Łobaczewska] and Chomiński are standing over me and telling me to pour into this letter as much cordiality and warm words as possible. I am doing this on behalf of all three.'¹⁴

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.

11 Chybiński to Ochlewski from Poznań 8 IX 1952, AACH-BUAM, Ochlewski's archive, p. 114.

12 Chybiński to Lissa from Poznań 14 IV 1948, AZL-BUW.

13 Łobaczewska to Chybiński from Cracow 20 XII 1950, AACH-BUAM, fol. K-Ł, p. 310.

14 Lissa to Chybiński from Warsaw 1 XII 1950, AACH-BUAM, fol. K-Ł, p. 204.

A token of the pupils' commitment (despite many a misunderstanding between the professor and some of his students back in the Lviv years) and respect for the professor was the second memorial book prepared by his closest musicologist friends, prepared as an anniversary gift for his seventieth birthday.¹⁵ The texts included were signed by – apart from Maria Szczepańska ('Nieznana tabulatura lutniowa krakowska z drugiej połowy XVI stulecia' [Unknown lute tablature from Cracow from the second half of the sixteenth century], pp. 198–217), Zofia Lissa ('Uwagi o metodzie marksistowskiej w muzykologii' [Remarks on the Marxist method in musicology], pp. 50–119), Stefania Łobaczewska ('Z zagadnień metodycznych historii muzyki' [From methodological issues of music history], pp. 120–145), Józef Chomiński ('Z zagadnień analizy formalnej' [From issues of formal analysis], pp. 146–197) and Father Hieronim Feicht (Marcin Mielczewski – *Missa super O gloriosa Domina*, pp. 218–232), also Ludwik Bronarski ('Kilka słów o obiegniku w utworach Chopina' [A few words about the turn in Chopin's works], pp. 233–241), Janusz Miketta ('Fuga a-moll Fryderyka Chopina' [Frederic Chopin's fugue in A Minor], pp. 242–257), Helena Windakiewiczowa ('Tematy obce w muzyce Chopina' [Foreign themes in Chopin's music], pp. 258–262), Stanisław Golachowski ('Niedokończony Koncert fortepianowy Karola Szymanowskiego' [Karol Szymanowski's unfinished piano concerto], pp. 263–274), Marian and Jadwiga Sobieski ('Wielkopolskie wiwaty' [Greater Poland fanfares], pp. 275–319), Jan Prosnak ('Z zagadnień polskiego folkloru muzycznego' [From issues of Polish musical folklore], pp. 320–338), Maria Turczynowiczowa ('Schematy Wielkiego Księstwa Poznańskiego' [Schemata of the Grand Duchy of Poznań], pp. 339–346), Alicja Simon ('Na drodze historycznego rozwoju gęśli słowiańskich' [On the path of historical development of Slavic gusle], pp. 347–353), Zdzisław Szulc ('Lutnicy polscy od XVI wieku do czasów najnowszych oraz ich karteczki rozpoznawcze' [Polish luthiers from the Sixteenth century to the latest times and their distinguishing signs], pp. 354–379); Tadeusz Ochlewski concluded the book with a summary of the history of Chybiński's editorial work (pp. 380–389), and the whole was complemented by a bibliography of Chybiński's works prepared by the then student, but also volunteer, in the Poznań department, Kornel Michałowski (pp. 26–43). The volume was presented to Chybiński during the National Scientific Conference for Arts Research, whose proceedings were held as mentioned above (see chapter III-2) in December 1950 in Cracow. During the same event, the professor was awarded the Order of the Banner of Work, First Class.

15 *Księga pamiątkowa* 1950.

After Chybiński's death, did all of his close associates and students prove their loyalty towards him? It seems that some of the Lviv-based pupils were guided by pragmatic reasons when planning their professional future (for example, in connection with the announced launch of the new print of syntheses or the enhanced editorial projects, just as the new source-critical series *Monumenta Musicae in Polonia*). Józef Chomiński, in a letter written to Zdzisław Jachimecki in the summer of 1953, informed the Cracow professor of his approval concerning the composition of the editorial committee (while the head of musicology in Poznań had unsuccessfully asked about personal issues in *Monumenta*);¹⁶ he also gave reasons for the many years of delay in launching cooperation with Cracow and the proceedings in this matter in spite of himself, just in order to 'not upset prof. Chybiński'.¹⁷ In any case, for the beginning of the next year, 1954, he proposed a contract to Jachimecki to prepare Zieleński's *Offertories* and *Communiones* for publication, but this came to nothing – the Cracow Nestor passed away on October 23 1953.

A year after Adolf Chybiński's death, at a meeting of the Programme Board of PWM, Józef Chomiński submitted a motion to prepare a reprint of selected papers and materials from the master's oeuvre. Soon, a draft of this publication was prepared by Tadeusz Strumiłło with the help of Maria Szczepańska. Strumiłło was one of the first pupils that the professor taught in Poznań after the war. He belonged to the next generation of musicologists and was one of the youngest assistants in the Poznań department. The draft was sent both to Cracow and to Chomiński.¹⁸ It is possible that Strumiłło based his work on the professor's own version of the idea. We find this fragment in Tadeusz Ochlewski's correspondence: 'As for the publication of my works printed earlier in publications: keep calm! They require so many modifications and additions that there is no way to print even just the first volume of the three (volume I would have around 350 printed pages). So, alas, the way things are, we need to leave it until 1951/52'.¹⁹ Nowadays, we do not know the content of 'series' discussed with the director of PWM. We do know that Chybiński did not manage to send the materials and the project proposed by the students was realised only in part. A few years later (in

16 See Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 324–325.

17 See Chomiński to Jachimecki from Sobieszewo 23 VII 1953, AJCh-BUW.

18 See Strumiłło to Chomiński from Poznań 6 XI 1953, AJCh-BUW (letter with a request for any remarks).

19 Chybiński to Ochlewski from Poznań 15 IV 1950, AACH-BUAM, Ochlewski's archive, p. 81.

1956), Strumiłło perished in the Tatra Mountains, while his colleague, Ludwik Bielawski, prepared the selected ethnomusicological works for print.²⁰

It shortly turned out that at least for the next two years, command over people's hearts and minds in Polish musicology would be passed on to four principal representatives of the second generation. In 1954, the Department of Musicology at UP (and at the University of Wrocław, where the Seminar ceased to exist by the end of the 1940s) was suspended, so there were two academic centres left: Zofia Lissa kept successfully developing the Unit (then the Department and finally, from 1958, the Institute) at the University of Warsaw, whereas Stefania Łobaczewska took over the Department at the Jagiellonian University from the late Zdzisław Jachimecki. In 1956, Father Hieronim Feicht created another Department at the Catholic University of Lublin. Józef Chomiński had supported Lissa in her didactic work from the very beginning, whereas when it came to his editing and publishing activity, he was involved mostly with PIS (in 1959, it was called Institute of Art of Polish Academy of Sciences, or IS PAN). In all fields he showed incredible energy that allowed him to carry out research work (which, amongst others, was crowned with the creation of the foundations of a new theory – sonology), as well as managing the work of several editorial offices – the aforementioned source-critical series *Monumenta Musicae in Polonia*, *Studia Muzykologiczne*, the quarterly *Muzyka*, *Rocznik Chopinowski*. Indeed, around Chomiński and Lissa and their friends, a new milieu formed, which in the following decades contributed to the building of Polish musicology.

