

## *Hudební listy* (1870-1875)

Jiří Kopecký

The weekly music journal *Hudební listy* [HUL] began publication on March 3, 1870, in Prague. The journal carried on the tradition of the periodical *Dalibor*, whose editor was between 1858 and 1864 Emanuel Antonín Meliš. *Hudební listy* was published by the Union of Czechoslavic Singers' Societies [Ústřední jednota zpěvákých spolků českoslovanských] with Ludevít Procházka as editor. From the second volume on, the publisher was Emanuel Jan Kittl, father of Ema Destinnova, who later grew into one of the world's famous sopranos. The periodical took pride in carrying the subtitle "Authority of the Union of Czechoslavic Singers' Societies" [Orgán Ústřední jednoty zpěvákých spolků českoslovanských]. From February 1871, *Hudební listy* was published by Jan Stanislav Skrejšovský, even though the journal was still owned by Kittl. Its third volume was – as the title page suggested – published under the joint editorship of Ludevít Procházka and Josef Richard Rozkošný; HUL was, however, edited by Procházka until November 1872.

December 1872 brought a fundamental change in the journal's management. Issue 49 (5 December 1872) lacked the names of both the editor and the publisher, an explanation for which appeared only in issue 51 (19 December 1872) in an opening essay "Word to Our Respectable Audience" [Slovo k našemu velectěnému čtenářstvu]. A new owner, Skrejšovský, took over the journal in December 1872 and stripped Ludevít Procházka of his editorship based on the notion that the journal should now serve a "national" goal, which was impossible to reconcile with Procházka's further engagement. From volume 4, 1873 on, HUL was published as the "Authority of Secular and Sacred Music and the Benefit of Union of Czechoslavic Singers' Societies" [Orgán světské i chrámové hudby, jakož i zájmů pěveckých jednot českoslovanských]. The name of the new editor, Josef Richard Rozkošný, harbored the real "ruler" of the *Hudební listy*, František Pivoda.<sup>1</sup> Rozkošný gave his editorship up at the end of 1873 due to the increasing anti-Smetana position of the journal. This credulous and generally-liked composer was considered a follower of Smetana, but the one year as the editor of the *Hudební listy* did not harm his reputation because "no-one believed that he would actually bother to ever enter the editorial office."<sup>2</sup> HUL was edited by František Pivoda in 1874 and 1875. In the late 1880s Pivoda tried to pick up the threads of HUL's six-year-long tradition; he revived the journal on 5 January 1889 but its short-lived operation ended with volume 7, issue 36, in January 1890.

Editorial changes naturally affected the content of the periodical. While under Procházka HUL defended the modern direction in Czech music as represented by the works of Bedřich Smetana, Pivoda was critical of Smetana's affection for Berlioz, Liszt and Wagner. The first three volumes of the *Hudební listy* had a clear ideological course, but the subsequent three volumes looked for an adequately principled opposing course. Pivoda's disputations and unclear concept of Austrian and later Slavic music led Czech musicologists to sharp criticism of works

---

<sup>1</sup> Otakar Hostinský, *Bedřich Smetana a jeho boj o moderní českou hudbu* (Prague: nákladem Jana Laichtera, 1901): 279.

<sup>2</sup> Ladislav Dolanský, *Hudební paměti*, ed. by Zdeněk Nejedlý (Prague: Hudební matice Umělecké besedy, 1949): 86-87.

written by Pivoda's colleagues Franjo Ksaver Kuhač, Max Konopásek and František Pazdírek, as if Smetana's opponents were not capable of anything else but "romantic delusions" and "bemusing" articles.<sup>3</sup> The initials with which they signed their contributions make them easily recognizable, for instance E. M. – Emanuel Meliš, M. K. – Max Konopásek, A. V. A. – August Wilhelm Ambros (who replaced W. with V. when publishing in Czech). We could match the code with the author in other cases too and without much difficulty (H. belongs to Otakar Hostinský, -pp- to Karel Pippich), yet many writers remained unidentifiable. HUL had greatly contributed to the promotion of domestic production by publishing musical supplements: Procházka published one per year, the journal under Rozkošný's ownership continued in this tradition and started to publish songs from Schubert's series *Spanilá mlynářka* [*Die schöne Müllerin*] in Czech. František Pivoda published about 20 musical supplements a year, thus, a total of 40 compositions.

