Gregor Pompe

Simfonična dela Lojzeta Lebiča

Osrednji nameni magistrskega dela so bili: odkriti kompozicijsko-tehnične značilnosti simfoničnega ustvarjanja sodobnega slovenskega skladatelja Lojzeta Lebiča (1934), razkriti posamezne kompozicijske postopke in strategije ter idejne podstati, iz katerih le-te izvirajo. Tak sinhron prerez skladateljevega dela je dopolnjen še z diahronim, saj naloga skuša odgovoriti tudi na vprašanje, kako so se vse te značilnosti spreminjale skozi čas: od zgodnje *Simfoniette* (1960) do poslednjega preiskovanega dela *Glasbe za orkester – Cantico I* (1997). Zasnova naloge, ki obsega pet poglavij, sledi Nattiezovem napotilu, da je v "totalnem glasbenem faktu" mogoče odkriti tri ravni: poietičnega predstavlja kompozicijski proces, imanentnega "tekst", torej glasbeno delo samo, estetski pa nastopi z aktom percepcije.

Uvodno poglavje skuša definirati pojem "simfoničnosti", še posebej pa odpira dileme, ki nastajajo ob tem vprašanju v 20. stoletju z razpadom tradicionalnih zvrsti. Pretres osrednje literature (H. Danuser, C. Dahlhaus, G. Mayer), ki se ukvarja z zvrstno problematiko, prinaša spoznanje, da si je pri poizkusu zvrstne opredelitve potrebno pomagati z več kriteriji, ki se skozi čas spreminjajo. Za zvrstno opredelitev Lebičevih del so uporabni trije kriteriji: kriterij zasedbe, kriterij forme in kot vsota obeh še specifični "karakter" simfoničnih del. Glede na te sodijo med Lebičeva simfonična dela *Simfonietta*, *Sentence*, *Korant*, *Nicina*, *Glasovi*, *Tangram*, *Uvertura za tri instrumentalne skupine*, *Queensland Music*, *Simfonija z orglami* in *Glasba za orkester – Cantico I*, kot "problematična" pa se izkažejo tri vokalno-instrumentalna dela – *Požgana trava*, *Novembrske pesmi* in *Miti in apokrif*. Slednja so sicer napisana za simfonični orkester, določa jih "simfonično razmišljanje", v veliki meri pa je zanje značilen tudi bolj kontrasten simfonični duktus, vendar pa so iz nadaljnje obravnave izločene, saj bi morale njihove analize potekati bistveno drugače: upoštevati bi bilo potrebno tudi vezi med besedilom in njegovo uglasbitvijo.

Sledi preiskava skladateljeve "eksplicitne" poetike, kakršna se razkriva v avtorjevih zapisih in razmišljanjih o lastnem delu in stvaritvah. Analiza takih prispevkov je pokazala, da je skladateljeva avtopoetika zaznamovana s številnimi napetostnimi dvojicami: (1) tako je Lebičev kompozicijski proces ujet "med logiko razuma in 'logiko' srca", – bistvo glasbe se skladatelju očitno kaže kot nepomirljivo nasprotje med matematično-objektivno opredeljivostjo (torej naravno danim, fizikalnim) in transcendentalno neizrekljivim, saj je zanj glasba po eni strani "stvar razmerij, proporcev [in jo] [p]oslušamo kot nekaj logičnega", spet drugič pa jo razume kot "odraz višjega reda" ali "zvenečo metafiziko"; (2) skladatelj glasbo razume kot avtonomno umetnost, ki nima sporočilne funkcije, vendar pa vseeno priznava, da je glasbi "treba vrniti več pripovedne moči, to pomeni ovrednotiti njeno gramatiko in sintakso"; (3) dialektičnost zaznamuje tudi Lebičev odnos med navezanostjo na rodno Koroško in njeno pokrajino ter odprtostjo za najnovejša dogajanja v svetu, preko ozkih mej domače države; (4) vsa ta navidezna nesoglasja pa se iztekajo v vprašanje o skladateljevi slogovni opredeljenosti, za katero je na eni strani značilna zvestoba modernizmu, proti koncu sedemdesetih let pa se skladatelju kljub zavračanju modnega postmodernizma ne zdi smiselno ločevati "več tako nepomirljivo na staro in novo", njegova glasba pa postane razpeta med primarne arhetipske vzorce in aktualno sodobnostjo. Ta nihanja, razpetosti in dialektične odnose predstavljajo korenike skladateljeve ustvarjalne invencije, bolj kot skrajnosti same pa so za razumevanje skladateljevih del pomembni tisti principi, po katerih so te napetosti med seboj urejene in uravnotežene.