* * *

Changes and reshuffling resulting from the central decisions, which were taking place at the turn of the 1940s and 1950s, had slowly but systematically affected the transfer of the main functions and positions to the second generation of Polish musicologists. Previously, Chybiński hoped to use this situation and returned once again to the idea of resurrecting the annual, with the assumption to make it a strictly scientific journal, perhaps a little niche and beyond the circle of interests and ideological pressure from the officers in Warsaw. As mentioned, Chybiński considered the resumption of PRM already in the first months after the war, in early 1946, before the ministerial decision of 1947 on the reactivation of *Kwartalnik Muzyczny* as a community magazine. At that time he reached out to Chomiński on the possible revision of his pre-war materials for the third

20 Adolf Chybiński, *O polskiej muzyce ludowej. Wybór prac etnograficznych* [About Polish folk music. A selection of ethnographic works], prepared for publication by Ludwik Bielawski (from the writings of Adolf Chybiński II) (Cracow 1961).

volume, and he obtained Bronarski's permission to use the earlier texts, although he did not even fully remember which ones. Alas, these efforts, let us repeat, proved futile, and the selected archival materials were used upon planning and editing the reborn *Kwartalnik Muzyczny*.

Chybiński accepted decisions to which there was no alternative, but in reality, he had always believed that a quarterly more than an annual best corresponded to the scientific aspirations of the musicological community. It seems that from the early years of his academic career, he had been thinking about creating a journal modelled after the German 'Jahrbücher,' which would be a chronicle of current achievements of the musicological academic community, as well as an impetus for serious scientific discussion within that community. In 1947, he accepted the offer to act as the editor of *Kwartalnik*, even though he had been dissuaded from it, but he still harboured hopes to revive the annual. After just three years, the authorities decided that *Kwartalnik* would be suspended once again. It seemed that this was finally the time for the professor's idea of publishing an annual to be brought to life and Chybiński shared his new hopes with trusted friends:

In place of *Kwartalnik*, the function of the organ of Polish musicology will be served (as 'predicted' by me already a long time ago) by *Polski Rocznik Muzykologiczny* in a volume at least twice as large compared to the pre-war *Rocznik* ... Who will edit *Rocznik* is not yet certain, but apparently it will be the current editor of *Kwartalnik*, who wishes to finally have peace of mind to complete several of his works, which are quite voluminous and, due to the editor's seventy years of age, is not a minor concern. ... But perhaps we will be able to pass this work to the youths.²¹

The professor expected the crisis to reach the current editors not only because of the plans of the ministry but above all 'due to lack of materials.'²² There was also fear that 'our "friends"' will take over the title.²³ It soon turned out that in place of *Kwartalnik*, which was closed in 1950 and the last numbers of which appeared under the banner of PIS, the 'friends' – namely the Directorate of the Institute – appointed a body which departed significantly from the academic profile – the *Muzyka* monthly (with time a bi-monthly), which served as a forum for socialist realist thought in Polish musicology. As Chomiński predicted – 'They will be ... focused on ideological articles, concerning ... more recent materials.'²⁴

21 Chybiński to Bronarski from Poznań 14 XI 1949, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski's archive, p. 208.

22 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 220–222.

23 Ibid.

24 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 239–241.

It turned out that the aim of establishing a music journal at PIS, which was supposed to support the study of art, was not to spread the word of science, but instead to provide an ideological background for science: 'a new synthesis of *Ruch Muzyczny* and *Kwartalnik* was born!!! ... They want to publish a fat monthly with popular articles, theoretical papers, current news and field updates... Cicer cum Gaule – as Tuwim wrote in *Problemy*.²⁵ This was also confirmed by the editorial, the populist-sounding introduction in the first issue: '*Muzyka* is to be a magazine not only for strictly musical circles, but also for all those for whom the issues of music are not alien, indifferent, or who are interested in the organisation of musical life, or education, or creativity, or creative work.'²⁶ The fight against formalism taken in those years and encouragement aimed at composers to combine their music with the life and work of the broadest masses was to be supported by the experience of 'the Soviets, the people's democratic states and progressive elements of the West.'²⁷

(It is worth noting here, that today's *Muzyka*²⁸ is not a continuation of the pre-war monthly created by Mateusz Gliński, nor the socialist realist magazine opened by PIS – only the title is the same; published since 1956 by the same institute, the quarterly journal is in fact the heir to *Kwartalnik Muzyczny*.²⁹ However,

25 Lissa to Chybiński from Warsaw 11 XI 1949, AACH-BUAM, fol. K-Ł, p. 177.

Properly: 'Cicer cum caule czyli groch z kapustą: panopticum i archiwum kultury' [Cicer cum caule or peas with cabbage: panopticum and culture archive]. In the years 1949–53 Polish poet Julian Tuwim wrote a column with this title in the monthly *Problemy* about literary curiosities collected in the period after 1945. The cycle was then published as a book in three parts by the publishing house Czytelnik (1958, 1959, 1963).

26 [Od Redakcji] [Editorial], (*Muzyka* 1950/1, 3–4, quote p. 3).

27 Ibid.

28 This is about the academic quarterly dedicated to the history and theory of music (and in accordance with the subtitle in the first period, until 1964 – also academic and artistic criticism), published by PIS (today IS PAN) from the second quarter of 1956, then edited by Józef Chomiński. The change in the position of editor-in-chief of the periodical took place only in 1972 – this function was taken by Elżbieta Dziębowska, formerly acting as the secretary of the editorial office (together with Andrzej Chodkowski, both were present in the editorial team from issue no. 3 in 1956) and deputy editor-in-chief. More than sixty years of history of the quarterly *Muzyka* forms a separate, very extensive chapter in the history of Polish academic music journalism and is material for a separate monograph.

29 On the other hand, the outer design is connected indirectly with the pre-war quarterly/bimonthly/monthly *Muzyka Polska*, from which it borrowed the typeface on the title page and rough cover layout.

there are indeed clear parallels between the goals that *Muzyka* had before the war and later when it assumed a 'social realist' form. Both journals were aimed not only at professionals, but also readers with no musical education. Moreover, materials published in them were shorter and had a much lighter tone than those published in their academic counterparts. They reflected current problems of the musicological community and commented on current events, thus serving as a concert chronicle and an almanack. However, the monthly published by Gliński was not under political pressure, whereas the one published by PIS was the ideological mouthpiece of the communist regime.)

The first issue of post-war *Muzyka* was issued, as intended by the management of the Institute, in the spring of 1950, which also coincided with the closure of the editorial board of *Ruch Muzyczny* at the end of 1949. The editors dedicated the editorial to the new, 'non-mannered' listener. They declared that it ought to be a journal 'for all those to whom the matters of music are neither foreign nor indifferent.' The magazine, which would participate in building a new socialist culture 'based on scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism and the designs of the victorious socialist state, our ally, the great Soviet Union.' It was supposed to not be limited to the function of information, but rather aim at influencing composers who, upon abandoning the previously prevailing artistic formalism, would adopt the interpretation of social realism for their works as the direction that will bring music to the masses. It was planned to deal not only with 'pure' music (whatever that meant) but also with new issues in the music press – popular music, dance, opera – as well as post reviews of Polish and foreign journals. Finally, the words of the memorandum formulated by the group of Soviet delegates during the memorable Prague congress of composers and critics in 1948 were recalled: 'Progressive musicians around the world cannot look calmly at the sinister deformation of contemporary musical art. We all feel an understandable anxiety about the fate of contemporary music. Therefore, progressive musicians of all countries more frequently raise their voices in defence of realism, addressed against the destructive and disastrous influence of formalism.' This 'confession of faith,' as defined by the editors themselves (unsigned under the editorial), branded the new *Muzyka* with the prevailing ideology and left no illusions as to what materials were expected from potential authors.