The editor of the first three volumes, Jan Ludevít Procházka (1837–1888), was a student of Bedřich Smetana. Procházka who played the piano, was a composer, conductor, and teacher but he became most famous for organizing musical life. He was one of the founders of singers' society *Hlahol*, *Hudební odbor Umělecké besedy* [Musical Department of Artists' Group Umělecká beseda], in 1871 he helped establish the *Hudební matice Umělecké besedy* [Music Association of Umělecká beseda], which published works of Czech composers cheaply (first published was the piano score of Smetana's opera *Prodaná nevěsta* [The Bartered Bride]). In 1874 together with František Ladislav Rieger, he founded a musical division in the *Museum Království českého* [Czech Royal Museum]. In the late 1860s, he organized historical concerts dedicated to the Renaissance and Baroque music, and in 1870 he added contemporary sacred music and called it *Musica Sacra*. Procházka also organized the centennial of the birth of Václav Jan Tomášek (1774–1850). Beginning in 1871 he organized so called "free musical soirees," which focused on new works by Czech composers. Other than Smetana, composers such as Antonín Dvořák, Zdeněk Fibich, Vilém Blodek, Karel Bendl, Karel Šebor, Pavel Křížkovský and Josef Richard Rozkošný generally became well known.

We need to emphasize that Procházka was behind the successful start of Dvořák's career as a composer. In 1871 HUL supplied the first written witness of Dvořák's works, which were undeniably composed for public performances.<sup>4</sup> When Smetana first publicly introduced Dvořák as an instrumental composer in 1874, Procházka became involved with organizing the event.<sup>5</sup> Procházka as a musical executive followed up on Smetana's activities in the *Národní listy* and in 1865 wrote for the musical column of a German paper *Politik*. As the editor of the *Hudební listy*, he invested his efforts mostly in securing high quality co-workers, he did not write long articles and reviews. He continued writing for the *Národní listy*, whose remarkable quality was guaranteed by Jan Neruda, a selfless admirer and friend of Smetana. When Ludevít Procházka was HUL's editor, one of his co-workers, Otakar Hostinský, and Bohdan Jedlička initially formed the three-member committee.

---

<sup>3</sup> Gracian Černušák, "Dalibor, Hudební listy" in *Československý hudební slovník osob a institucí I* (Prague: Státní hudební vydavatelství, 1963): 223–24, 509–10.

<sup>4</sup> Klaus Döge, *Antonín Dvořák. Život, dílo, dokumenty*, translated by Helena Medková (Prague: Vyšehrad, 2013): 9, 4.

<sup>5</sup> Václav Vladimír Zelený, *O Bedřichu Smetanovi* (Prague: František Šimáček, 1894): 8.

When Procházka lost control of HUL in 1872, his debate with Hostinský resulted in the acknowledgment that a new journal *Dalibor* should emerge. The title was chosen deliberately after Smetana's most lambasted opera in order to indicate clearly the direction of the periodical. *Dalibor*, published in 1873–1875, unmistakably defended the works of Bedřich Smetana and powerfully argued against HUL; Procházka was the editor of *Dalibor* its first two years; the third volume of 1875 was published under the auspices of Václav Juda Novotný. The cooperation with Otakar Hostinský became again important; he wrote the analysis of Smetana's *Dalibor*. A new generation, composed of people like Václav Vladimír Zelený, Ladislav Dolanský and Zdeněk Fibich, also began to defend Smetana. Procházka left Prague in 1879 to follow his wife Marta (b. Reisingerová) to Hamburg, where she was employed by the city theatre opera ensemble. Not even being abroad stopped Procházka promoting Smetana's work; for instance, in Hamburg, Procházka and his wife helped with the premiere of Smetana's opera *Dvě vdovy* [Two Widows].

HUL, edited by Ludevít Procházka, was rightfully considered the “first modern musical journal in Bohemia.”<sup>6</sup> The periodical published articles that extensively affected the general public and composers alike. August Wilhelm Ambros prepared musical historical essays. Eliška Krásnohorská translated into Czech German texts of famous songs; she also wrote a theoretical essay about Czech musical declamation. Otakar Hostinský analyzed the issue of so-called “Wagnerism.” The discourse over the influence of Richard Wagner on Bedřich Smetana and by extension all Czech music, harbored the key contribution of the journal. Procházka's successor as editor, František Pivoda (1824–1898), defended the cultural-political viewpoint, which tried to uplift Czech music from its own roots and faced opposition from friends of Smetana led by Hostinský, who were not afraid to open the domestic production to Western cultural influence. Furthermore, František Pivoda was a well-known music teacher and his singers' institution in Prague had a sizeable reputation. As an educated person, he daily encountered the real world of music and could not agree with the theoretical constructs of Hostinský, who in the 1870s engaged in aesthetic polemics with Josef Durdík and Eduard Hanslick. In 1870 Hostinský finished his thesis titled *Das Musikalischschöne und das Gesamtkunstwerk vom Standpunkte der formalen Aesthetik*. In the meantime, he became a distinguished journalist in the *Hudební listy* and *Dalibor* journals. A confident aesthete, he divided Richard Wagner's contribution to music into two parts – the aesthetic principle (“Wagnerianism”) and the musical side to Wagner's work (this current was in Czech musicology later labeled “Wagnerism”). Based on this construct, he made striking statements, such as Wagner would have been an important figure even if he did not write a single score. Hostinský perceived Smetana as an independent composer who adopted Wagner's aesthetic principle but was not harmed by his music. He defended Smetana as a leading representative of national art, which was on equal footing with European modern thinking.

Debates did not concern only Smetana's musical dramatic work and his job as a musical director of the Prozatímní divadlo Opera [The Prague Provisional Theatre Opera], Hostinský held extraordinarily dear Smetana's work as a concert director, unlike Pivoda, who already in 1870 criticized his choice of repertoire in the periodical *Pokrok* [Progress]. HUL was in this sense an important reference for the origins of regular concert productions in Prague; in December 1869 a

<sup>6</sup> Jana Vojtěšková, ed.: *Album Jana Ludevíta Procházky z let 1860–1888* (Prague: KLP et Národní muzeum v Praze, 2013): ix.

series of “philharmonic concerts” commenced, first only with the Prozatímní divadlo Opera orchestra and from 1871 with orchestras from both Czech and German theatres, and from 1873 a fixed form of the *Filharmonie* [Philharmonic] society emerged and the conductors were alternately both music directors, Bedřich Smetana and Ludwig Slansky.<sup>7</sup> Hostinský argued that the first half of the 1870s was the period of the “greatest battles,” which culminated in the period between the premiere of Smetana’s opera *Dvě vdovy* in March 1874 and his loss of hearing in the autumn of the same year. Pivoda’s side highlighted the inappropriate exaggeration of Smetana’s performances, argued that *Dvě vdovy* was an opera composed for an orchestra with accompanying vocals. The politically motivated skirmishes between the Old Czechs and Young Czechs led to the uncompromising criticism of the Young Czechs management of *Prozatímní divadlo* Opera; Smetana was said to receive too high a pay while composing only four operas in eight years (opera *Libuše* was intentionally overlooked) and when Smetana in October 1874 lost his hearing completely, the news seemed so incredible that his opponents accused him of regarding the theatre as “a provision shelter, residence of invalids, a pathological institution.”<sup>8</sup>

HUL represented a unique source of information about the rapidly growing music culture in Prague and inspired reflection on the direction of Czech national music. Smetana’s work as a director and composer often inspired these contemplations. The primary impulse to establish the periodical came in 1870 and was inspired by the activity of the singers’ associations in the Czech lands. HUL’s first volume thoroughly followed the activities of the current Slavic societies, and reported on the foundations of the new singers’ societies and unions. It recorded programs of concerts, concert soirees and academies. They recommended new songbooks and choral works by Czech composers; they also announced a composer competition of compositions for male choirs. The journal also advertised compositions published by *Jednota českoslovanských zpěváckých spolků* [The Union of Czechoslovak Singer’s Societies] and the theoretical work of piano teacher Josef Proksch. The section *Zprávy z ciziny a Rakouska* [Foreign and Austrian News] offers information about the development of national schools (for example in Lublin, Zagreb), the Slavic Union in Vienna, and the careers of Czech expatriates abroad. A noteworthy topic was the movement of famous singers and instrumentalists (for example, Adelina Patti, Paulina Viardot, Clara Schumann); the journal subscribers could learn about the work of Stanislav Moniuzsko in Warsaw, about the assignment to perform Mussorgsky’s opera *Boris Godunov*, about the debut of Liszt’s oratorio *Svatá Alžběta* [Legend of the Saint Elizabeth], about the composition of Verdi’s opera *Aida* or about the breakthrough of Smetana’s *Prodaná nevěsta* [The Bartered Bride] abroad. The centennial of the birth of Ludwig van Beethoven was also a current newsworthy event. Wagner’s creative plans were a source of permanent fascination as much as his Munich premieres of *Das Rheingold* and *Die Walküre* (including Smetana’s presence at these events). A musical supplement presented the opera *Lejla* by Karl Bendl.

The column *Zprávy domácí* [Domestic news] focused on opera production, plans for operas by Czech composers and the publication in Prague of piano-vocal scores of Russian operas. It also reports on the productions of the Prague Conservatory, organ school and many other private music institutions. Special attention was paid to the so-called “filharmonické koncerty” [philharmonic concerts]. Otakar Hostinský presented regular updates about the events

---

<sup>7</sup> Hostinský: 286.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 295–301.

of the *Prozatímní divadlo* Opera; and, by criticizing the lack of concept in its opera repertoire, he tried to implement Smetana's program of "increasing the artistic level of the opera and the audience."<sup>9</sup> Among the multifarious selection of longer essays about Rossini's *The Barber of Seville*, Weber's *Der Freischütz*, Smetana's *Prodaná nevěsta* in St. Petersburg, Gluck, Rubinstein, Chopin, Berlioz, Liszt, Leopold Eugen Měchura, music in Egypt, Gregorian chant, music life in Serbia, or Helmholtz's physical theory of music, the articles by Ambros stand out about Palestrina and Beethoven, the polemic essay by Eliška Krásnohorská *Český básník a hudební drama* [Czech poet and musical drama] and most of all, Hostinský's crucial essay *Wagnerianismus a česká národní opera* [Wagnerianism and Czech national opera], which Hostinský adopted in 1901 for his book *Bedřich Smetana a jeho boj o moderní českou hudbu* [Bedřich Smetana and his struggle for modern Czech music]. The study emerged from two lectures for the literary section of *Umělecká beseda* [The Artist Society] and stemmed from the belief that the audience's dislike of Smetana's works arose from their ignorance of Wagner's operas. Hostinský himself stated that in its time, the essay had become "almost a program to the *Hudební listy* and the circle of friends of progress gathered around it."<sup>10</sup>