Skladateljev osrednji napor je namreč usmerjen v iskanje srednje, zlate poti, pri čemer sta mu v glavno pomoč zvestoba etosu in zaupanje arhetipskim vzorcem. Visok etos se razkriva v skladateljevem dojemanju glasbe kot dejanja ljubezni in milosti, v njegovem trdem in skrbnem delu ter zaupanju v duhovno vrednost umetniškega dela, medtem ko arhetipski vzorci zaznamujejo predvsem formalno ustrojenost skladateljevih del in njihovo izraznost.

V tretjem poglavju je izrisana skladateljeva življenjska pot in prek posameznih, izrazitih "postaj" je mogoče načrtati tudi tri značilna ustvarjalna obdobja: (1) leta iskanja, "trganja" iz "domačnosti" in tradicije (1952–1971), (2) čas modernističnih sintez (1972–1981/85) in (3) obdobje individualne izraznosti ter idejne izšiščenosti (1985–). Taki periodizaciji sledi osrednji del magistrske naloge, ki ga predstavljajo analize desetih Lebičevih simfoničnih del, pri čemer pa metodološko orodje ni ves čas identično, saj kronološko prediranje v glasbene stavke posameznih del omogoča razpoznavanje zakonitosti spreminjanja skladateljeve poetike, kompozicijskih postopkov in tehnik. Zato vsaka izmed analiz v središče postavlja svojo značilnost, ki je odločilna prav za to izbrano delo, prek celote pa se postopoma izrisujejo tudi skupne značilnosti skladateljevih simfoničnih del.

Končna sinteza, mogoča na podlagi opravljenih analiz, prinaša potrditev številnih napetostnih dvojic, ki jih je mogoče reducirati na tri glavna problemska območja. Prvega predstavlja skladateljeva razpetost med racionalnim načrtom in duhovnostjo glasbe; skladatelj najprej racionalno domisli skico skladbe, v toku kompozicijskega procesa pa v skrbno načrtovano strukturo pušča prosto pot tudi intuitivnim domislekom, med obojim – "matematiziranim" razumom in intuitivnostjo "srca" – posreduje etos. Drugo problematiko odpira razpetost med povednostjo glasbenega toka in imanentno glasbenimi rešitvami: čeprav skladatelj dvomi o sporočilnosti glasbe, vanjo vendarle vnaša visoko etične vsebine na ta način, da glasbene rešitve opisuje s poetičnimi moti, zunajglasbene ideje prevaja v imanentno glasbeno logiko, celotno skladbo zaznamuje z enotno semantično zanko ali pa se iz njegovih del zaradi kontrastnih glasbenih kontekstov izluščijo izraziti semantični okruški. Tretji problem pa je povezan s slogovno opredelitvijo skladateljevih del. V Lebičevih skladbah je namreč najti sledi treh različnih slogovnih usmeritev. Medtem ko so glasbeni material, številni kompozicijski postopki in poudarjena etičnost zavezani modernistični izraznost, pa oblikovalni principi sledijo predmodernističnim, celo arhetipskim vzorcem tridelnosti, razpetosti v obliki loka in umeščenosti med "najavljanje" in "vračanje", konfrontacija (ali: sopostavljanje) obeh slogov ("svetov"), ki se najbolj poudarjeno kaže v obliki semantičnih okruškov, pa najavlja še postmodernistične vplive. Zato je enoznačna slogovna opredelitev Lebičevih simfoničnih del praktično nemogoča. Skladatelj sam poudarja svojo zvestobo modernizmu, obenem pa se čuti zavezanega veliki tradiciji zahodnoevropske umetne glasbe, do postmodernizma pa je v svojih estetskih proklamacijah odločno odklonilen. Lebičeva zavrnitev postmodernizma je povezana predvsem z njegovo neetičnostjo: razpadom vrednot, razsrediščenjem, izgubo orientirjev, koncem "velikih zgodb", implozijo popularnega in visoko-umetniškega ter vsesplošnim izenačevanjem. Na taki etični ravni se skladatelj distancira od postmodernizma, v svojo poetiko pa vendarle sprejema postmodernistično semantiziranje, ki nastaja s sopostavljanjem različnih svetov. Lebič je torej tipični modernist, ki se zaveda, da živi v postmodernističnem času – ta pa nanj vpliva.

