Avant-Garde, Modernism, Postmodernity—

or the 'Semanticist's Despair' of Teaching the History of Twentieth-Century Music

MARTA SZOKA
The Grażyna and Kiejstut Bacewicz Academy of Music in Łódź
Email: marta.szoka@gmail.com

Open Access. © 2026 Author, published by Polish Composers' Union. BY-NC-ND This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 License.

Musicology Today • Vol. 23 • 2026
DOI: 10.2478/muso-2026-0008

ABSTRACT

The topic announced in the title—*Avant-Garde, Modernism, Postmodernity—or the 'Semanticist's Despair' of Teaching the History of Twentieth-Century Music*—is rooted in the experience of university teaching. The author surveys three concepts central to the history of twentieth-century music, concepts that are widely used but not always precisely. Her starting point is Władysław Tatarkiewicz's article 'Romanticism, or the Semanticist's Despair' (*Pamiętnik Literacki*, 1971), in which he identified twenty-five different definitions of romanticism in the history and criticism of art. Although avant-garde and modernism most often denote a historical period or epoch, and postmodernity is treated in much the same way, all three concepts must also be considered in narrower senses—as doctrine, ideology, an artistic movement, a set of features of a work of art and, above all, an attitude in its most individual dimension. In this context, Carl Dahlhaus's question, posed in 1977 in *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*, remains current: how can art history be practised with the work itself at its centre without losing sight of its biographical, social and cultural determinants?

Keywords: music history, avant-garde, modernism, postmodernism, twentieth century.

This article surveys three concepts central to the history of twentieth-century music, concepts that are widely used in university teaching, albeit not always precisely. Its title alludes to Władysław Tatarkiewicz's celebrated essay 'Romanticism, or the Semanticist's Despair',[1] in which he identified at least twenty-five meanings of the term 'romanticism' found in Polish writing from the nineteenth century onwards. From a more methodological perspective, he also proposed nine definitions of romanticism, distinguishing two principal scopes: a narrower one limited to literature and art, and a broader one referring to 'all human creativity and human attitudes' in general. He also acknowledged that differently defined referents may be combined. The distinction matters between using a term in a historical-factual perspective—as part of periodising history (through periods, phases and turning-points)—and in a synchronic-phenomenological perspective, where we speak, instead, of artistic movements, currents, types, tendencies and works, describing them by shared features independently of chronological context. Among Tatarkiewicz's definitions of romanticism we also find the name of a school (camp or artistic group), an ideology, an aesthetic doctrine, a theory, a feature or set of features of a work, and an attitude. Yet, in attempts to penetrate the essence of romanticism, he advocates constructing a composite referent that includes everything 'that happened around poetry and art in particular times and places: a group of people, their doctrine, activities and works'. His conclusion is that 'the *differentia specifica* of romanticism can be stated only in alternative form'.[2]

Without succumbing to despair, we shall examine the concepts of modernism, avant-garde and postmodernity on the basis of the many approaches found in contemporary academic practice—approaches that sometimes complement one another and sometimes conflict. Leaving aside strictly methodological questions concerning the teaching of recent music history, we should note that the education of composers and music theorists ought to rest on a deeper awareness of the complexity of these concepts and of their interdependence. Such awareness is indispensable at every level of study, not only when studying history itself but also when exploring the aesthetics of contemporary music, contemporary compositional techniques and composition itself, or engaging in music criticism.

Alongside Tatarkiewicz, the fundamental study by Carl Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte* (Cologne, 1977),[3] provided the inspiration and a point of departure for the discussion that follows. Half a century ago, Dahlhaus asked how far the history of art is, and should be, genuinely history rather than a collection of loosely connected analyses of individual works, while avoiding a historical-narrative paradigm centred on their biographical or social conditions. On the one hand, he criticises the retreat from traditional historical narratives of decisive events and the concentration on the present; on the other, he suggests that musical historiography must concentrate on the significance of individual works of art. He advocates combining the two dimensions of music—the aesthetic and the historical: 'The fundamental problem facing the music historiologist is the relation between art and history.'[4] He therefore argues that 'Now a music history that proceeds from a study of musical works—even if more is said of the composers, whose biographies are scoured for explanatory matter, than of the music itself—is based on the notion of the autonomy of art.'[5]

1 Władysław Tatarkiewicz, 'Romantyzm, czyli rozpacz semantyka' [Romanticism, or the Semanticist's Despair], *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 62/4 (1971), 3–21.

2 Tatarkiewicz, 'Romantyzm', 20.

3 Carl Dahlhaus, *Foundations of Music History*, trans. J. B. Robinson (Cambridge, 1983).

4 Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 19.

5 Dahlhaus, 11–12.

Besides organising facts, history should also advance hypotheses about them, their interrelations and contexts. In music, the historian's concern extends beyond works and their creators (biographical writing) to reception, performance and the social and psychological dimensions of this art. The twentieth century is particularly tangled in this respect. From the standpoint of global processes, its course began with the outbreak of the First World War (1914) and ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989), with 1945, the end of the Second World War, dividing it in two. Although the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries may be dated to 1911 (Gustav Mahler's death) or 1913 (the premiere of *The Rite of Spring*), neither 1945 nor 1989 marks any perceptible aesthetic turning-point in musical composition and musical life. Hence, as Maciej Gołąb observes, there is no 'music of the twentieth century' but 'music in the twentieth century'.[6] Stylistic phases that dominated earlier epochs as exclusive currents or tendencies cannot be isolated; the early, mature and late phases still used in nineteenth-century historiography are wholly inadequate.

1.

The difficulty begins with the definition of modernism. Arnold Whittall, in his monograph on twentieth-century music,[7] sees twentieth-century composition as 'the result of a continuing, intensifying dialogue between modernism and classicism which began quite early in the nineteenth century, in the wake of Enlightenment'.[8] He therefore does not try to demonstrate a parallel between compositional technique and the social and cultural processes that directly reflect the development of history, including the history of ideas. His book surveys compositional attitudes from Sibelius to Birtwistle, relying on binary oppositions (for example, 'Experiment and Orthodoxy') and on categorising concepts drawn from the avant-garde, although it never uses the word 'avant-garde'.

In its broadest sense, modernism denotes the opposition of an art with properties unlike those of earlier art (the *querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*). It is therefore a transhistorical phenomenon, of limited use in periodising the twentieth century. As a synonym for modernity, it is sometimes projected back as far as the Enlightenment. Maria Piotrowska advocates a broad perspective: 'Modernism, or modernity, as properly understood today, is a long-lasting formation: it spans nearly four centuries',[9] locating its beginnings in the eighteenth century, like Whittall. In a narrower sense, however, she places it in the decades 1880–1910, defining it as 'a particular constellation of artistic tendencies, articulated both in the programmatic statements of theorists and ideologues and realised in the artefacts themselves',[10] whose shared feature is protest against realistic and academic art. In other words, she does not treat it as a movement or tendency. Maciej Gołąb takes a similar position, understanding modernity as broadly as possible as 'a certain hidden ("invisible") socio-historical formation […] not set against either the avant-garde or postmodernity'.[11] More narrowly, he defines it as 'a communal social formation of composers whose specific aims and musical strategies change over time'.[12]

Alongside seeing modernism as an attitude, formation or community of artists, some authors also point to a historical factor linked to twentieth-century chronology. Jadwiga Paja-Stach treats both modernism and postmodernism as epochs in cultural history. She dates the beginnings of modernism to Debussy's innovative *Prélude à l'après-midi d'un faune* (*Prelude to the Afternoon of a Faun*), although she concedes that 'innovation in this respect [harmony, orchestration and melody] is also characteristic of neoclassicism, twentieth-century folklorism, Viennese expressionism, serialism and aleatory', concluding that 'it would be difficult to specify modernism's terminal date'.[13] David Metzer and Klaus-Steffen Mahnkopf refer respectively to 'late modernism' and 'second modernism', since both study music composed at the turn of the twentieth

6 Maciej Gołąb, *Muzyczna moderna XX wieku. Między kontynuacją, nowością a zmianą fonosystemu* [The Musical Modernity of the Twentieth Century: Between Continuity, Novelty and Change in the Phonosystem] (Wrocław, 2011), 48.

7 Arnold Whittall, *Exploring Twentieth-Century Music: Tradition and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2003).

8 Whittall, *Exploring*, vii.

9 Maria Piotrowska, 'Kanon i postmodernizm' [The Canon and Postmodernism], *Muzyka*, 42/1 (1997), 5–30, at 16.

10 Piotrowska, 'Kanon', 15.

11 Gołąb, *Muzyczna moderna*, 35.

12 Gołąb, 38.

13 Jadwiga Paja-Stach, 'Kompozytorzy polscy wobec idei modernistycznych i postmodernistycznych' [Polish Composers in Relation to Modernist and Postmodernist Ideas], in Alicja Jarzębska and Jadwiga Paja-Stach, eds, *Idee modernizmu i postmodernizmu w poetyce kompozytorskiej i w refleksji o muzyce* [Ideas of Modernism and Postmodernism in Compositional Poetics and Reflection on Music] (Kraków, 2007), 56.

and twenty-first centuries and both date the beginning of this second phase to 1980. The question of its relation to postmodernism is therefore unavoidable. As Metzer observes, 'some recent scholarship has aimed to expand the idea of modernism beyond the focus on compositional innovation by staking out modernist ideals in popular culture or in more traditional composers'.[14] In his view, innovative features in the construction and expression of musical compositions began to appear around 1980. But can a return to tonality and late-Romantic aesthetics—for example in Krzysztof Penderecki's music—be regarded as an innovative phenomenon? Innovative in relation to the avant-garde aesthetics of the 1960s and 1970s, yes; but is it genuinely new? Metzer himself admits that the demarcation line between postmodernism and modernism is weakening in the twenty-first century. Yet, 'Far from being contained and relegated to the past, modernism still occupies a prominent role in recent music'.[15]

Klaus-Steffen Mahnkopf, by contrast, sees no contradiction. Whereas postmodernists invoke ideas such as pluralism and heterogeneity, works of the second modernism are realised through complex polyphony, intricate rhythms, amorphous structures, microtonality, or an opposition between closed and open form.[16] It is worth noting that the term 'neo-modernism' appears in the title of a book by Charles Jencks, who examines tendencies in recent architecture but has little faith in modernism's future as such.[17] Maciej Gołąb's reflections convey similar scepticism: 'The modernity of the second half of the century is no longer Latin (Western) modernity but transatlantic (Euro-American) modernity. […] This is no longer the polychronism of musical cultures […]. It marks the beginnings of the globalisation of musical culture, a peculiar monochronism in the face of a new model of cultural communication'.[18]

2.

Let us now turn to definitions of the musical avant-garde found in scholarship. The first questions concern its relation to modernism. Which concept is broader, given that the two phenomena manifest themselves over roughly the same period? Is the avant-garde a branch of modernism? Is it its 'vanguard'? What, fundamentally, distinguishes them if both involve innovation? Following Tatarkiewicz's analogy with romanticism, we may say that the avant-garde 'is a proper name and, at the same time, a name for a general concept';[19] it is also used colloquially. Rebellion against all formulas and rules, experimentalism, novelty, rejection of standardisation and simplicity, total freedom, non-conformism, revolution, provocation, shock, irony, iconoclasm … As Grzegorz Gazda observes, 'the extensive register of names and labels for tendencies that emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century continues to determine all attempts at synthetic description'.[20]

One of the earliest examples of a consistent use of the term 'avant-garde' was Guillermo de Torre's *Literaturas europeas de vanguardia* (1925). With this term, he sought to 'reduce European artistic tendencies to a common denominator'.[21] Other labels were already in circulation: new art, dehumanised art, abstract art, young art and so on. One of the most distinguished theorists of the avant-garde, Renato Poggioli, in *Teoria dell'arte d'avanguardia* (1962), interprets the avant-garde very broadly, even annexing existentialism and decadence and almost equating it with modernism. He argues that the group of avant-garde tendencies cannot be reduced to a common denominator; only the ideological and psychological phenomena associated with it reveal certain shared features. This permits us to treat the avant-garde as a kind of subset of modernism. Poggioli also formulates four determinants linking different manifestations of avant-garde art (chiefly in literature and the visual arts): dynamism (activism, or the directing of activity towards itself); antagonism (towards both the public at large and history, and opposition to the established order); nihilism ('a propensity for destruction, a radical revolt against […] the value

14 David Metzer, *Musical Modernism at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, 2009), 3. In that discussion on that page, Metzer cites two works: Alfred Appel, Jr, *Jazz Modernism: From Ellington and Armstrong to Matisse and Joyce* (New York, 2002), and J. P. E. Harper-Scott, *Edward Elgar, Modernist* (Cambridge, 2006).

15 Metzer, *Musical Modernism*, 29.

16 Klaus-Steffen Mahnkopf, ed., *Facets of the Second Modernity*, with Frank Cox and Wolfram Schurig (Hofheim, 2008).

17 Charles Jencks, *The New Moderns: From Late to Neo-Modernism* (London, 1990).

18 Gołąb, *Muzyczna moderna*, 296.

19 Tatarkiewicz, 'Romantyzm', 14.

20 Grzegorz Gazda, *Nowoczesność i awangarda* [Modernity and the Avant-Garde] (Łódź, 1986), 15.

21 Gazda, *Nowoczesność*, 19.

systems hitherto in force'[22]); and agonism (a conviction that culture is in crisis, and catastrophic moods). This confirms that modernism as such has a much wider scope.

In 1985, Andrzej Turowski identified sixteen definitions of avant-garde and avant-gardism found in different authors,[23] among them: oscillations of alienation (R. Poggioli), alienated art (G. Lukács), revolt against massification (T. W. Adorno), negation by transformation rather than annihilation (U. Eco), radical innovation (S. Morawski), and others. According to Turowski, in the present day (that is, at the end of the twentieth century), 'philosophical and ethical reflection dominates the historical and theoretical view of the avant-garde'. This historical-theoretical perspective is represented, among others, by art historian Mieczysław Porębski: 'I regard the emergence of avant-gardes (not one avant-garde; there were several from the outset […]) as a historical, one-off, closed and, in principle, unrepeatable phenomenon'.[24] Yet Porębski's view is difficult to reconcile with the distinction made in music history between the first and second avant-gardes, although many authors stress that the first avant-garde was socio-political,[25] while the second shifted the emphasis towards aesthetic questions.

Jadwiga Paja-Stach, defining the avant-garde as 'a distinct artistic formation, characterised by revolutionary views of art and a decisive break with tradition, whose manifestos and works attest to a rupture with the set of aesthetic values hitherto attributed to art',[26] also stresses experiment as the distinguishing feature of the two twentieth-century musical avant-gardes. For the first, represented by the Futurists, this means an experimental approach to sound material; for the second—also known as the avant-garde of the 1950s or of the second half of the twentieth century—it means experimentation in form (aleatory music, happenings and so on). Schönberg and twelve-tone technique are therefore not avant-garde: they do not reject established rules or values, and the conception itself lacks destructive features, although it is prophetic. Zbigniew Skowron, however, includes Schoenberg, Berg and Webern in the first avant-garde, reserving the second for post-war composers, with Anton Webern's output providing the point of contact between the two phases.[27] In his later work, he describes their compositional activity as 'the second phase of the first avant-garde's activity, also known as the historical avant-garde, [which] falls in the 1920s',[28] assigning mainly Italian Futurists to the first phase (1910–14). He is nonetheless aware of the profound differences in the Futurists' attitudes to tradition—rejecting the legacy of the past—and those of Schoenberg and Berg, who retained a clear link with the Romantic tradition. The result is that two strongly antagonistic currents are placed under the single heading of the first avant-garde.

We can therefore see that among critics and historians of art and literature, the prevailing view is that the avant-garde is above all a particular attitude to life, an understanding of human existence and a worldview, and to a lesser extent an artistic movement with fixed features. This attitude must nevertheless involve 'consistent experimental action directed towards forms and shapes yet unknown and still to come',[29] not merely innovation. In music history, the term avant-garde—though ambiguous—helps organise the diverse tendencies in compositional work, both in the first and second halves of the century. Sceptical voices are also heard: according to Paul Griffiths (the entry in *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980), the avant-garde remains more a slogan than a definition. Witold

22 Łukasz Kraj, *Szkicowanie awangard(y) Renato Poggiolego* [Sketching Renato Poggioli's Avant-Garde(s)], Jagiellonian University Repository, PDF (2020), 73. Cf. English edition of Poggioli's book: Renato Poggioli, *The Theory of the Avant-garde*, trans. Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1968).

23 Andrzej Turowski, *Budowniczowie świata. Z dziejów radykalnego modernizmu w sztuce polskiej* [Builders of the World: From the History of Radical Modernism in Polish Art] (Kraków, 2000).

24 Mieczysław Porębski, 'Dyskurs (wstęp do metakrytyki II)' [Discourse (An Introduction to Metacriticism II)], *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 30 (2001), 8.

25 Gazda, *Nowoczesność*, 11.

26 Jadwiga Paja-Stach, 'Awangarda muzyczna a idee artystyczne przełomu XIX i XX wieku' [The Musical Avant-Garde and Artistic Ideas at the Turn of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries], *Muzyka*, 35/1 (1990), 21.

27 Zbigniew Skowron, *Dzieło, twórczość, percepcja w refleksji wybranych przedstawicieli awangardy muzycznej drugiej połowy XX wieku* [Work, Creativity and Perception in the Reflections of Selected Representatives of the Musical Avant-Garde of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century] (Warsaw, 1985).

28 Zbigniew Skowron, *Teoria i estetyka awangardy muzycznej drugiej połowy XX wieku* [Theory and Aesthetics of the Musical Avant-Garde of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century] (Warsaw, 2016), 38.

29 Dariusz Kosiński, 'Kroniki przepowiedzianej śmierci [o J. Grzegorzewskim]' [Chronicles of a Foretold Death (on J. Grzegorzewski)], *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 16 (2005), 95.

Lutosławski resorted to irony: 'The true avant-garde are those who become bored with what exists sooner than others'.[30] Yet this raises the question whether, in the third decade of the twenty-first century and amid today's dominant 'culture of exhaustion',[31] the avant-garde still has meaning and *raison d'être*. If everything in art has already been done, everything can be repeated and combined, and novelty and originality have been consigned to the lumber room, what could avant-garde projection into the future mean? According to Łukasz Kraj, whose view is hard to dispute, the avant-garde is no longer a living organism but 'a historical fact, a living fact only insofar as the artistic practices it developed are repeated in the postmodern world'.[32]

3.

Broadly speaking, we are still in the postmodern phase. Its beginnings are most often dated to the 1960s (in architecture), whereas in music works from the second half of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s demonstrate a new quality. Yet what art treated as our present before the turn of the century cannot be fully recovered in the third decade of the twenty-first century. Krystyna Wilkoszewska regards postmodernism as a concept that is too ambiguous and disputed in its ever-expanding temporal boundaries.[33] Jonathan D. Kramer had already drawn attention to the term's imprecision in his canonical 1997 article,[34] asking whether it should refer to an aesthetic or a historical epoch. At the global level, the turn of the millennium—including the emergence of new artistic phenomena—did not bring radical changes of paradigm. Historians tend instead to regard 1989—the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the end of the Cold War, China's opening to world markets, the turn towards neoliberalism in global politics and the beginnings of the Internet—as the real end of the twentieth century. The beginning of the twenty-first century is marked above all by the attack on the World Trade Center in 2001.[35]

The sheer quantity of scholarship in different artistic fields, and of artefacts that have shaped public reception of architecture, music, literature and film, does not make it easier to answer a basic question in university teaching: is postmodernism an epoch in recent cultural history, or an artistic movement? Umberto Eco regards it as a 'spiritual category', a desire to create art in a particular way.[36] Stefan Morawski calls it a 'cultural formation'.[37] The related term postmodernity, often used interchangeably, has somewhat different connotations. Whereas postmodernism admits of a lower temporal boundary, marked by the emergence of new works oriented towards the past and signalling a retreat from the avant-garde (naturally, the point varies by art form), postmodernity, in Zygmunt Bauman's account,[38] denotes the mature phase of modernity, which has reached the point of critically assessing its own earlier achievements. It is modernity looking back on itself from a distance and recognising the incoherence of the desires that previously guided it. This entails recognising a causal relationship between modernism and postmodernism: the latter does not mean the end of modernity; nor are the two opposed—rather, they differ. According to Jean-François Lyotard, 'the Postmodern does not take its place in the aftermath of the "modern," nor in opposition to it […]' What is Postmodern is already a part of the modern.'[39] In *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, the thesis is advanced that postmodernism is a critical revision of modernism rather than its successor, and what appeared in art in the 1970s is described as 'transformed' modernism.[40] Kramer, by

30 Witold Lutosławski, *Zapiski* [Notes], ed. Z. Skowron (Warsaw, 2008), 38.

31 See John Barth's 1967 essay 'The Literature of Exhaustion'.

32 Kraj, *Szkicowanie*, 80.

33 Krystyna Wilkoszewska, *Wariacje na postmodernizm* [Variations on Postmodernism] (Kraków, 2000).

34 Jonathan D. Kramer, 'O genezie muzycznego postmodernizmu' [On the Origins of Musical Postmodernism], trans. D. Maciejewicz, *Muzyka*, 45/3 (2000), 63–72.

35 Tim Rutherford-Johnson, *Music after the Fall: Modern Composition and Culture since 1989* (Oakland, 2017).

36 Umberto Eco, *Dopiski na marginesie „Imienia róży"* [Postscript to *The Name of the Rose*] (Warsaw, 1993), 617.

37 Stefan Morawski, 'Na tropach modernizmu jako formacji kulturowej' [On the Trail of Modernism as a Cultural Formation], *Teksty Drugie*, 5–6 (1994), 67–78.

38 Zygmunt Bauman, *Wieloznaczność nowoczesna. Nowoczesność wieloznaczna* [Modern Ambivalence: Ambivalent Modernity] (Warsaw, 1995).

39 François Lyotard, 'Answering the Question: What Is Postmodernism?', in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis, 1984), 79. Quoted here after: Ferrier, Jean-Louis, *Art of Our Century, The Chronicle of Western Art, 1900 to the Present*, trans. Yann le Pichon, (New York, 1988), https://noteaccess.com/APPROACHES/Lyotard.htm, accessed 6 Oct. 2026Jean-.

40 Alastair Williams, 'Ageing of the New: The Museum of Musical

contrast, introduces the concept of anti-modernism, a form of nostalgia for past styles: an essentially conservative attitude opposed to both modernism and postmodernism.

More recently, the term 'metamodernism' has emerged alongside a conception of the dialectic of rupture and continuation; although apparently mutually exclusive, the two can coexist within metamodernism.[41] The concept, current in philosophy, semiotics, linguistics, sociology and other fields, has not yet gained wide application in music (or art) history.