Muzyka focused on popularising a few main themes which dominated the contents of six annuals: issues related to the opera, cantata and songs (with an emphasis on mass songs), issues related to folk music and folklore in general, and the task of maintaining the cult of artists who were convenient for the regime. It was communist mentors and influential members of the musicological community who chose such artists. They included Chopin, Moniuszko and (after a

certain point in time) also Szymanowski. When it comes to foreign composers, it was mostly Bach and Beethoven, the so-called 'revolutionists.' Mass songs were considered to be one of the most natural methods of making the general public familiar with music, whereas the fact that modern composers did not incorporate enough mass songs in their work was regarded as one of the most serious problems. This theme turned out to be the most important for the editorial staff, and it was to this subject that Zofia Lissa dedicated her extensive article that opened the first edition.³⁰ This issue was returned to many times, through preparing, amongst others, a block of several texts about mass songs that filled most of the 'non-informative' part of one of the monthly's numbers.³¹

Issues featuring meeting and conference materials were prepared regularly. The first occasion arose early in the summer of 1950. The combined booklet 3/4 included speeches delivered during the recently completed fifth ZKP Congress. One and a half years later, *Muzyka* lent its columns for papers and reports on the next, sixth Congress. On the eve of the Polish Music Festival, which opened in April 1951, an article prepared by Tadeusz Marek, the editor of *Muzyka*, was published in late autumn 1950 on this occasion, under the title 'Growth of the music of work, friendship and peace.'³² Short statements about music 'in the fight for peace' were also requested for this edition from leading apparatchiks from neighbouring countries – Miroslav Barvik, Georg Knepler, Olga Pozdnieva, and to the number 9/10 from 1954, talks on the conference devoted to the problems of entertainment and dance music. One of only two texts in *Muzyka* signed by Chybiński at that time was his presentation during the First National Scientific Conference on Research on the Arts.³³

The editorial team also sought 'anniversaries' which gave it a chance to pay tribute to artists whose creative achievements were praised for fighting with formalism. However, it may be surprising that the revolutionary feature of the legacy

30 Zofia Lissa, 'Raz jeszcze o polską pieśń masową' [One more time about Polish mass songs] (*Muzyka* 1950/1, 5–17).

31 The above-mentioned issue No. 7/8 from 1954 included, amongst others, materials by Witold Rudziński ('Pieśń masowa na punkcie zwrotnym' [Mass songs at the turning point], pp. 34–38), Elżbieta Dziębowska ('Pieśń masowa w twórczości W. Lutosławskiego' [Mass songs in the creative work of W. Lutosławski], pp. 38–44), Alina Kawczyńska ('O popularności pieśni masowych Alfreda Gradsteina' [Concerning the popularity of mass songs by Alfred Gradstein], pp. 44–48).

32 *Muzyka* 1950/7–8, 9–14.

33 Adolf Chybiński, 'Zagadnienia tradycji narodowych muzyki polskiej' [Issues of national traditions of Polish music] (*Muzyka* 1951/1, 3–7).

of Ludwig van Beethoven, which had been noticed even before the war, did not lead to publishing commemorative materials in post-war *Muzyka* (the 180th anniversary of the composer's birthday was not celebrated with a single paper), while authors readily and frequently wrote about Bach. Part of the 1950 number 6 edition was dedicated to him (speeches and reports from the main celebrations organised on the bicentenary of the death of the Leipzig cantor authored by Jerzy Jasieński, Zofia Lissa, Dmitri Shostakovich, Georgi Chubow, supplemented with a sketch by Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz,³⁴ which introduced monographic articles sent for the occasion by Bronisław Rutkowski and Jan Ekier)³⁵ and only a few months later, a block of materials being the aftermath of the Bach inter-school competition in Poznań: apart from reflections and remarks, there were also monographic studies (though extremely sketchy and popular) by Bronisław Rutkowski, Emma Altberg, and Bronisław Romaniszyn.

In the fifth anniversary year of the death of Béla Bartók (and also the occasion of the upcoming seventieth anniversary of his birth) the editors prepared several characterisations of his work, written by another distinguished Hungarian, Zoltán Kodály,³⁶ and a translation of the composer's reflection 'O muzyce ludowej' [About folk music].³⁷

Folklore was frequently present in the pages of *Muzyka* and in a variety of ways – in the context of its connections with art music (for example, through the plot of the 'folk' operas as they were described by Leon Schiller),³⁸ in an analytical view (for example, the series of articles by Włodzimierz Kotoński 'Uwagi o muzyce ludowej Podhala' [Remarks on the folk music of Podhale])³⁹ and in current reports (such as for example, Kotoński's impressions 'Po konkursie kapel góralskich w Zakopanem' [Following the highlander band competition in Zakopane],⁴⁰ supported, however, by an academic commentary referring to the works of Mierczyński and Chybiński). The progress of the collection of folklore initiated by employees of the PIS was also monitored.⁴¹

34 'Związki J.S. Bacha z Polską' [J.S.Bach's links to Poland] (*Muzyka* 1950/6, 53–56).

35 'Jan Sebastian Bach' and 'W dwóchsetną rocznicę śmierci Jana Sebastiana Bacha' [On the two-hundredth anniversary of Jan Sebastian Bach's death] (*Muzyka* 1950/2, 11–17, 18–27).

36 'Bartok jako folklorysta' [Bartok as a folklorist] (*Muzyka* 1950/9, 57–60).

37 *Muzyka* 1950/9, 60.

38 'O treść oper ludowych' [About the content of folk opera] (*Muzyka* 1951/9, 13–18).

39 *Muzyka* 1953/5–6, 3–25, 1953/7–8, 43–58, 1953/11–12, 25–45, 1954/1–2, 14–27

40 *Muzyka* 1952/7–8, 84–90.

41 'Śladami Akcji Zbierania Folkloru' [Tracing the action of collecting folklore] (*Muzyka* 1950/5, 45); Jadwiga Sobieska, 'Folklor muzyczny w Rzeszowskiem i Lubelskiem (Z

Due to the relaxation of the atmosphere of the fight with formalism and the pervasive reign of methodology developed for education and culture by historical materialism, starting from editions from 1954, and even in issues from the second half of the year 1953, the number of materials and contributions deriving from previously applicable ideological schemes based on the Marxist philosophy of history gradually increased. In issue 5/6 of the monthly *Muzyka* from 1954, we find a report from a conference on the development of a new profile of the magazine, which took place in mid-March in PIS.⁴² Apart from representatives of the institute (director Juliusz Starzyński and his deputy Aleksander Jackowski, as well as Józef Chomiński, director of the Music Section) 'distinguished musicians' also took part in it, but there were other guests as well. Among the debaters mentioned above, there were Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, Wojciech Dzieduszycki, Stefan Śledziński, Jan Prosnak, Zygmunt Latoszewski, Józef Powroźniak, Kazimierz Serocki, Michał Bristiger, and Kazimierz Wiłkomirski. The reporter stressed the absence of a representative of ZKP. Among different options which surfaced during the debate, it seems that the idea presented by Kazimierz Serocki was the best one. He believed that *Muzyka* 'should be transformed into a professional quarterly and apart from that, we should publish a popular science music biweekly like *Nowa Kultura* and a popular weekly magazine for amateurs, something like *Przyjaciółka*.'⁴³

The magazine's profile did not change immediately. 'Propaganda' still dominated, as evidenced by, for example, a block of articles about mass songs published in the following edition, and in the next a series of texts about entertainment and dance music (including a report from a creative meeting devoted to this subject).⁴⁴ However, historical articles gradually began to dominate, often centred around current anniversaries (though without giving any features of monographic editions): dedicated to Michail Glinka (in the 150th anniversary of his birth, *Muzyka* 1954, No. 11/12), Chopin (in preparation for the Fifth Piano Competition, especially *Muzyka* 1955, No. 1/2 and 3/4), Adam Mickiewicz (due to the 100th anniversary of the poet's death *Muzyka* 1955, No. 10/09 and 11/12). At the beginning of 1955, the external appearance of the monthly changed: the

akcji zbierania folkloru muzycznego w Polsce)' [Musical folklore in Rzeszowskie and Lubelskie regions (From the action of collecting musical folklore in Poland)] (*Muzyka* 1951/5, 29–46).

42 'Narada w sprawie *Muzyki*' [Consultation concerning *Muzyka*] (*Muzyka* 1954/5–6, 105–106).

43 *Ibid.*, 106.

44 *Muzyka* 1954/9–10, 49–55.

cover which had been used for five years with staves and an 'emblem' with the number of booklet at the foreground, signed by outstanding graphic artist Henryk Tomaszewski, was replaced by a modern title font occupying almost the entire surface of the cover, as 'composed' by the artist Tadeusz Błażejowski.⁴⁵ At the same time, the 'layout' of *Muzyka* was also established, which, despite major changes in the nature and content of the journal, was adopted in 1956 by the editors of the quarterly and was still valid until recently.

Progressive changes, which were getting deeper with time, concerned the form of the periodical, the nature of articles, as well as target readers. As a result, the socialist realist page in the history of *Muzyka* was finally turned. The last issue appeared in the first quarter of 1956. Without warning, in spring of that year, PIS published a quarterly under the same title but with entirely different content. It was devoted to the history and theory of music and (at least according to initial declarations) scientific criticism and art criticism. The previous 'Committee' was dissolved with Józef M. Chomiński as the only member who remained in the new editorial team; he assumed the position of chief editor. Chomiński was joined (in the editorial committee) by Lvivians – Lissa, Łobaczewska, Father Feicht, Maciej Zalewski (a music theorist), and Stefan Jarociński, who became the secretary of the editorial office. The journal referred directly to the traditions of all editions of 'Kwartalnik' and set the standards for Polish musicological literature which are still applicable to this day.

It is worth mentioning that the editorial committee of the monthly (which, according to Lissa's words, was to have been 'huge, a dozen or so, with one musicologist – as bait')⁴⁶ was not disclosed until the spring edition (number 3/4) of 1954. It then turned out that the editor-in-chief of *Muzyka* was Witold Rudziński, his deputy Tadeusz Marek, and they were supported by a group consisting of Józef Chomiński (chair), Maria Andrzejewska, Aleksander Jackowski, Jerzy Jasieński and Zygmunt Mycielski (who, along with Chomiński, apparently initially completely refused to participate in the editorial work;⁴⁷ from the middle of 1954 he was replaced by the young composer, Włodzimierz Kotoński, who at the same time aligned himself academically with PIS, as he researched recordings of Polish folk material stored in the phonographic archive of the Institute, which

45 The format of the magazine changed earlier: the initial format A4 (21x30 cm) was reduced after two years to B5 (17,5x24 cm).

46 Lissa to Chybiński from Warsaw 11 XI 1949, AACH-BUAM, fol. K-Ł, p. 177.

47 See Ochlewski to Chybiński from Cracow 16 XII 1949, AACH-BUAM, fol. O-P, p. 90.

resulted in the publication of the monograph *Góralski i zbójnicki* [Highlander and bandit] (Cracow 1956).⁴⁸

The assignment of functions within the 'committee' would definitely be subject to rotation. The correspondence from Warsaw musicologists to Poznań and letters from others to Chybiński, and the CV written down by Aleksander Jackowski show that he had initially (1950–51) led the editorial office. From other sources, we know that Tadeusz Żakiej (who used the pseudonym Tadeusz Marek and appeared in PIS magazines under this name) 'took over' *Muzyka* in May 1951.⁴⁹ Regardless of who was in charge, Adolf Chybiński did not reply to their hot requests for new texts. His name appeared twice in the magazine and only in 1951: the previously mentioned speech at the Wawel conference opened that year, and the only original contribution is a message about a mysterious term 'Murky'.⁵⁰ The professor was still determined to send a portfolio to the editor, Jackowski, consisting of 'feuilleton (5 pages typewritten with margins and spaces)' 'Do kwestii reminiscencji w dziełach Fr. Chopina' [To the question of reminiscence in the works of Fr. Chopin],⁵¹ but the intermediary in the transmission of the typescript, Chomiński, predicted that he had no chance of a quick publication and stopped the material for printing in the second edition of the Chopin *Kwartalnik*.⁵²

48 In behind-the-scenes conversations about nominations for the editorial office of *Muzyka* the names Stefan Jarociński and Jerzy Broszkiewicz were also mentioned, see Ochlewski to Chybiński from Cracow 10 I 1950, AACH-BUAM, fol. O-P, p. 94. Let us recall that before the war, Stefan Jarociński studied law at the University of Warsaw. After the war, when the POW camp in Murnau was liberated, Jarociński ended up in Paris, where he took up philosophical and sociological studies. He had started acquiring musicological knowledge at the end of the 1930s in Warsaw, where he attended lectures given by Julian Pulikowski. He continued his education in Paris, where he went to lectures given by Paul-Marie Masson. Jerzy Broszkiewicz, a writer and publicist who also had the experience of studying musicology in Lviv and (for a brief period of time) in Cracow, was the editor of RM and most probably accepted the invitation to the Editorial Committee of *Muzyka* as well. However, I could not get to sources which would provide more details and unequivocally verify this piece of information.

49 See Marek to Chybiński from Warsaw 8 V 1951, AACH-BUAM, fol. M-N, p. 16.

50 Adolf Chybiński, 'Murky' (*Muzyka* 1951/8, 26–27).

51 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016 233–235. He wrote further: 'I saw that it pleased him, me too, because I will have a moment of calm with possible nagging me for writing to the monthly.'

52 KM 1949/28, 142–148.

Furthermore, the names of other doyens occasionally appeared as well. Zdzisław Jachimecki was amongst the authors of the booklet dedicated to Karol Szymanowski. He elaborated on the composer's unknown stage composition – *Loteria na mężów, czyli Narzeczony nr 69 albo Główna wygrana* [Lottery for a husband: Fiancé No. 69 or the main prize].⁵³ Józef Reiss published his contributions concerning the music culture of the nineteenth century⁵⁴ three times, but only beginning with the fourth year of the appearance of *Muzyka*. Hieronim Feicht was co-author (together with Chomiński and Lissa) of a review of the latest synthesis on Polish musical culture, a book by Igor Bełza.⁵⁵ The authors of the monthly were also the founding members of the pre-war period SMDM – Bronisław Rutkowski, amongst others, twice prepared Bach materials,⁵⁶ Tadeusz Ochlewski and Emma Altberg permanently cooperated, preparing current information about new releases for the editorial office. From the pre-war circles, there was also Chybiński's friend, the singer and pedagogue Bronisław Romaniszyn already known for his publications about vocal matters,⁵⁷ and the music journalist Karol Stromenger, who this time presented George Bernard Shaw's achievements in the field of music criticism.⁵⁸ Another experienced and known Warsaw author, Piotr Rytel, prepared two occasional texts: he introduced the composer Reinhold Gliere (in the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth) and reminiscences about Józef Turczyński;⁵⁹ Janusz Miketta, who before 1939 was a ministerial bureaucrat, but who already during the war deepened his musicological knowledge, published a 'chopinological'⁶⁰ contribution.

53 'Operetka Karola Szymanowskiego' [Karol Szymanowski's operetta] (*Muzyka* 1952/3–4, 27–39).

54 Including the monographic article on the theme of Polish dance music of the nineteenth century (*Muzyka* 1953/9–10, 26–44).

55 'Radziecka książka o dziejach polskiej kultury muzycznej' [Soviet book about the history of Polish musical culture] (*Muzyka* 1954/11–12, 33–39).

56 'Jan Sebastian Bach' (*Muzyka* 1950/2, 11–17). Let us remember that Bronisław Rutkowski was a propagator of Bach's work both as a journalist and musician – organist and pedagogue. More than a dozen years after the events described, in 1964, he died in Leipzig, where he was a member of the jury of the International Bach competition.

57 Here also, similarly to KM, focused on vocal issues (*Muzyka* 1950/9, 47–49, 1955/5–6, 47–57).

58 *Muzyka* 1951/1, 42–44.

59 *Muzyka* 1950/1, 41, 1954/5–6, 74–76.

60 The sketch 'Chopin o Mickiewiczu' [Chopin on Mickiewicz] (*Muzyka* 1953/9–10, 44–51).

The new journal published by PIS was definitely dominated by representatives of the second generation, including Zofia Lissa. Even though in the beginning she did not support the form of the journal proposed by PIS, she quickly started using it to publish the results of her comprehensive scientific activity. She published texts of conference presentations, reports on current events,⁶¹ discussions of works by contemporary artists⁶² and normal 'productions,' such as the already mentioned monographic sketch on the subject of mass song, but also historical contributions, for example, about the Warsaw episode in the life of Michail Glinka.⁶³ Together with Józef Chomiński, she prepared what was for the norms of *Muzyka* an extensive historical article 'Muzyka polskiego Odrodzenia' [Music of the Polish Renaissance]⁶⁴ (which was the fruit of their joint monograph published by PWM under the same title), and earlier reflections on folklore in the work of contemporary Polish composers.⁶⁵ Chomiński himself focused on contemporary art⁶⁶ on the one hand, and on contemporary ideology on the other.⁶⁷ He was also the chosen one among Adolf Chybiński's students who after the death of the professor wrote a memoir about him.⁶⁸

Tadeusz Marek, the editor of *Muzyka*, was able to match Lissa in terms of the number of published materials. In his case, however, most comprised ongoing relations from the musical life and publishing movements; he undertook historical themes rather occasionally.⁶⁹

61 Amongst others 'Próba podsumowania Festiwalu [Muzyki Polskiej] i wyników Zjazdu [ZKP]' [An attempt to summarise the festival [of Polish music] and results of the conference [ZKP]] (*Muzyka* 1952/1–2, 21–33).

62 For example, 'Koncert na orkiestrę Witolda Lutosławskiego' [Witold Lutosławski's *Concerto for Orchestra*] (*Muzyka* 1955/3–4, 25–52).

63 'Michał Glinka w Warszawie' [Michail Glinka in Warsaw] (*Muzyka* 1954, 11–12, 15–26).

64 *Muzyka* 1953/11–12, 5–25.

65 *Muzyka* 1951/5–6, 3–24.

66 For example, 'Koncert na orkiestrę smyczkową Grażyny Bacewicz' [Grażyna Bacewicz's concerto for string orchestra] (*Muzyka* 1955/5–6, 20–29).

67 Such as in the case of the article 'inspired' by Lenin's theory of reflection, 'O możliwościach poznawczych w muzyce' [About cognitive possibilities in music] (*Muzyka* 1951/3–4, 5–7).

68 *Muzyka* 1953/3–4, 15–22.

69 For example, 'Książęcy kapellmistrz' [Princely Kapellmeister] (*Muzyka* 1954/11–12, 44–51). As he himself wrote, this was supposed to be a fragment from a monograph by Joseph Haydn prepared for print. This monograph, however, did not appear.

These are, of course, not all the authors of *Muzyka*. The list should be supplemented with the names of editorial staff members – Zygmunt Mycielskie Aleksander Jackowski, Witold Rudziński and regular co-operators with the editors Maria Andrzejewska, Igor Belza, Mirosław Dąbrowski, Mieczysław Drobner, Jerzy Jasiński, Jan Prosnak, Stefan Śledziński, amongst others; Witold Lutosławski also wrote a few analytical articles for *Muzyka*. Perhaps due to the Zofia Lissa's intercession, the monthly also provided debuts for representatives of the youngest generation of Polish musicologists at that time. For the first time texts appeared by Alina Nowak-Romanowicz, Tadeusz Strumiłło, Zygmunt Szweykowski, Elżbieta Dziębowska, Krystyna Kobylańska and not just in information columns.⁷⁰

Only some of the cited names had the opportunity to also appear in another periodical, whose form was significantly different, and which was aimed at educated musicologists and music theorists. It was supposed to be a continuation of the literary tradition built by Chybiński. Almost simultaneously with the launch of *Muzyka*, independently of the professor's earlier plans – an idea to publish a strictly scientific journal called *Studia Muzykologiczne* surfaced there. It was supposed to be headed by Józef Chomiński, who cooperated with PIS. Apart from Chomiński, the editorial team was made up of former students of the Department of Musicology in Lviv: Zofia Lissa, Stefania Łobaczewska, Father Hieronim Feicht. Despite the age of seventy years and fatigue, Chybiński still expected that the generational change would not happen and he would once again serve as the head of the editorial team. When it became known that it would be otherwise, he could not conceal his grief: 'Alas, *Kwartalnik Muzyczny* came to an end. Instead of *Kwartalnik*, PIS will issue *Studia Muzykologiczne*. It will be a periodical. I will not be a part of *Studia* for it will be a publication of the Institute. It will be edited by Dr Chomiński, an employee of the Institute.'⁷¹

70 See for example, Alina Nowak-Romanowicz, 'Przynależność J.K. Elsnera do kultury polskiej' [J.K. Elsners belonging to Polish culture] (*Muzyka* 1954/1–2, 31–38), Tadeusz Strumiłło, 'Jan Kiszwalter (1787–1843)' (*Muzyka* 1952/7–8, 36–41), Zygmunt Szweykowski, 'Zapomniana polska śpiewaczka Teodozja Friderici-Jakowicka' [Forgotten Polish singer Teodozja Friderici-Jakowicka] (*Muzyka* 1952/7–8, 41–45), Elżbieta Dziębowska, 'Pieśń masowa w twórczości W. Lutosławskiego' [Mass songs in the creative work of W. Lutosławski], (*Muzyka* 1954/7–8, 38–44), Krystyna Kobylańska, 'Henrietta Sontag' (*Muzyka* 1951/7, 23–27).

71 Chybiński to Bronarski from Poznań 11 IX 1951, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski's archive, p. 214.

Already during the preliminary preparation for opening the title, a sharp dispute was triggered between Chybiński and Chomiński over the title of the magazine, which was one of the examples of frictions accompanying the generational shift in Polish musicology, difficult to accept for the senior. Initially, the title *Muzykologia Polska* was proposed in Warsaw, on which Chybiński commented: ‘I do not like this ostentatious title at all. Why not call the annual *Rocznik Muzykologii Polskiej*, if you do not want to title it after the pre-war *Polski Rocznik Muzykologiczny*.’⁷² He also wrote to Director Ochlewski: ‘The successor to *Kwartalnik* is supposed to be *Muzykologia Polska*.... He [Chomiński] wrote me, that they don’t want to be cramped by the name “annual,” because they intend to publish two or even three volumes per year I replied that it is possible to publish two thicker volumes as a so-called semi-annual: “Halbbaende” rather “Halbjahrbaende.” He wrote back to me that it was still being settled.’⁷³

The title of the new journal led to a serious misunderstanding between Chybiński and Chomiński, which continued for many weeks. The professor expressed his opinion in a balanced, yet unambiguous way: ‘I won’t write a lot, just a few words about the planned publishing of *Muzykologia polska*. I’ve thought a lot about this title, which strikes me to some extent with its ostentatiousness. This title sounds like a title of a chapter in some paper on musicology in general. In my opinion, we could make a reference to the pre-war annual and publish it as volume III of *Polski Rocznik Muzykologiczny*. And if we want to avoid. . . “tradition,” give it the title of *Rocznik Muzykologii Polskiej*.’⁷⁴ Chomiński wavered for several months, fearing that the word ‘annual’ would determine and limit in practice the real needs with regards to the frequency of publishing. It was finally decided that the new periodical (published by PIS) would have the title *Studia Muzykologiczne*. While it was intended to be a semi-annual (in 1953, two extensive volumes were published), in the course of the next three years, it became a de facto yearbook.

Adolf Chybiński, who remained in Poznań and had lived for years in the hope of reactivating *Rocznik*, did not participate in the editorial works, although he had some tips and suggestions for the new editors: ‘I would ... believe that you should cease printing kilometre-long works in the musicological journal.

72 Chybiński to Bronarski from Poznań 28 II 1951, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski’s archive, p. 213.

73 Chybiński to Ochlewski from Poznań 21 III 1951, AACH-BUAM, Ochlewski’s archive, p. 101.

74 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 304–305.

Everywhere, annuals, semi-annuals and monthly journals contain shorter works; some are very short. And this makes sense. Do not shun “contributions.” In years, they make up for greater things. Longer works should be published as books and pamphlets; shorter ones should be assigned to *Rocznik*.⁷⁵ This was not quite in line with the plans of the young editors. As to the scale of the publication, it should be stated that the *Studia* were dominated by extensive dissertations, although the possibility of printing was allowed to ‘works limited only to discussing some details,’⁷⁶ however, subject to their originality and use of the presented material for future syntheses.

Even though *Studia Muzykologiczne* were published by the Music Section of PIS, the inaugural editorial announced cooperation with all three Departments of Musicology at the universities in Warsaw, Cracow and Poznań. However, only about a dozen authors’ names appeared on the pages of the periodical. Among those, there were Lvivians, that is Chybiński (only in the first volume), Lissa, Łobaczewska, and Chomiński, as well as other authors who had already had their debuts (e.g. in *Kwartalnik Muzyczny*), such as Krystyna Wilkowska, Jan Prosnak and Janusz Miketta. However, some new names also began to appear which formed the next generation of Polish musicologists: Tadeusz Strumiłło, Alina Nowak-Romanowicz, Józef Kański, Stefan Jarociński, Andrzej Koszewski, Henryk Anders and others.

As to the frequency of the publication of following volumes of *Studia*, reality verified the original plans. Although Chomiński intended to issue a new title on a semi-annual or quarterly cycle, from the third number, the journal was de facto an annual. Initially, the new title fully expressed the ideological assumptions that were in effect in academia at the time – acceptance of dialectical materialism for historical research, the most prominent example of which was Zofia Lissa’s opening dissertation, ‘Niektóre zagadnienia estetyki muzycznej w świetle artykułów Józefa Stalina o marksizmie w językoznawstwie’ [Some issues of musical aesthetics in the light of Joseph Stalin’s articles on Marxism in linguistics]⁷⁷ and the words from the first page of this publication: ‘Today, we consider historical and dialectical materialism to be the only scientific direction of thought leading to a true knowledge of reality.’⁷⁸ Adoption of such priorities also determined the layout of content: the volume did not open – as is usually

75 Ibid.

76 ‘Od Redakcji’ [Editorial] (SM 1953/1, 9).

77 SM 1953/1, 11–154, also printed in 1954 by PWM as an individual publication.

78 Ibid., 11.

the case of musicological journals – with historical works but with essays on the ‘theory of methodology-aesthetics.’ They were followed by chapter ‘2) the history of music with contemporary music’ and – later on – ‘3) ethnomusicology, 4) historical materials, 5) reports and discussions.’⁷⁹ The position taken by the editors – applying in music scholarship a method based ‘on the experience of Soviet science’⁸⁰ – did not disturb them in taking as the most important goal to ‘direct the main attention to the history of Polish musical culture.’⁸¹ It was assumed that the interest in popular music should be reconsidered: ‘in this area, the most important issue will be papers studying musical relations between Poland and Russia, as well as our artistic relations with nations which form the Soviet Union and people’s democracies.’⁸² Critical studies on contemporary works were aimed at helping composers with ‘rapid ideological maturation’ (in accordance with guidelines from the national meetings of musicians, musicologists and music critics held at the time), while in case of ethnomusicological works it was expected to go beyond the circles of the ‘bourgeois cultural-historical school’ and not be restricted to research on rural folklore. Finally, in the reporting section, besides discussions on Polish works, it was recommended to deal with Soviet works as well, because as it was written ‘we believe that the experience of Soviet studies will help Polish musicology completely master the modern scientific method and ensure its comprehensive development in the service of the society.’⁸³

Authors and members of the editorial team did not have problems with formulating scientific arguments which were very much in line with the expected socialist phrasing and rhetoric. Moreover, Stefania Łobaczewska started working on reformulating nineteenth-century foundations for the analysis of musical works to adapt them to the assumptions of Marxist aesthetics. She presented her reflections on the example of two previous volumes of *Analizy i Objasnienia Dzieł Wszystkich Fryderyka Chopina* [Analysis and explanation of the complete works of Frederic Chopin] (that is *Mazurki* [Mazurka] written by Janusz Miketta and *Preludia* [Preludes] prepared by Józef Chomiński).⁸⁴ Chomiński himself also remained in the circle of musical analysis; he examined the issue

79 ‘Od Redakcji’ [Editorial] (SM 1953/1, 7).

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid., 8.

82 Ibid.

83 Ibid., 10.

84 Stefania Łobaczewska, ‘Z zagadnień analizy muzykologicznej’ [From the issues of musicological analysis] (SM 1953/1, 155–188).

of musical elements as the subject of analytical considerations.⁸⁵ In both texts, their authors came to a similar conclusion that the value of a musical work is determined by the balance of its content and form, and the aspect ‘content–form’ is ‘a necessary condition as a starting point for the analysis.’⁸⁶ Publishing her ‘*Studia nad klasowym obliczem tańców polskich w epoce renesansu*’ [Studies on the class aspect of Polish dances in the Renaissance],⁸⁷ Krystyna Wilkowska went further: she declared the transition from a postulative only approach to changes in analytical principles to their realisation in practice. The adoption of such an ‘action’ approach by the author may be confirmed, for example, by her criticism of the not entirely consistent, in her opinion, division of dances from the tablature of Joannis de Lublin, which was conducted by Chybiński in a fundamental paper on this monument, published in 1911–13 on the pages of the ‘first’ *Kwartalnik Muzyczny*.⁸⁸ Although Wilkowska acknowledges that the professor ‘even attempted to divide the dances from two points of view: national and class,’ but ‘when it comes to interpreting the class aspect of the dances by Joannis de Lublin, then Chybiński only distinguishes two categories of dances, namely peasant and courtly. This is, of course, an incomplete division. In the face of rapidly developing cities, it is difficult to suppose that an urban culture would not be created at that time.’⁸⁹

It is hard to say whether the professor would have crossed swords with Wilkowska or instead agreed with her. When the first volume of *Studia Muzykologiczne* came out, the master had already been dead for a few months. We know from numerous letters that he did not agree with many decisions made in his twilight years. He was also irritated by the behaviour of some of his colleagues and pupils. Until the very end, he represented ‘the old school’ and could not adapt the new methodology to his own research work. When it comes to papers written at that time, he just kept clumsily ‘squeezing’ some phrases or sentences into them which could protect him against the criticism of ill-disposed state functionaries (like for example, the sentence closing the article which was posthumously published in the first volume of *Studia*:⁹⁰ ‘I did not have enough works of Slavonic composers in writing this work, to make the most use of them.

85 SM 1953/1, 189–213.

86 Stefania Łobaczewska, ‘Z zagadnień. . .’, op. cit., 188.

87 SM 1953/1, 214–248.

88 See chapter I-1, footnote 102.

89 Krystyna Wilkowska, ‘*Studia nad klasowym obliczem. . .*’, op. cit., 217.

90 Adolf Chybiński, ‘O pewnym “motywie” w dziełach F. Chopina’ [About a certain motif in the works of F. Chopin] (SM 1953/1, 249–266).

This particularly applies to the very rich piano music of Russian and Czech masters').⁹¹

Jan Prosnak also protected himself with the socialist realist narrative; his restricted his work on Chopin's flute variations, (*E-major* on the theme of *Non più mesta* from Act II of the opera *La Cenerentola* by Gioachino Rossini) to classical description and analysis,⁹² as did Marian Sobieski, who (against the editorial board's recommendations) who exclusively undertook 'rural' folklore and presented the tonal qualities of Polish folk music, without taking into consideration possible social conditions of this work.⁹³ This group of 'a-ideological' works from the first volume of *Studia* was filled by material prepared by Stefan Jarociński, who was starting his career path in PIS, entitled 'Z korespondencji Romana Statkowskiego' [From the correspondence of Roman Statkowski], based on the letters preserved in the archives of Wilski family (cousins of the composer).⁹⁴

The volume concluded with a report on publications which tied up some loose ends. First of all, due to the aspirations of the editorial team, these were to a large extent (or rather the majority) Russian books (including the translation of a monograph by Vyacheslav Paskhalov, *Chopin a polska muzyka ludowa* [Chopin and Polish folk music]). It was at the same time one of a few works on Chopin. Apart from this, two commemorative issues of *Kwartalnik Muzyczny* devoted to Chopin were also discussed, as well as reflections of Karol Szymanowski entitled 'O Chopinie' [On Chopin], which were prepared by Stanisław Golachowski. Another paper by Szymanowski was also introduced; it was worthy of attention because it contained 'a giant load of progressive thought.'⁹⁵ There was also a huge monograph devoted to the composer (*Karol Szymanowski. Życie i twórczość*. [Karol Szymanowski. Life and work], Cracow 1950), written by Stefania Łobaczewska. The circle of reviewers was quite closed. Commentaries were

91 Ibid., 266. I do not rule out that these kinds of notes were not authored by the professor himself, but were issued by the editorial staff.

92 Jan Prosnak, 'Wariacje fletowe Chopina' [Chopin's flute variations'] (SM 1953/1, 267–307).

93 Marian Sobieski, 'Oblicze tonalne polskiej muzyki ludowej' [The tonal aspect of Polish folk music] (SM 1953/1, 308–332).

94 SM 1953/1, 333–349.

95 Stefania Łobaczewska, 'Karol Szymanowski: Wychowawcza rola kultury muzycznej [Karol Szymanowski: Educational role of music culture] with a preface by Zbigniew Drzewiecki. PWM. Cracow 1949' (SM 1953/1, 382).

written by Lissa, Łobaczewska and Wilkowska, as well as Kornel Michałowski and Józef Patkowski, young assistants from Poznań and Warsaw.

Volume II of the *Studia* had a similar, primarily 'Polish' content, with considerations (after Lissa's 'aestheticising' dissertation 'O specyfice muzyki' [The special nature of music])⁹⁶ about the creative work and lives of Chopin, Szymanowski and Moniuszko. Articles by Łobaczewska, Chomiński, Prosnak and another young Poznań musicologist, Andrzej Koszewski, and material by Witold Rudziński (supplemented with a translation of a paper by the German musicologist and music sociologist at the musicological conference in Berlin, Ernst H. Meyer, on the theme of 'Beethoven i muzyka ludowa' [Beethoven and folk music]),⁹⁷ made up the entire publication, deprived this time of the reports. Already in this book one can recognise refraining from the ideological programme, unequivocally designated in the editorial, which the office wanted to impose.⁹⁸ As Elżbieta Dziębowska wrote, 'the normatively recognised aesthetic and methodological issues lost their central position, ... historical themes began to prevail with a clear preference of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. ... volume 5 [the last, completed in 1954, released in 1956 – ed. MS] is dominated by analyses

96 SM 1953/2, 7–132.

97 SM 1953/2, 153–166.

98 Although it should be noted that the subtitle of Chomiński's article on Chopin's sonatas – 'Sonata jako element nadbudowy ideologicznej' [Sonata as part of ideological superstructure] – and his first sentence ('Examination of the ideological side of an artistic work is conditioned by the possibility of penetrating its content,' op. cit., p. 167) still placed the author at the forefront of representatives of the current humanities methodology. The socialist realistic 'class' optics adopted by him indeed sparked criticism on the pages of *Muzyka*. In issue 1954/7–8 (pp. 83–87) an extensive review was published by a theatre and literary critic, one of the employees of the then PIS Theatre Section, Tadeusz Sivert. Although the author was not a musicologist, he was able to report substantively on the content of volume II of MS, providing the broadest discussion on Lissa's study 'O specyfice muzyki,' stressing the author's valuable and innovative contribution and her analysis of the problems of music to studies on music and its social role. He devoted much less space to Chomiński's monographic article and, at the same time, despite paying attention to the author's insightful explanations, first of all pointed to the simplification in the form of 'conclusions on the class of Chopin's sonatas in view of the fact that such complex material is an expression of the artist's emotional relationship towards various elements of music.' Next, upon citing Chomiński, he refuted the value of conclusions that can be drawn by looking amongst Chopin's works for merely 'peasant' and 'bourgeois' elements and 'class aspects.'

of works from contemporary composers.⁹⁹ Looking through all the volumes of *Studia* one can say that the number and value of the Chopin-based papers significantly contribute to the cult of Chopin.¹⁰⁰

The topic of creating a magazine entirely dedicated to the works and figure of Chopin had been appearing in discussions amongst musicologists – primarily from the circle of Adolf Chybiński – for many years, much before the jubilees of 1949 and 1950. In connection with the upcoming anniversaries, the creation of a new research unit – the Institute for Chopin Research – had been considered at the very highest level.¹⁰¹ In these difficult years of rebuilding the country, all works related to Chopin were given the green light because it was seen as an opportunity for propaganda. Let us recall that the Frederic Chopin Institute, which was established in 1934, did not operate during the war. It renewed its activity in the first months of freedom and resumed work on the edition of *Dzieła Wszystkie Fryderyka Chopina* [The Complete Works of Frederic Chopin], edited by Ignacy Jan Paderewski, Ludwik Bronarski and Józef Turczyński (eventually, the volumes appeared in print in the years 1949–61). After 1950, the Institute functioned as the Frederic Chopin Society. It attracted a growing number of researchers who studied the composer's legacy, as well as activists who wanted to keep his memory alive.

The announcement of Chopin Year was supported by the Resolution of the Council of Ministers and the creation of a relevant Executive Committee. In its composition, besides the appointed departmental and union officials, there were also musicologists Adolf Chybiński, Zdzisław Jachimecki, Hieronim Feicht and Zofia Lissa, along with musicians Stanisław Kazuro, Zbigniew Drzewiecki and Stanisław Szpinalski, and Juliusz Starzyński – acting as director of the international cooperation office at MKiS, and the future director of the newly opened PIS. The Jubilee Committee had to fulfil several tasks, including to prepare 'a)

99 Dziębowska 2000, 187.

100 In total, nine articles were published in SM on Chopin along with twelve reviews of books devoted to the work and the figure of the composer.

101 See Chybiński to Lissa from Zakopane 12 VIII 1948, AZL-BUW: 'Institute for Research on Chopin... 100 years of health for President [Bierut] for such a wish! As soon as possible! For it also has political significance (not only in relation to France). I think the matter will be ripe for realisation next year.' The professor also informed Bronarski about the matter: 'by the will of the President of the Republic of Poland, the Institute of Research on Chopin's life and work will be created next year (I don't yet know the name of the institute);' see Chybiński to Bronarski from Zakopane 24 VIII 1948, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski's archive, p. 198.

collective issue of the works of Frederic Chopin under the editorship of Ignacy Paderewski, b) issue of monographs and research works related to the life and work of Frederic Chopin¹⁰²: they considered, among others, translation of the *Chopin* monograph by Bernard Scharlitt (Leipzig 1919), resume of *Chopin* by Ferdinand Hoesick (after necessary amendments), and the issue of collective work analysing the individual elements of the composer's work.¹⁰³

Chybiński kept cherishing his *idée fixe*, which was related to promoting expert knowledge about the life and work of Frederic Chopin. He started thinking about establishing an annals devoted to the composer just a few months after he assumed the position of chief editor of the new-old *Kwartalnik*. In response to the news about official initiatives, he shared his idea with Chomiński and some time later also with Lissa. He planned to 'create either something like "Chopin Annual" or ... something like "Studies in the Life and Work of Frederic Chopin." It would be a non-periodical publication in hardcover or paperback.¹⁰⁴

to celebrate the Chopin anniversary in 1949 one could think of initiating a special series of publications devoted to the life and works of Chopin. *Bach-Studien* and *Handel-Jahrbuch*, as well as *Beethoven-Jahrbuch*, can be issued abroad – why shouldn't we create something similar on Chopin?! Eventually, this could be called *Rocznik Chopinowski* – what do you think? This would also have a good side, we could place smaller works there along with special articles and mini-articles, a 'chronicle' of matters relating to Chopin worldwide etc. ... The editor need not be a musicologist, but in any case someone close to Chopin's affairs. IFC may be involved in this work, but with the most far-reaching reservations. For example, why not appoint [Bronisław] Sydow as editor? Without a doubt, he is the most serious amongst the IFC members. A man of good, and even the best intentions, and a bibliographer of Chopin. He could be given a small committee (e.g. two people), and thus we could be calm about everything. ... And if IFC would not follow our line, then we can manage without the IFC as well.¹⁰⁵

A year later, he had another candidate for the position of chief editor – Janusz Miketta. He wrote about this to Ludwik Bronarski:

we are thinking about bringing *Rocznik Chopinowski* to life in order to relieve the quarterly in 1950. We will discuss it in detail with associate professor Lissa and doctor Chomiński For the time being, I don't want *Rocznik* to have more than 15–20 printed sheets I would like Janusz Miketta to become chief editor of *Rocznik*. ... In

102 The full text of the Resolution of 20 III 1948 was included, among others, in RM 1948/8, 24.

103 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 70–71.

104 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 71–73.

105 Chybiński to Lissa from Zakopane 11 VII 1948, AZL-BUW.

relation to *Rocznik* I dare ... ask whether you would like to honour volume I of *Rocznik* with your presence in it. A more extensive paper would be welcomed.¹⁰⁶

Lissa agreed with the idea of preparing a publication on Chopin, except that she saw it as a volume of analytical studies related to the jubilee. For this purpose, the professor was ready to give up most of the Chopinological materials dedicated to *Kwartalnik*, although he already expressed the opinion that there is too little time for organising such a volume. As an alternative, Chomiński presented his next project – a series of several volumes, ‘similar to Bücken – on the widest possible scale’ which would be entitled *Chopinologia Polska* [Polish Chopinology]:

Volume I would cover the history of our Chopinography and Chopinology along with criticism of previous work. Volume II: Chopin and his epoch (Zofia Lissa wants to work on this topic, and of course besides a sociological approach she would have to take into account the pan-cultural, and especially the historical-musical background). Volume III: Rhythmics. Volume IV: Melodics. Volume V: Harmonics. Volume VI: Form. Volume VII: Piano texture... etc. What is your, Sir Professor, view on this plan? Besides, upon my stay in Poznań, we could discuss this plan in detail. As it turns out, X. Feicht and Ms Zofia Lissa will be there as well.¹⁰⁷

The professor this time also distanced himself from the idea of a collective study, indicating the superiority of the destiny of *Rocznik Chopinowski*, ‘after the model of such projects dedicated to Bach, Haendel, Beethoven, Wagner. This would be a place for specialised research, and only after some time becoming a kind of “Corpus Chopinianum.” I will show you when we talk that it is much too early for this, even though the very idea is excellent.’¹⁰⁸ Eventually, Chomiński agreed with the professor regarding the periodic nature of the publication, but they still could not reach an agreement on the optimal volume. The professor, who was experienced and could realistically assess the capabilities of the musicological community, imagined volumes comprising of about one hundred and fifty pages rather than four hundred or five hundred.¹⁰⁹

Further efforts did not follow the professor’s thoughts. The news he gave Bronarczyk two months later was not optimistic. He informed that *Rocznik Chopinowski* would not be published (‘The reasons for this are not financial, but

106 Chybiński to Bronarski from Poznań 26 VI 1949, AACh-BUAM, Bronarski’s archive, p. 203.

107 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 173–174.

108 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 1775–176.

109 Chybiński/Chomiński 2016, 177–178, 178–179.

of a completely different nature, about which it is not worth writing'),¹¹⁰ and at the beginning of November he closed the subject with the remark: '*Rocznik Chopinowski*, planned by myself, is unfortunately not happening.'¹¹¹

The idea of launching a magazine entirely dedicated to the works of Chopin was not abandoned, and soon it was undertaken by Chomiński, who took over as editor-in-chief. This time the appointed editorial committee included Zofia Lissa and Stefania Łobaczewska, along with musicians – pianists connected with the TiFC – Zbigniew Drzewiecki, Jan Ekier, Jan Hoffman and Stanisław Szpinalski (only in the initial period – he died in mid-1957) – and a theorist who had been associated with the publishing community for years, and was Chybiński's trusted associate – Kazimierz Sikorski, and the young musicologist Józef Kański. Krystyna Wilkowska-Chomińska was appointed as secretary. The first volume of *Rocznik* was released in 1956. The materials were published in several sections: 'Life and work,' 'Performance style,' 'Heritage and the cult of Chopin,' 'Bibliographic materials,' 'Reports.' Among the first authors were both members of the editorial committee – Łobaczewska,¹¹² Lissa,¹¹³ Chomiński,¹¹⁴ Drzewiecki,¹¹⁵ Kański¹¹⁶ – as well as invited musicologists – Franciszek German,¹¹⁷ Krystyna Kobyłańska¹¹⁸ and the Russian historian, Igor Bełza.¹¹⁹

110 Chybiński to Bronarski from Zakopane 9 VIII 1949, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski's archive, p. 204.

111 Chybiński to Bronarski from Zakopane 1 XI 1949, AACH-BUAM, Bronarski's archive, p. 205.

112 'Wkład Chopina do romantyzmu europejskiego' [Chopin's contribution to European Romanticism] (RCh 1956/1, 9–95).

113 'Problem polskiego stylu narodowego w twórczości Chopina' [The problem of the Polish style in Chopin's works] (RCh 1956/1, 96–170).

114 'Mistrzostwo kompozytorskie Chopina' [Chopins compositional mastery] (RCh 1956/1, 171–226).

115 'Próba charakterystyki polskiego stylu wykonawczego dzieł Fryderyka Chopina' [An attempt at characterisation of a Polish performance style of Frederic Chopin's works] (RCh 1956/1, 254–262).

116 'Raport Polskie prace o Chopinie (1945–1955)' [Report of Polish works about Chopin] (RCh 1956/1, 330–349).

117 'Chopin i Mickiewicz' [Chopin and Mickiewicz] (RCh 1956/1, 227–253).

118 'Chopin w Polsce Ludowej' [Chopin in the Polish People's Republic] (RCh 1956/1, 282–303), and 'Zbiory muzealne Towarzystwa im. F. Chopina w Warszawie' [Museum Collections of the F. Chopin society in Warsaw] (RCh 1956/1, 304–323).

119 'Tradycje uprawiania muzyki Chopina w Rosji i ZSRR' [The tradition of performing Chopin in Russia and the USSR] (RCh 1956/1, 263–281) and the report 'Książki radzieckie o Chopinie' [Soviet books about Chopin] (RCh 1956/1, 324–329).

Subsequent issues did not appear regularly, but the editorial team did try to make up for delays. After a two-year break, the second and third volume were published almost simultaneously, whereas, in the following years, two or three annuals were merged into one volume. Starting from number two, the journal entered the international arena thanks to abstracts translated into French. Therefore, the plans that Chybiński and then Chomiński had been making for many years finally came to fruition. This time, the editorial office took things a step further and published materials in original language versions. The annual started coming out under the title *Annales Chopin*. In-depth research and a separate monograph would be needed to study international contracts related to this fact, the history of the journal, which started coming out in English in 1985, as well as the history of post-war Frederic Chopin Society, which currently operates as the Institute of Frederic Chopin, and the Frederic Chopin Museum.

* * *