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Muzikal’nai.a starina: sbornik statei i materialov dlia istorii muzyki v Rossii (Early music: a collection of articles and materials on the history of music in Russia), published in six volumes between 1903 and 1911, introduces the reader to a vital movement in pre-Revolutionary Russian historiography driven by a small group of scholars devoted to the preservation of early Russian music. As the title indicates, Muzikal’nai.a starina presents compilations of primary source documents amplified by commentary, as well as original articles of unprecedented scholarship. In view of the lack of publications on early Russian music, much of this information continues to be authoritative.

The editor of Muzikal’nai.a starina, Nikolai Fedorovich Findeizen (1868-1929), was a giant among pre-Revolutionary Russian music historians. His reputation in the West rests primarily upon his editorship of the Russkaia muzikal’nai.a gazeta (Russian music newspaper). He founded Muzikal’nai.a starina and wrote most of the articles in all six issues, aided in his work by contributions from another esteemed Russian scholar, Stepan Vasil’evich Smolenskii (1848-1909). The journal was printed by the St. Petersburg publishing magnate Pëtr Ivanovich Jurgenson (1836-1903)—a man who, in his own right, did as much as any pre-Revolutionary activist to preserve the legacy of early Russian music.

Copies of Muzikal’nai.a starina are bibliographic rarities; of great interest, therefore, is the recent reproduction of all six issues on microfiche as part of the Russian History and Culture Series produced by University Microfilms International. The renewed availability of Muzikal’nai.a starina also allows access to a publication which, for the most part, fails to appear in bibliographies of music periodicals. Its omission may be attributable to the word sbornik (collection) in its subtitle: sbornik statei i materialov (collection of articles and material).  

1 Published in St. Petersburg: monthly between 1894 and 1898; weekly from 1899 to 1917.
2 Findeizen published a necrology for Jurgenson in the Russkaia muzikal’nai.a gazeta (no. 52, 1903). More recent literature on Jurgenson includes a chapter in the monograph entitled Russkie utopy v XX vekh (Russian utopias in the twentieth century) by Boris Vol’man (Leningrad, 1970).
4 No mention will be found in the Union List of Serials or among the “Zhurnaly dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii i SSSR” (Journals from pre-Revolutionary Russia and the USSR), a sub-section of the compilation “Zhurnaly muzikal’nii” (Music journals) in the Russkai.a entsiklopedii, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1974), pp. 409-413. When referenced in Soviet scholarship, each volume of Muzikal’nai.a starina is called a kniga (book).

Muzikal’nai.a starina was never intended to be a regular serial or a forum for the popular exchange of ideas as was Findeizen’s Russkaia muzikal’nai.a gazeta, nor did it carry advertising, with the exception of listings of recent Jurgenson publications. Instead, Muzikal’nai.a starina provided Findeizen an opportunity to publish serious scholarship emanating from his tireless research into Russia’s musical past.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Russian populace became increasingly curious about the Russian starina (antiquity). A number of popular historical journals flourished, of which Russkaia starina is the best known. For scholars of Findeizen’s era, the
designation _muzykal'naia starina_—“musical antiquity” or “early music”—was expected to encompass the entire range of musical phenomena from the earliest extant sources through the documents of the nineteenth century. Indeed, Findeizen, by including the correspondence of Mili Balakirev (1836-1910) (Volume VI/2, VI/3), was embracing the activities of an older contemporary under the auspices of “early music.” Today, in Soviet historiography, the term _muzykal'naia starina_ generally refers to the “pre-Glinka era,” i.e., musical activities preceding Glinka’s operatic successes with _Zhizn’ za tsaria_ (1836) and _Ruslan i Lindmila_ (1842).

The articles in _Muzykal’naia starina_ introduce a fascinating spectrum of topics indicative of Findeizen’s own broad interests. During the sixty years of his lifetime, Findeizen witnessed many political and cultural upheavals, including the Bolshevik Revolution. He was allied early in his career with a circle of artists grouped around the critic Vladimir Vasil’evich Stasov (1824-1906) and the composer Nikolai Andreevich Rimskii-Korsakov (1844-1908). His first work on the history of Russian music appeared in 1890. By 1892, Findeizen was writing music criticism for St. Petersburg’s general newspapers, the success of which led him, in 1894, to found the _Russkaiia muzykal’naia gazeta_ (RMG), a newspaper devoted strictly to music. The RMG quickly became the most popular forum for the exchange of ideas among composers and critics. Findeizen continued to edit the RMG until 1918, embarking during those twenty-four years upon an unbroken series of demanding works of scholarship, including a Russian-language translation and supplement to Hugo Riemann’s _Musikalisches Lexikon_ and the first systematic studies on composers Mikhail Glinka (1804-1857), Aleksei Verstovskii (1799-1862) and Cesar Cui (1835-1918). His magnum opus, the two-volume _Ocherki po istorii musiki v Rossii s drevneishikh vremen do kontsa XVIII veka_ (Articles on the history of music in Russia from the most ancient times through the end of the eighteenth century) allowed him to culminate his decades of research in a comprehensive and detailed study of Russian music. This history, unprecedented in Russian scholarship, continues to serve as an oft-quoted and as yet unparalleled source of information.