Zaključek prinaša misel, da številne *razpetosti* in *napetostne dvojice* tvorijo konstitutivno bistvo Lebičeve glasbe, ki raste iz njih, njihovega premagovanja in harmoniziranja. Take dvojice so med seboj *povezane* in *sprepletene*, tako da tvorijo *gosto mrežo*, ki je razpeta na vseh ravneh glasbene produkcije in recepcije, za razumevanje njihovega "de-

lovanja" pa so najpomembnejši "*harmonizatorji*" – tisti elementi, ki posredujejo med večkrat diametralno nasprotnimi možnostmi, saj je skladatelj kljub močnim razpetostim, ki delujejo v njem, ali pa prav zaradi njih, zavezan iskanju srednje, "zlate" poti in ga ne zanimajo skrajnosti. V ospredju je torej značilna *dialektična igra* – med dvema nasprotnima elementoma posreduje tretji, s katerim je mogoče začrtati "varno", sredinsko pot. Takšni dialektiki pa gre pripisovati *metafizične razsežnosti*, saj navidezna protislovja urejuje nadrejeni etični princip, ki se kaže v razumevanju glasbe kot "duhovnosti".

Obranjeno 3. septembra 2002 na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani

Symphonic Works of Lojze Lebič

The main aims of the work at issue were, as follows: to discover the compositional-technical characteristics of the symphonic creations of the contemporary Slovenian composer Lojze Lebič (1934), and to bring to light individual compositional procedures and strategies, as well as the intellectual basis they originate from. This synchronous cross section of the composer's work is complemented by a diachronic one, since the research project also wants to give an answer to the question of changes these characteristics experienced over longer periods of time: from the early Symfonieta (1960), to the last analysed work, Music for Orchestra – Cantico I (1997). The scheme of the work, which comprises five chapters, follows Nattiez's instructions that within the "total musical fact" one can discover three levels: the poetic, representing the compositional process, the immanent, representing the "text", i.e. the musical composition itself, whereas the aesthetic sets in through the act of perception.

The introductory chapter tries to define the term "symphonic", bringing up all the dilemmas that have, with the disintegration of traditional genres, appeared in the 20th century. After discussing the main literature (H. Danuser, C. Dahlhaus, G. Mayer) that deals with the problems of genre, one comes to the conclusion that, when trying to define genre, one has to find a way out by making use of several criteria: the criterion of instrumentation or rather setting, the criterion of form, and, as their sum total, the specific "character" of symphonic compositions. According to these, the following works of Lebič can be classified as symphonic: Symfonieta, Sentences, Korant, Nicina, Voices, Tangram, Overture for three instrumental groups, Queensland Music, Symphony with an organ, Music for Orchestra – Cantico I, whereas three vocal-instrumental compositions – Burnt Grass, November Songs, and Myths and Apocryphs – appear to be "problematic". The latter works are also set for symphony orchestra, and they reveal a "symphonic way of thinking" with that typical, symphonic flow, full of contrasts. However, they were eliminated from further treatment, since their analyses would have proceeded in an essentially different manner: it would have been necessary to take into account the links between the text and its setting as well.

The next chapter brings the elucidation of the composer's "explicit" poetics as to be found in his notes and reflections on his own work and individual creations. The analysis of such contributions shows that the composer's autopoetics is characterized by numerous pairs of tension: (1) his compositional process seems to be caught between "the logic of reason and the logic of the heart", which means that the essence of music appears to him as being an irreconcilable conflict between the mathematically or rather