In HUL's second volume (1871), Otakar Hostinský published an extensive series entitled "Richard Wagner, nástin životopisný" [Richard Wagner, a biographical outline]. We can also attribute to Hostinský the general review of the opening of *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* in the German theatre in Prague. Eliška Krásnohorská used HUL for the establishment of women's singing societies and continued to translate the texts of songs from other languages into Czech. Above all, she published her essay "O české deklamaci hudební" [On Czech musical declamation], which provided a positive influence on Czech composers including Bedřich Smetana. Karel Pippich translated Beethoven's letters, Josef Durdík translated Serov's study *Ruská národní píseň* [Russian folk songs]; Jindřich Pech's interest in *bel canto* is reflected in his contributions. There are also texts about Gregorian chant and liturgy and about the history of eighteenth-century music. Popular anecdotes from Rossini's life found their counterpart in the preservation of the Mozart cult in the reading "Mozartův poslední pobyt v Praze" [Mozart's last stay in Prague]. An inspirational essay "Cesta kol světa s průvodem piana" [Around the world with the piano] balanced the news about Serbian instrumental music or Rusnak folk songs. Emanuel Meliš prepared "*Příspěvky k životopisům českých hudebních umělců*" [Papers on the biographies of Czech musical artists]. HUL's editorial board was invited to celebrate the first anniversary of the establishment of the singers' society *Hlahol* in Prague; to join *Malice hudební*; to compose works for women singers' union and to appeal repeatedly to its readers to "ardently cultivate the Czech song!" Reviews drew attention to Slavic-oriented piano arrangements of Max Konopásek and to songs by Zdeněk Fibich; Ludevít Procházka presented "patriotic dumka" for solo and mixed choir and piano *Světla víc!* [More light!] with lyrics by Václav Štulc (music supplement no. 2). The section "*Kronika zpěváckých spolků a hudebních jednot*" [The chronicle of singers' societies and musical unions] continued to follow the activities of musical societies in the Czech lands in great detail. "*Zprávy z ciziny a Rakouska*" [Foreign and Austrian news] did not neglect Italian culture, at the forefront was news about Verdi's *Aida*, yet information about Wagner's theoretical works, construction of the theatre in Bayreuth and the planned execution of the tetralogy *Der Ring des Nibelungen*, about the fate of Wagner's operas in Italy, and the

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 145.

execution of Beethoven's symphonies in London conducted by Wagner dominated quantitatively. Prominent in *Zprávy domácí* [Domestic news] was information about the celebration of the centennial of the birth of Václav Jan Tomášek, new operas by Czech composers: *Král a uhlíř* [King and charcoal burner] by Dvořák, and *Zakletý princ* [Enchanted Prince] by Hřímálý and *Bukovín* by Fibich; naturalized Italians were also the subject of attention, such as Luigi Ricci and his *Kryšpín a kmotra* [The cobbler and the fairy], the engagement of the singer Lela Ricci. News about Czech opera was complemented with information about the illness of the music director Bedřich Smetana or the trip of the second music director of the Prozatímní divadlo Opera, Adolf Čech and Zdeněk Fibich to Munich to visit the performances of *Das Rheingold* and *Die Walküre*.

The contents of HUL's third volume (1872) became, on one hand, more distinctively specialized in terms of popular and somewhat tabloid news about the events in foreign music centers (for example, laying a cornerstone of the Bayreuth theater, the jubilee performance of *Huguenots* in Paris, of Moniuszko's *Halka* in Lvov, salary conditions of American artists, Adelina Patti in Moscow), and, on the other, much more rigorously defended of the "Smetana" program. Longer articles dealt with the life and work of Beethoven, Schumann, and Serov. The contemporary Cecilian movement was addressed in the articles by Antonín Foerster about the reform of church music and by Franz Xaver Witt about Gregorian chant. The essay about Serbian folk music or the chapter about the theory of harmony by Václav Emanuel Horák were counterbalanced by yet again articles with Wagner themes (Czech translation of Wagner's *Eine Pilgerfahrt zu Beethoven* [A pilgrimage to Beethoven] and the dispute between Ambros and Hostinský). Eliška Krásnohorská brought attention to the unilateral cultivation of opera at the expense of song. The most important essay of HUL's third volume was the detailed polemical reply of Otakar Hostinský *Také některé myšlenky o české opeře* [Also some thoughts on Czech opera], which reacted to Pivoda's article in the journal *Osvěta*. When the possible resignation of Bedřich Smetana from the post of art director of Czech theater opera was being debated, the *Hudební listy* publicly defended him. The journal regularly commented on Smetana's conducting performances in both opera and philharmonic concerts, its readers knew about the completion of the opera *Libuše* and the plan to compose the symphonic poems *Vyšehrad* and *Vltava*. Also the new compositions by Antonín Dvořák captivated their attention. The periodical consistently communicated biographical data about Czech musicians (e.g., Pavel Křížkovský); translations of lyrics by Eliška Krásnohorská were supplemented with Jindřich Böhm's translation of the popular song *La Mandolinata* by Émile Paladilhe.

HUL's fourth volume (1873) displays an anti-Smetana attitude, with pro-Smetana attitudes being transferred to the newly-founded periodical *Dalibor*. Czech periodicals then mostly supported Smetana (Hostinský edited the music section in *Politika*, Jindřich Pech in *Pokrok*), František Pivoda worked in the monthly *Osvěta* and thanks to the *Hudební listy* gained a more influential platform. At the outset of the fourth volume, is the article "Kde jsme? Kam chceme se dostat?" [Where are we? Where do we want to go?], which deals with the concern that Smetana's style is so close to Wagner's that it threatens to paralyze the development of Czech music. Otakar Hostinský responded to these concerns under the initials Fl. (i.e., Florestan) in *Dalibor* by publishing an essay "Kde jsme? Kam nechceme se dostat?" [Where are we? Where we don't want to go?].<sup>11</sup> Other texts also contained this polemic thorn, including "Jak

---

<sup>11</sup> Dolanský: 157; Hostinský: 284–285.

*si pĕje Āech*” [How a Czech sings] and “*Úvahy o naši hudební literaturĕ*” [Thoughts about our music literature] by František Pazdírek. The journal also discussed the works of F. Chopin, Southern Slavic folk songs, and critical opinions on Wagner’s work from Italy and France. Pivoda’s editorial claimed that Prozatímní divadlo Opera was suffering a personnel crisis, Vojtěch Hřimalý attacked Procházka, Hostinský and Adolf Āech, he wrote about “a group of few fanatics concentrated around a single personality.” The journal did not leave out information about events in societies; it followed the compositional efforts of Antonín Dvořák and communicated biographical data of older Czech composers. It also paid special attention to the works of Franz Schubert. Pivoda had not yet embarked on promoting a genuinely Czechoslavic course. Rather, at the time he promoted the idea of an Austrian style of composition, which explained the bilingual publication of Schubert’s songs from the series *Spanilá mlynářka* (*Die schöne Müllerin*) as a *Hudební listy* musical supplement.

The exhausting composing and directing work, the need to face public attacks, and the progressive illness of Bedřich Smetana escalated in 1874 into his full loss of hearing. HUL’s fifth volume (1874) represented the most extensive platform for arguing the points used to attack Smetana. The objectives of the weekly were articulated in the very first issue, claiming that “We serve the Czechoslavic musical style with all our ardor.” We refuse to “bind the Czech talent to serve a foreign spirit,” and are against any trace of “friendship” with foreigners. It advocated that the main interest of the journal should focus on “sacred church music and the domain of dramatic music.” Pivoda fiercely criticized the activities of the Czech opera’s singing school and attacked the financial situation of the Prozatímní divadlo Opera. The opening of Smetana’s opera *Dvě vdovy* had an awkward epilogue, namely, a dispute several pages long between the *Hudební listy* and *Dalibor*; the then deaf, Smetana requested the score from the music director Jan Nepomuk Maýr, in order to prepare a piano score, and when Maýr gladly submitted the requested material to Smetana, Maýr clearly indicated that he would not perform the opera in *Prozatímní divadlo Opera*.<sup>12</sup>