Should, then, the present in culture and art be understood as a transitional period between postmodernism and metamodernism? Fredric Jameson's view that historicity has disappeared from twenty-first-century culture coincides with the conviction that 'Grand periodizing concepts such as modernity, postmodernity, and metamodernity are generally incoherent'.[42] Josephson Storm even argues that using postmodernism as a chronological category for organising the present in which we live is mistaken, because modernism's very core contains mutually opposed processes. Treating postmodernism primarily as a philosophical tendency, he associates it with scepticism that weakens faith in rationality, objectivity and science, and with ethical relativism. 'We could say that every period has its own postmodernism […]'[43], Eco writes. Maciej Gołąb takes a different view, asserting—in agreement with Jonathan D. Kramer—that postmodern music 'is generally regarded neither as a repudiation nor a continuation of the experiences of modernity, but as a combination of the two'.[44] Hermann Danuser distinguishes between modernity, whose defining orientation is towards the work and its internal organisation; the avant-garde, characterised by experiment and opposition to tradition and institutions; *Neue Musik*, understood as the sum of modernism and avant-garde; and postmodernism.[45] Danuser sees the latter as a specific relation to, or negation of, modernism, and thus neither a combination nor a continuation. Finally, Maria Piotrowska states that postmodernism differs from modernism through 'the loss of that ethical tone'[46] and, in this critique of postmodernity, shares Stefan Morawski's reflection on the 'boundless tolerance of competing values and valuelessness'[47] characteristic of postmodern art—something that sharply distinguishes it from the avant-garde. This, however, is a separate question requiring its own source-based exegesis.

REFERENCES

Alfred Appel, Jr, *Jazz Modernism: From Ellington and Armstrong to Matisse and Joyce* (New York, 2002).

Bauman, Zygmunt, *Wieloznaczność nowoczesna. Nowoczesność wieloznaczna* (Warsaw, 1995).

Dahlhaus, Carl, *Foundations of Music History*, trans. J. B. Robinson (Cambridge, 1983).

Danuser, Hermann, 'Zur Kritik der musikalischen Postmoderne', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 149/12 (1988), 4–9.

Eco, Umberto, *Postscript to 'The Name of the Rose'* (London, 1984).

Gazda, Grzegorz, *Nowoczesność i awangarda* (Łódź, 1986).

Gołąb, Maciej, *Muzyczna moderna XX wieku. Między kontynuacją, nowością a zmianą fonosystemu* (Wrocław, 2011).

Harper-Scott, J. P. E., *Edward Elgar, Modernist* (Cambridge, 2006).

Jameson, Fredric, *A Singular Modernity; Essay on the Ontology of the Present* (London and New York, 2002).

Jencks, Charles, *The New Moderns: From Late to Neo-Modernism* (London, 1990).

Josephson Storm, Jason Ānanda, *Metamodernism: The Future of Theory* (Chicago, 2021).

Kosiński, Dariusz, 'Kroniki przepowiedzianej śmierci [o J. Grzegorzewskim]', *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 16 (2005).

Modernism', in Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople, eds, *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music* (Cambridge, 2004), 506–38.

41 Robin van den Akker, Timotheus Vermeulen and Alison Gibbons, eds, *Metamodernism: Historicity, Affect, and Depth After Postmodernism* (London and New York, 2017); Jason Ānanda Josephson Storm, *Metamodernism: The Future of Theory* (Chicago, 2021).

42 Josephson Storm, *Metamodernism*, 16.

43 Umberto Eco, *Postscript to 'The Name of the Rose'* (London, 1984), 66.

44 Gołąb, *Muzyczna moderna*, 255. Jonathan D. Kramer identifies as a leading feature of postmodern music that it 'is generally regarded neither as a repudiation nor a continuation of the experiences of modernity, but as a combination of the two' (Kramer, 'O genezie', 66).

45 Hermann Danuser, 'Zur Kritik der musikalischen Postmoderne', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 149/12 (1988), 4–9.

46 Piotrowska, 'Kanon', 17.

47 Piotrowska, 'Kanon', 17.

Kraj, Łukasz, *Szkicowanie awangard(y) Renato Poggiolego*, Jagiellonian University Repository, PDF (2020).

Kramer, Jonathan D., 'O genezie muzycznego postmodernizmu', trans. D. Maciejewicz, *Muzyka*, 45/3 (2000), 63–72.

Lutosławski, Witold, *Zapiski*, ed. Z. Skowron (Warsaw, 2008).

Lyotard, Jean-François, 'Answering the Question: What Is Postmodernism?', trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis, 1984).

Mahnkopf, Klaus-Steffen, ed., *Facets of the Second Modernity*, with Frank Cox and Wolfram Schurig (Hofheim, 2008).

van den Akker, Robin, Vermeulen, Timotheus, and Alison Gibbons, eds, *Metamodernism: Historicity, Affect, and Depth After Postmodernism* (London and New York, 2017).

Metzer, David, *Musical Modernism at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, 2009).

Morawski, Stefan, 'Na tropach modernizmu jako formacji kulturowej', *Teksty Drugie*, 5–6 (1994), 67–78.

Paja-Stach, Jadwiga, 'Awangarda muzyczna a idee artystyczne przełomu XIX i XX wieku', *Muzyka*, 35/1 (1990), 21–32.

Paja-Stach, Jadwiga, 'Kompozytorzy polscy wobec idei modernistycznych i postmodernistycznych', in Alicja Jarzębska and Jadwiga Paja-Stach, eds, *Idee modernizmu i postmodernizmu w poetyce kompozytorskiej i w refleksji o muzyce* (Kraków, 2007), 51–69.

Piotrowska, Maria, 'Kanon i postmodernizm' [The Canon and Postmodernism], *Muzyka*, 42/1 (1997), 5–30.

Poggioli, Renato, *The Theory of the Avant-garde*, trans. Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1968).

Porębski, Mieczysław, 'Dyskurs (wstęp do metakrytyki II)', *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 30 (2001), 8.

Rutherford-Johnson, Tim, *Music after the Fall: Modern Composition and Culture since 1989* (Oakland, 2017).

Skowron, Zbigniew, *Dzieło, twórczość, percepcja w refleksji wybranych przedstawicieli awangardy muzycznej drugiej połowy XX wieku* (Warsaw, 1985).

Skowron, Zbigniew, *Teoria i estetyka awangardy muzycznej drugiej połowy XX wieku* (Warsaw, 2016).

Tatarkiewicz, Władysław, 'Romantyzm, czyli rozpacz semantyka', *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 62/4 (1971), 3–21.

Turowski, Andrzej, *Budowniczowie świata. Z dziejów radykalnego modernizmu w sztuce polskiej* (Kraków, 2000).

Whittall, Arnold, *Exploring Twentieth-Century Music: Tradition and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2003).

Wilkoszewska, Krystyna, *Wariacje na postmodernizm* (Kraków, 2000).

Williams, Alastair, 'Ageing of the New: The Museum of Musical Modernism', in Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople, eds, *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music* (Cambridge, 2004), 506–38.

Prof. Marta Szoka, MA: theory of music and organ concert class at the *Grażyna and Kiejstut Bacewicz Academy of Music*, Łódź, Poland; PhD: Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Art, Warsaw, 1988; Fulbright scholar—University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1993–1994. As a concert organist, she has given numerous recitals in Poland and other countries. Author of the books: *Polish Organ Music 1945–1985* (Łódź, 1993), *The Musical Language of Frank Martin* (Łódź, 1995), *Frank Martin: Musical Contexts* (Łódź, 2002), *George Crumb: The Music of Oneiric Visions and Magic Formulas* (Łódź, 2011), and *Monster vs New Music: Somewhat Subjectively about Contemporary Organ Music* (Łódź, 2021); co-author of the lexicon *Composers of Łódź 1945–2000* (Łódź, 2001). The author of numerous articles on contemporary music, including Polish, Lithuanian and American composers, such as W. Albright, F. Bajoras, Ph. Glass, A. Tansman, F. Martin, G. Crumb, P. Mykietyn, etc. In 2002–2008, she was the dean of the Department of Composition, Theory of Music, Eurhythmics and Art Education at the Academy of Music in Łódź. In 2003–2016, she was a member of the Warsaw Autumn International Festival of Contemporary Music programme committee.