objectively definable (in the nature of things, physically explicable) and the transcendently unutterable, since music is on one hand "a matter of relations, of proportions we listen to as something logical", whereas on the other it can be understood as "a reflection of a higher order" or as "sonorous metaphysics"; (2) the composer understands music as an autonomous art without any informational function, nevertheless admitting that it "should regain more of its narrational powers, i.e. its grammar and syntax should be reevaluated"; (3) dialectical seems to be also Lebič's relation between his attachment to his native Carinthia and its landscape, and his openmindedness regarding the newest trends abroad, beyond the borders of his native country; (4) all these seeming discrepancies lead to the question of the composer's stylistic orientation characterized by his typical faithfulness to modernism, although towards the end of the seventies, and in spite of rejecting fashionable postmodernism, he does not find it sensible to go on making "irreconcilable divisions between old and new", whereas his music becomes torn between primary archetypal patterns and the topical present. All these oscillations, torn states of mind and dialectical relations represent the rhizomes of the composer's creative imagination. However, for understanding Lebič's works, more than these extremes themselves, those principles are of importance in accordance with which all these tensions are resolved and balanced. The composer's main efforts lie namely in the search of a middle, golden course, while faithfulness to ethos and trust in archetypal patterns remain his greatest willing helpers. As regards his understanding of music, high ethical standards are those which, as deeds of love and grace, reveal themselves in his hard and careful endeavours as well as in his trust in the spiritual values of creative work, whereas archetypal patterns mark the formal structure and expressiveness of the composer's creations.

The composer's curriculum vitae is given in the third chapter. Taking into account explicit, individual "stations", three creative periods can be established: (1) years of search, of freeing oneself from "home life" and tradition (1952–1971), (2) period of modernistic syntheses (1972–1981/85), and (3) period of individual expressiveness and intellectual purification (1985–). This is the periodization followed in the main part of the work comprising analyses of ten Lebič's symphonic creations; the methodological tools used are continuously not the same, since only chronological penetration into single movements of the works in question can pave the way for discovering the laws of change that govern the composer's poetics, his compositional procedures and techniques. Therefore, each of the analyses focuses upon its characteristic trait, crucial for the very work chosen, while, through the broad picture, the common characteristics of Lebič's symphonic works become gradually visible.

The final synthesis, possible only after all of the analyses have been undertaken, brings the confirmation of numerous pairs of tension that can be reduced to three main spheres of problems. The first, represents the composer's dividedness between rational plans and the spirituality of music; initially, the composer makes a rational scheme of the work, whereas during the compositional process intuitive ideas are given green light to trespass the carefully planned structure, so that ethos can mediate between the two – the "mathematically disciplined" reason and the intuitiveness of the "heart". The next round of problems has its origins in the divide between the narrativeness of the flow of music and the immanently musical solutions: although the composer doubts about the ability of music to communicate messages, his works are infused with high ethical contents in such a way that musical solutions are described by poetic mottoes, extramusical ideas translated into immanently musical logic, the whole marked with a unifying semantic loop or

that, because of contrasting musical contexts, explicitly semantic splinters can be extracted from his works. The third problem is that of defining the composer's works stylistically. Whereas the musical material, numerous compositional procedures and emphasized ethicalness appear to be typical of modernistic expressiveness, his formal principles follow premodern, and even archetypal patterns of tripartiteness, sinuous formations, as well as the practice of "announcements" and "comebacks"; however, the confrontation (or: parallel construction) of both styles ("worlds"), which is most evident in the above-mentioned splinters, is already a harbinger of postmodern influences. That is why an unambiguous stylistic definition of Lebič's symphonic creations comes to be practically impossible. The composer himself emphasizes his fidelity to modernism, while at the same time feeling bound to the great traditions of West European art music, so that in his aesthetic proclamations he is firmly negative only as regards postmodernism. Lebič's repudiation of postmodernism originates above all from its unethicalness: from the crumbling of values, loss of focus and points of orientation, the end of "great stories", to the implosion of the popular and the highly artistic, and the general levelling out of everything and anything. On such an ethical level the composer distances himself from postmodernism. However, his poetics is receptive to postmodern semantisation that arises from the construction of parallel worlds. Lebič is therefore a typical modernist who is aware of the fact of living in postmodern times which, nevertheless, do exert influence upon him.

The conclusion brings out the thought that all these numerous cases of dividedness and pairs of tension constitute the essence of Lebič's music which grows out of them either in a conquering or harmonizing way. Such pairs are linked and interwoven between themselves, thus creating a thick network that spreads over all levels of musical production and reception; for understanding the ways they "operate", "harmonizers" are of utmost importance, since they represent those elements that mediate between diametrically opposed possibilities, for the composer – in spite of great inner conflicts raging in him or just because of them – is bound to find a middle, "golden" course beyond any extremes. In the foreground, there is this characteristically dialectical play or rather game: between two conflicting elements the third mediates and traces a "safe" course. This and such dialectics seem to possess metaphysical dimensions, since seeming discrepancies appear to be regulated by a superior ethical principle that, in its understanding of music, shows itself to be – "spiritual".

Defended on September 3, 2002 Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana