The Solo Piano Works of Andrzej Panufnik

In this presentation I shall discuss the three solo piano works of Andrzej Panufnik, the Twelve Miniature Studies (1947, rev. 1955/64), Reflections (1968) and the Pentasonata (1984). I shall outline the circumstances of their conception, Panufnik’s compositional philosophy, and how certain of his structural and analytical preoccupations are manifested in the works. Finally, I shall explore what demands these place on the performer.

Andrzej Panufnik is primarily known as a composer of symphonies and large-scale orchestral pieces. The Piano Concerto is performed regularly, yet the works for solo piano are far less well known. These pieces, however, tell an important story that reflects the major biographical and musical events of his life.

Born in Warsaw in 1914, son of Tomasz Panufnik, a maker of string instruments, and Matylda Thonnes Panufnik, a talented violinist, pianist and composer of English descent, Andrzej Panufnik initially entered the Warsaw Conservatoire at the age of 11 to study piano. While he enjoyed his musical studies, his relationship with his Professor during the first year was fraught. As he walked into his end-of-year exam, to see Szymanowski on the panel looking “tired and deadly bored as he balanced his head gloomily upon his hand”,1 Panufnik was struck with a serious attack of stage fright. He performed badly and was refused entry to the second year. There followed several years where he did not study music at all.

At 16 Panufnik realised that music was his calling and that, without it, he was living in a “spiritual and emotional vacuum”.2 He found, however, that he was now too old to audition for the Piano Department at the Conservatoire and lacked the requisite knowledge to enter the Faculty of Music Theory and Composition. He spent a year teaching himself music at home and spent much time improvising works at the piano. The cabaret song, ‘Ach, Pardon!’, performed at the Grand Revue in Warsaw, was a result of these efforts.

When Panufnik was 17, he auditioned to study percussion at the Conservatoire and was granted a place, with permission to sit in on the music theory classes. Before long, he had transferred to study composition and within four years, half the prescribed time, had gained a diploma with distinction. During his time there he composed various student pieces but it was his Piano Trio, written in 1934 when he was 19, that he considered his first significant work, his ‘Opus 1’ as it were.

Panufnik’s time at the conservatoire was particularly significant as it gave him an opportunity to meet composers of his own and the older generation and to become familiar with their compositional styles. He was particularly sympathetic with Szymanowski’s endeavour to, as he phrased it, “bring the excessively backward school of Polish composition up to date”.3 In 1935, he met Szymanowski in Zakopane and was invited back to his house. After listening to Szymanowski abuse his colleagues for some time, Panufnik finally managed to turn the conversation to music and they discussed the importance of the peasant music of the Tatra region in Szymanowski’s work.

Panufnik graduated from the Warsaw Conservatoire in 1936 and travelled to Vienna the following year to study conducting with Felix von Weingartner at the State Academy of Music. His decision to study conducting, rather than composition, was influenced by his resolution to find his own way in composition, a theme that was to recur in later years. Panufnik believed that he could benefit from an exposure to the orchestral music of other composers but that he wished to have a year without formal composition tuition so that he could develop his own ideas and creative independence.
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Panufnik did, however, present some of his compositions as part of his entrance examination in Vienna. By this point, he had already taken to leaving blank spaces in the scores, rather than rests, for visual clarity, a development that was later taken up by Stravinsky. Again, this was to become a feature of Panufnik’s later works. Panufnik enjoyed his time with Weingartner, who he admired intensely, and was particularly inspired by his teacher’s former acquaintance with Liszt, Wagner and Brahms. He enjoyed the concert scene in Vienna and the opportunities to hear performances of extremely high quality, although he was frustrated by the lack of new music in concert programmes.

It was during this period that Panufnik became familiar with the 12-tone technique. While unable to hear their works in concert, Panufnik obtained scores of pieces by Berg, Webern and Schoenberg. Although he was fascinated by their endeavours, he felt that 12-tone technique was not something that he would adopt in his own practice. He agreed with the “principle of a self-imposed discipline, a limitation to achieve unity” yet thought that, as a whole, the method compromised variety and expressivity. While he knew that he needed a framework within which to build his own works, he resolved that he would have to construct it himself and that anything he did develop would have to meet his “need for emotional content as well as structural cohesion”.

In February 1938 disaster struck. The Nazis entered Vienna, Anschluss was declared, and Weingartner was shortly dismissed from his post at the Academy. Panufnik decided to escape the suffocating atmosphere by taking a short trip to Budapest, where he met Kodály for the first time. On his return to Vienna, he discovered that Weingartner had been replaced by a prototypical Aryan, brought over from Germany, with little knowledge of conducting. He immediately resolved to leave Vienna and went to Paris.

Paris was a fertile ground for new music and concert programming was much more adventurous than in Vienna. Panufnik heard live performances of Stravinsky, Les Six, and Debussy and was particularly impressed by Bartók’s Sonata for Two Pianos and Percussion, which he heard performed by Bartók and his wife. He found this music “uniquely satisfying spiritually, emotionally and aesthetically”. After a few months in Paris, Panufnik crossed the Channel to Britain where he spent more time working on his own compositions. He did, however, find time to visit the archives of the British Museum to look at scores by early English composers including Boyce, Avison and Arne. This was to be of use to him in later years as Director of the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra.

Panufnik sensed that the political situation in Europe was worsening and returned home just before the outbreak of war and aerial bombardment of Warsaw. In September 1939 the Russians occupied eastern Poland, the country was again partitioned, and in October Poland surrendered. While living under Nazi occupation in Warsaw, Panufnik found composition difficult but was sufficiently inspired by a book of old Polish folk songs found at home to write the Five Polish Songs. In winter 1941 he finished his Symphony No. 2 of which he was critical. In subsequent compositions, he decided to impose an “even stricter economy of means of expression; not write so much as one note too many”. Again, this was to be a recurring concern in later years.

Panufnik spent much of his time during the war discussing composition and performing two-piano works with Witold Lutosławski. They set up as a duo in various cafés throughout the city performing at considerable risk to themselves in secret underground concerts to raise funds for the resistance and Jewish musicians. Both composed cabaret songs and Panufnik’s Four Underground Resistance Songs were a great success, particularly Warszawskie Dzieci (‘Warsaw Children’) regarded by many as an unofficial national anthem and still sung in
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schools to this day. In 1944, restrictions on music-making in the capital were relaxed and Panufnik was able to conduct a symphony concert for the Polish Charity RGO (Rada Główna Opiekuńcza – Central Council for Care).

In August, however, the Uprising was declared. At the time, Panufnik was in the countryside outside Warsaw caring for his ailing mother. While desperate to rejoin his friends and colleagues and support the Uprising, he was unable to negotiate his way past the Nazi checkpoints on the way into the city. Instead, he was forced to hide in a well every time Nazi soldiers came to search the house. During the Uprising, Panufnik’s brother Mirek was killed and he lost his compositions. These works, left in a friend’s flat, were burnt not during the Uprising but afterwards in a zealous fit of house-keeping by the new occupant. Believing his entire collection of compositions to be rubbish, she had thrown them onto the heap in the yard which had later been decimated.

After the War, Panufnik moved with his family to Kraków, the centre of cultural rejuvenation in Poland. While censorship was on the rise under the Soviet People’s Government, composers were still virtually free to compose as they wished. Panufnik became both Director of the Warsaw Philharmonic and an unwilling member of delegations to foreign cities, with the aim of promoting Polish music, and more importantly, Soviet politics, abroad.

In 1947, after a break of five years from serious creative work, Panufnik began tentatively to compose again. Improvising at the piano, exploring various themes, he found, to his great relief, that “musical ideas, orchestral as well as pianistic, began to surge in my imagination”. It was at this stage that he wrote the Twelve Miniature Studies, his first work for solo piano and one which marks an important turn in his creative and compositional fortunes.

In 1948, resolutions passed at the Soviet Composers’ Conference in Moscow signalled a dramatic change in attitudes to creative work and its purpose. ‘Formalism’, a hazily defined concept, was denounced and works that demonstrated this trait, including Panufnik’s Sinfonia Rustica, were condemned as “alien to the socialist era”. The Russian politician Andrei Zhdanov stated that “cultural products must serve politico-economic ends” and after the Conference of Composers and Music Critics in Prague in June, composers were compelled to write in a way that “depicts socialist reality”, was “simple and understandable to the broad masses” and “worthy of the great Socialist epoch”. Finding it difficult to satisfy both such obscure demands, and their own creative imperatives, life for composers in Poland became markedly more difficult. In 1949, Panufnik met Kodály on a trip to Budapest. In the brief moment when his keepers were absent, Panufnik asked Kodály how he was “really feeling” only to be told that it was “terrible” in Hungary and that he was unable to find the peace of mind that he needed to compose.

While the government encouraged the production of staunchly patriotic, ‘accessible’ music for consumption at home, more progressive works were often toured internationally in order to persuade the wider world that composers still had freedom of expression under the Soviet régime. Panufnik found himself unwillingly at the head of international delegations, was elected vice-chairman of the International Music Council of UNESCO in 1950, and was personally received by Chairman Mao Tse-Tung in 1953, for whom he conducted the Poem to Stalin. The political control was stifling and Panufnik found it impossible to compose original works in these conditions. He felt that he was being “drawn into a propaganda machine that opened and shut my mouth for me while gnawing away at my dwindling reserves of independence and objectivity”. In 1954 he resolved to leave Poland for good.
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After conducting a recording session in Zurich, Panufnik managed to escape his keepers and flew to England where he began a precarious existence as a political refugee. He hoped, in leaving Poland, to be able to describe the plight of composers in the Eastern bloc to the Western press and that he might be able to bring external pressure to help his compatriots.

The next few years were tremendously difficult, both creatively and financially. Again Panufnik took on conducting positions in order to earn a living and used what free time he had to revise existing compositions for publication in London. His works, which had been viewed as too progressive in Poland, were deemed conservative in England and neglected by the musical establishment. By 1960 he was prepared to relinquish England and move to the United States but was, fortuitously, introduced to Camilla Jessel, a professional photographer and writer. They married in 1963.

From then on Panufnik had the support and security that he needed to dedicate himself fully to composition. The couple moved to a house in Twickenham, on the banks of the Thames, and he entered the most creative period of his life. In the spring of 1968 he completed his second piano piece, Reflections, within days of the birth of their daughter Roxanna. Reflections is saturated with symmetrical patterns that also play an important part in his final work for piano, Pentasonata, composed in 1984, the year of his 70th birthday.

Compositional Philosophy

In looking at the biographical circumstances surrounding the composition of the three piano works, we have touched briefly on certain elements that were to become an important part of Panufnik’s compositional philosophy. His desire to combine ‘emotional content’ with ‘structural cohesion’, determination to find his own methods of constructing a work, and insistence on clarity and economy of means are key. Each of these considerations is explored in the foreword to Impulse and Design in my Music, a booklet published in 1974 by Boosey & Hawkes, and in his biography Composing Myself, published in 1987 by Methuen.

Panufnik describes his compositional method as remarkably consistent between works, each of which he approaches in “more-or-less the same manner.” He states:

“I could liken myself to an architect, tackling each work in three stages, always in the same order: first the purpose, or reason for which the work is composed; then the architectural structure; then the material of which it is built.”

“Sometimes an idea comes at once; sometimes this chrysalis stage takes weeks, even months... Once the structure of a new work is clear to me – once I know where I am going – I roughly sketch the whole outline in pencil and the first important stage of creative work is over. Every note, every sound combination, whether for symphony orchestra or small ensemble, is safely in my head.

In reference to the influence of emotional content on structure, Panufnik declares that:

“With regard to the impulse (or purpose), almost none of my works can be completely detached from the events around me or the vicissitudes of my own life, because for me personally music is an expression of deep human feeling and true emotion. Some spiritual and poetic content is therefore for me essential, and decisively influences the design of the composition.”

---
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Panufnik’s determination to find his own methods of structuring his works, to be ‘true to himself’, is apparent throughout his biography, as is his desire that structural concerns never impinge on the expression of a work.

“I never regard the technical side of a musical work as an end in itself, and perhaps this is one of the reasons why I do not belong to any particular ‘school’ of thought. I compose rather in an intuitional way, but at the same time I impose upon myself a very strong discipline in sound organisation.”

“I continue my quest for clarity and transparency in my scores... and just as I bypassed the now eclipsed fashion for dodecaphony, I also felt no urge to leap onto the bandwagon of aleatoric music: the element of chance is contrary to my passion for order which in my eyes is the intrinsic core of a viable work of art”.

The importance of clarity and economy of means is one that Panufnik frequently stresses and is immediately apparent on listening to his works. He favours the:

“greatest possible economy and clarity in means of expression. For example, in some compositions, I have allowed myself to be dominated by a sense of geometrical pattern and order: taking a single triad with its perpetual reflections as my fundamental structural element through a whole extended work. However this stringent discipline of constant repetition of reflected triads was not chosen as a purely intellectual exercise (construction for construction’s sake), but rather as a means to an end: as an aid to expression – not a limitation of it.”

Elsewhere he states that:

“[Economy of means] was precisely what I want. Each work is as if cut from a single diamond, there is nothing that is spare: each note is of tremendous importance to me. When it has been weighted and considered it is then placed directly into the full score”.

Panufnik touches here upon the importance of geometry to his work, particularly in the formative stages. In his biography, one reads that:

“Everything has to be imagined and worked out in my head before a single note is put on paper. Here my geometry is a great help, providing as it can an unseen framework around which I can organise my notes, my thoughts and feelings.”

Panufnik’s diagrams will be well known to you. As a brief illustration I offer here those for the Winter Solstice (1972), Sinfonia di Sfere (1975), and Arbor Cosmica (1984). He also designed diagrams for two of the piano works, the Twelve Miniature Studies and Reflections, which we shall study in detail later on.
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Diagram of Winter Solstice

Diagram of Sinfonia di Sfere

Listener’s perception – starting point.
Diagram of Arbor Cosmica
One element of Panufnik’s compositional style that we have not yet discussed, and which is paradoxically of particular importance to the piano repertoire, is his habit of conceiving works symphonically from the outset. This was initially encouraged by his teacher at the Warsaw Conservatoire, Kazimierz Sikorski, and is a habit that he retained throughout his life.

“Even when I am composing for a large symphony orchestra... I write the full score immediately as the composition will sound... perhaps this gives me the advantage that from the very beginning I conceive the music symphonically”.22

This idea of conceiving the music ‘symphonically’ is one I think that is particularly relevant to Reflections and Pentasonata as I shall explain later on. I shall now discuss Panufnik’s three pieces for solo piano in turn, considering how these elements of his compositional philosophy are revealed in each.

Twelve Miniature Studies

The Twelve Miniature Studies mark an important juncture in Panufnik’s compositional life. Unable to attempt serious composition during the war, it wasn’t until 1947 that he found himself with the time and mental peace necessary to recommence serious creative work. Unsure whether he would be able to compose at all, he:

“began tentatively to improvise on the piano, exploring harmonic, melodic and rhythmic ideas, gradually making additional searches to extend some purely pianistic possibilities”.23

The studies alternate between those that are fast and loud and those that are slow and quiet. The final study, No. 12, starts quietly with suppressed energy and gradually grows louder and more frenzied towards the end. The studies are based on a circle of fifths. The first is in C sharp (major-minor), the next in F sharp, the third in B and so on until the final study starts in C sharp, every key in the scale having been exhausted. Panufnik initially called the work Circle of Fifths but it was later published as Twelve Miniature Studies.

Panufnik designed a diagram outlining the structure of the series, including dynamics, tempo and key, as follows:
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Each study is interwoven with what Panufnik termed a “double wave-like melodic line” introduced “in order to achieve unity throughout the whole work”.\textsuperscript{24} I shall now play you two of the studies to demonstrate this feature.

\textbf{DEMONSTRATION:}  
Study No. 1 (1’05)  
Study No. 2 (at a faster tempo, 1’50)

While this work does not have overtly programmatic content, it does have very strong emotional impact. After the first few minutes, the audience becomes involved in an almost trance-like alternation between the fast and furious studies and their more contemplative counterparts. The use of the double wave-like melody and strict circle-of-fifths scheme is an inventive and very personal way of adding structural cohesion. This also presages Panufnik’s later concern with geometrical schema and could be seen as a prototype of the symmetrical forms that occur more explicitly in \textit{Reflections} and the \textit{Pentasonata}.

Again, Panufnik’s concern for clarity and economy of means is already apparent, particularly in the slower studies. When I played the second study for you just now, I did so at a faster tempo than is indicated so that you could more easily get a sense of the double wave-like melody. The tempi that Panufnik indicates for performance are extremely slow and this creates particular problems on the piano. Unlike strings or wind instruments, the piano cannot sustain notes at a constant or growing volume. Every sound decays after the first impact. In slow tempi in any piece, the pianist is forced to become an illusionist and create the impact of a continuous sound using voicing and the sustaining pedal. In the slower of Panufnik’s studies, the textures are so sparse that the pianist has very little with which to create this illusion. Everything is pared down to a minimum which creates a very focussed sound and demands great concentration from the performer.

The final element of Panufnik’s compositional philosophy as outlined above, that of conceiving works symphonically, is not as relevant to the \textit{Twelve Miniature Studies} as it is to his later piano works. These studies were devised primarily as piano pieces and that is very apparent both from the score and in the way that they ‘feel’ at the keyboard.

\textit{Reflections}

It was to be twenty-one years before Panufnik wrote again for the piano. By 1968 he had left Poland, married Camilla, and settled at Riverside House in Twickenham. The first few years there were a period of recuperation, contemplation and gestation. Panufnik’s first compositions in Britain, the \textit{Polonia Suite}, \textit{Rhapsody}, \textit{Sinfonia Sacra} and the \textit{Katyń Epitaph}, had been, as he put in, “dominated in their musical content by my innate Polishness”.\textsuperscript{25} He realised that in order to avoid artistic stagnation he had to “reach out for a more universal spirituality”.\textsuperscript{26} In addition, he was “searching too for a new dimension in musical grammar and language, because I felt that somewhere within my imagination lay something different, undiscovered, a future source for fresh creative endeavours”.\textsuperscript{27}

Panufnik spent almost four years trying to find this ‘new dimension’ until he happened upon a group of three notes which, as he “manipulated them within the stave and on the piano… [seemed to have] some evocative and strangely expandable qualities – even, it felt to me,
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some magical power.” It is worth focussing on Panufnik’s subsequent descriptions of this process at length as *Reflections* was the first work that was composed following this discovery and is permeated at every level with this ‘three-note cell’. Panufnik writes:

“I repeatedly sang and played the three crucial notes of my three-note cell: F-B-E, adding in subconsciously its two reflections, B-E-F and E-F-B. I then tried various transpositions of these cells on the piano, using them both horizontally (melodically) and vertically (harmonically), which seemed to produce an extraordinary sense of organic unity. At the same time, as I played on, I heard to my amazement new harmonies, new expressions, new sound colours. I knew within minutes that this three-note cell would be material out of which I could build both small- and large-scale musical structures; that it had as much potential for poetic and human expression as it did for intellectual fastidiousness; that it was the ultimate basis from which all my future compositions could grow... The spring of 1968 saw the completion of the first of my new line of compositional progeny, the piano piece, *Reflections.*

Again, Panufnik designed a diagram showing the thematic and motivic content of *Reflections*. This outlines the various vertical inversions of the three-note cell that form the harmonic basis of the work as well as its melodic form which is based around two intervals: a fourth (either major or augmented) and a second (either major or diminished).
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It is clear from the way the work is constructed that its title, Reflections, is particularly apt. Panufnik intended it to refer both to reflection “in the sense of contemplation, the musical thought behind the notes” and “reflections in the tangible sense: the actual musical material of the work... based on constant reflections of a single triad with its perpetual transpositions used both vertically and horizontally”.  

Thus the emotional content of the work, its structural cohesion, and the originality of Panufnik’s method of composition, are all clearly apparent. Reflections is a particularly vivid testament to Panufnik’s fascination with mirror forms and geometric patterns. Here, Panufnik’s mode of notation is also pared away to a bare minimum. Repeated chords are denoted merely with the tail of a note and spaces are left in the place of rests on either side of the central section.

Two of Panufnik’s other key concerns, that of economy of means and his habit of conceiving works symphonically, are closely linked here. Again, the principal difficulties in performing this piece stem from the fact that it seems to have been conceived symphonically. The textures are often very sparse, figurations are repeated at great length with little variation, and the tempo is relentlessly slow. On approaching the piece initially, I felt that I could orchestrate it more easily than I could find a way of realising it on the piano. Yet, in this, Panufnik forces the pianist to develop new ways of approaching the instrument and to listen in an intensely focussed manner. One has to dig more deeply in order to find the particular resonances that he demands, in order to bring the piece to life. While not difficult technically, this piece is enormously challenging to perform and exhausting to sustain.

**Pentasonata**

Panufnik’s final composition for solo piano, the Pentasonata, was written sixteen years later in 1984, the year of his seventieth birthday. It was only at this late stage that Panufnik truly felt accepted by the British musical establishment. Both the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra and the London Symphony Orchestra held celebratory concerts to mark his birthday.

---

and at the party held for him by his publishers, Boosey & Hawkes, Panufnik felt that it had taken him “perhaps until that moment to find that at last I was no longer an exile”.31

As with Reflections, Pentasonata is written as one continuous movement and is strictly conceived from a structural point of view. The ‘Penta’, or ‘five’, of the title is manifested at various levels throughout the work. There are five principal sections, the entire work is based on the pentatonic scale, and each section (excluding the central part), is either in 5/8 or 5/4. The five sections are arranged palindromically so the first and fifth sections are marked ‘allegretto scherzoso’, the second and fourth are ‘andantino amorosa’ and the central section ‘contemplivo, molto rubato’. Panufnik preserves the remnants of a sonata aesthetic, designating the central section as a development of sorts, before the piece recapitulates in reverse order.

The three-note cell that was first explored in Reflections reappears here, in multiple permutations and transpositions, and is blended with the pentatonic melodic lines, which occur in different keys.

DEMONSTRATIONS: p. 2 Pentasonata
p. 4 Pentasonata

So, once again, the structural cohesion of the work, originality of Panufnik’s formal conception, economy of means, and importance of symmetry and geometrical patterns within the work are indisputable. The emotional vitality of the piece comes through very strongly in performance, particularly in the contrast between the energetic and the more contemplative sections. In the central section, Panufnik omits rests in order to declutter the score and make it easier to read. As in Reflections, in the slower sections of the Pentasonata the pianist is forced to contend with material that seems to have been conceived symphonically rather than pianistically.

The Pentasonata could be interpreted as a synthesis of ideas that Panufnik had explored in his earlier piano works. It shares many of the same figurations and structural concerns as Reflections but also has the virtuosity and youthful élan of the Twelve Miniature Studies. Panufnik states in his programme note to the piece that as in “all [his] works, in Pentasonata I was seeking to achieve a balance between heart and mind, intellect and emotion”, a precept that he referred to throughout his career. In an interview with Nigel Osborne in 1984, Panufnik professed:

“there is a duality in my work, between intellect and intuition, form and emotion, if you like. The composer must always explore, uncover new experience, take an active part in the evolution of humanity – it is not only his right, it is his duty”.32
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