Main articles and columns were aimed at emphasizing the Slavic roots of Czech culture. In the spirit of František Palacký “each to his own and always by truth,” Pivoda urged that a Czech musician should not submissively bow to Germans abroad and that artists should be inspired by Franjo Kuhač from Zagreb and Max Konopásek from Lvov. Kuhač contemplated, in the call *Vzchopme se k dílu!* [Pull ourselves together!], the potential for uplifting Slavic music and for the de-Germanization of music terminology. The same author wrote an essay on Serbian folk music. Konopásek in his essay “*Rozbor otázky slovanské hudby*” [Exploration of Slavic music matter] interconnected Greek modes with folk songs and touched upon the issue of declamation and Czech poetry; he specifically stressed the Russian “kolomejka”. The series of these articles were thematically complemented with *Z jaké půdy vyrodí se hudba slovanská?* [From which soil will Slavic music arise?] and *Proč zaniká krásný zpĕv (“bel canto”)* [Why does beautiful singing “bel canto” perish?]. The section *Zprávy z ciziny a Rakouska* [Foreign and Austrian News] moved its attention to the introduction of works popular with the public, e.g., it communicated the information that Wagner’s theatre in Bayreuth lacked money to complete construction. *Zprávy domácí a z venkova* [Domestic and rural news] presented for instance

<sup>12</sup> HUL, December 1874: 200, 204, 208, 211–214.

selected programs emphasizing Slavic themes, other than Dvořák's *Symphony D minor*, and informs the readers about the flourishing of operatic performances (*Bukovín* and *Blaník* by Fibich, *Drahomír* by Šebor, *Dvě vdovy* by Smetana, *Král a uhlíř* by Dvořák). Musical supplements provided access to opera arias of baroque composers Georg Friedrich Händel and Alessandro Stradella, transcribed for harmonium (cavatina from Weber's *Der Freischütz*, Liszt's *Ave Maria*), yet the main emphasis was on music with Slavic tendencies, that is, songs by F. Pivoda, J. R. Rozkošný, Josef Paukner, Konopásek's piano pieces, *Písňe beze slov* [Songs without words] by J. Přibík, Kuhač's composition *Tamburaši* or J. F. Kloss' song *Splyňte vy slovanští jazykové* [You, Slavic languages, merge!]. Subscribers also receive a portrait of V. J. Tomášek.

HUL's sixth volume (1875) takes on a pedagogical dimension while retaining the characteristic traces of Pivoda's virtues and vices. Other than a series about the history of music by Josef Vacek, longer articles handled theoretical issues (e.g., characteristics of keys, transposition, harmony). Pivoda retained his time-tested co-workers; Kuhač published a review of the *Sborník ukrajinských písní* [Collection of Ukrainian songs], Konopásek in a series presents the readers with his thoughts on "*Hudební i nehudební stránky slovanské hudby*" [Musical and non-musical aspects of Slavic music]. Konopásek also became the leading supplier of musical supplements. Other than songs by Josef Paukner, Eugen Miroslav Rutte, František Josef Bučovský and Pivoda's adaptations of folk songs, the HUL supplied its readers with piano compositions from Konopásek's cycle *Slovanka* [Slavic woman]. The main essay in the last issue of the *Hudební listy* was titled "*Přívřezenci a odpůrcové*" [Friends and foes], in which the author profusely quoted Ambros's work in order to confront devotees of Wagner's musical reforms with those, who rather considered Wagner a butcher of music. Pivoda's ideas proceeded in the following way: Wagner belongs to Germany, where reason stands above emotion; so let Germans cultivate his fame; this would guarantee that the German element would not devour Slavic music, which would thus be preserved for the future.

Although Smetana could no longer perform in public, his works proved that he could mobilize his compositional art. Reviews of his new composition provoked new disputes between the *Hudební listy* and *Dalibor*; Pivoda decidedly uncovered the leading ideological architect of Wagner's theories and of the corrupt views on Smetana's works, and identified him as Otakar Hostinský. After the premiere of Smetana's symphonic poems *Vyšehrad* and *Vltava*, the journal's issue 14 expressed the delight over Smetana's fortunate production, which was based on "natural native soil, leaving aside all alien."<sup>13</sup> When the twenty-four year old wrote in *Dalibor* that the teacher at Pivoda's institution, Karel Knittl, was an incompetent composer, who defamed Wagner's music but needed to apply Wagner's achievements in his own works, he provoked Pivoda to an extensive defensive reaction in issue 24 of the *Hudební listy*.<sup>14</sup> Whether or not Pivoda considered *Dalibor* a "depot of lies" and "den of personal interests," he in all honesty and impartiality tried to clarify his position: he cared about Slavic music, which was built on the foundations of "singing and musical property of the Slavic peoples,"<sup>15</sup> while Fibich and others on the contrary, saw "the salvation of Slavic music in imitation of compositions of the German

---

<sup>13</sup> HUL, April 1875, issue 14, p. 55.

<sup>14</sup> HUL, Juni 1875, issue 24, p. 98.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.



spirit.”<sup>16</sup> Yet, Pivoda acknowledged that he could be wrong: he forgave Fibich because of his youth, unquestionable art as a composer, and “flimsy logic” of Otakar Hostinský and asked a provocative question; why would it be wrong to establish Slavic music not on German but Slavic roots? Simultaneously, Pivoda acknowledged that he was only at the beginning, that is, the folk song. Smetana and his very work proved that only folklore and simple forms were not sufficient to step up to arduous artistic concepts. On the other hand, we have to admit that Pivoda’s *Hudební listy* forced Czech composers to study intensively Slavic music (including the works of F. Chopin) and even Bedřich Smetana’s *České tance* [Czech dances], Zdeněk Fibich’s string quartets and especially the works of Antonín Dvořák and Leoš Janáček indicated that Pivoda’s and Konopásek’s suggestions were not all that far off as the followers of Hostinský believed. Smetana disputes had unfortunately entered a personal level and its current consequences exceeded those of the earlier 1870s. Just a small footnote comment, we could note that issue 7 of HUL labeled the authors of the opera *Blaník* (Zdeněk Fibich and the librettist Eliška Krásnohorská) as Wagnerians<sup>17</sup> and, less than ten years later, Karel Knittl condemned Fibich’s opera *Nevěsta messinská* [The Bride of Messina] with a libretto by Otakar Hostinský as a failed attempt at the adaptation of Wagner’s musical-dramatic principles into the Czech opera.<sup>18</sup>

The following identifies authors signing with initials in *Hudební listy*.

August Wilhelm Ambros	A. V. A. <sup>19</sup>
Otakar Hostinský	H.
Max Konopásek	M. K.
Emanuel Meliš	E. M.
Karel Pippich	-pp-

Translated into English by Lucie Tungul

### Bibliography

Černušák, Gracian, Dalibor, *Hudební listy*, in: *Československý hudební slovník osob a institucí*, vol. 1, Prague: Státní hudební vydavatelství, 1963, p. 223–224, 509–510.

Döge, Klaus, *Antonín Dvořák. Život, dílo, dokumenty* (translation Helena Medková), Prague: Vyšehrad, 2013.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> HUL, February 1875, issue 7, p. 27.

<sup>18</sup> Vladimír Hudec, *Zdeněk Fibich* (Prague: Státní pedagogické vydavatelství, 1971): 82.

<sup>19</sup> Ambros used the initial V. for Vilhelm when publishing in the Czech language.

Dolanský, Ladislav, *Hudební paměti* (ed. by Zdeněk Nejedlý), Prague: Hudební matice Umělecké besedy, 1949.

Hostinský, Otakar, *Bedřich Smetana a jeho boj o moderní českou hudbu*, Prague: nákladem Jana Laichtera, 1901.

Hudec, Vladimír, *Zdeněk Fibich*, Prague: Státní pedagogické vydavatelství, 1971.

Vojtěšková, Jana, ed.: *Album Jana Ludevíta Procházky z let 1860–1888*, Prague: KLP et Národní muzeum v Praze, 2013.

Zelený, Václav Vladimír: *O Bedřichu Smetanovi*, Prague: František Šimáček, 1894.