The biographies of Stepan Smolenskii, a secondary contributor to _Muzykal’naia starina_, and of Pëtr Jurgenson, the journal’s publisher, reveal two equally fervent activists for the preservation and dissemination of early Russian music. Smolenskii, before assuming the directorship of the Moscow Synodal School in 1889, had already distinguished himself in the field of liturgical scholarship. Throughout his varied career as teacher and choral director, a stream of scholarly articles issued forth from his pen, the majority of which were historical-paleographical discourses on liturgical notation and repertoire.

Jurgenson, known as the primary publisher of Pëtr Chaikovskii’s music, attacked the problem of the general lack of printed early Russian scores by undertaking editions of music by approximately five hundred Russian composers, including Bortnianskii, Glinka, Alib’ev, Arenskii and Dargomyzhskii.

In choosing topics for articles in _Muzykal’naia starina_, Findeizen considered the full vista of resource materials—most of them unpublished and, in many cases, newly discovered. The articles may be classified as follows:

1) biographical articles:
   - Vols. 1/1, 1/4, 1/5, 2/3, 2/1, 2/4
2) collections of correspondence:
   - Vols. 2/4, 4/3, 4/4, 4/1, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3
3) exposure of forgotten repertoire and performance practices:
   - Vols. 1/2, 1/3, 2/1, 2/2, 4/1, 4/2, 3/2, 3/4
4) publication of obscure documentation (printed and manuscript):
   - Vols. 2/1a, 1/1b, 2/2, 2/5a, 4/1
5) bibliographic compilations:
   - Vols. 2/6, 1/2

This quotation is taken from Iastrebtsev’s correspondence, _Reminiscences of Rimsky-Korsakov_, edited and translated by Florence Jonas (New York: Columbia, 1985), p. 455, and is one of more than two dozen mentions of Findeizen in the letters.

Published in Moscow and Leningrad, 1928-1929.

See _Muzykal’naia starina_, vol. V/2, pp. 41-46.

See the biographical entry on Jurgenson in _Muzykal’naia entsiklopediia_, vol. 6 (Moscow, 1982), pp. 501-502. A large catalogue of Jurgenson’s editions was published in 1900: _Polnyi kataloog izdani_ P. Jurgensona (Complete catalogue of the editions of P. Jurgenson) (Moscow and Leningrad). A supplement appeared four years later: _Dobavlenie k Polnomu kataloog izdani P. Jurgensona v Moskve_ (Supplement to the complete catalogue of the editions of P. Jurgenson in Moscow) (Moscow, 1904).
6) documentation of performances and premieres:
   Vols. II/3b, II/5c, II/5d
7) variety features, such as caricatures, portraits, illustrations:
   Vols. I-VI (see especially Vol. III/3)

Within these divisions, certain articles reflect more than others the intensely personal interests of the authors. For example, Smolenskii's article "Oratoriiia Step[an][a] Anik[ievicha] Degtiareva [...]" (Vol. IV/1) emanates from a time in his own life during which he was closely associated with (and supported by) the Russian manorial family of Sheremetevs, whose ancestors in fact had owned the serf composer Stepan Degtiarev (1766-1813). To take another example, one of the compilations printed by Findeizen (Vol. VI/3) reflects the scholar's close friendship with Liudmila Ivanovna Sheskakova (1816-1906), the sister of Mikhail Glinka. Shestakova championed her brother's music and is credited with saving the only existing score of Russian i Liudmila after the original burned in an 1859 fire at the Maryinskii theatre, today the Kirov Theatre. She maintained an active membership in the circle of artists grouped around Stasov and Balakirev and collaborated with Findeizen on his 1898 publication Katalog notnykh rukopisei, pisem, i portretov M. I. Glinki (A catalogue of Glinka's musical manuscripts, letters and extant portraits).13

The majority of pages in Muzykal'naia starina reflect Findeizen's passionate desire to preserve the rapidly vanishing materials of the musical past, particularly correspondence and out-of-print publications. The need to protect musical documents of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was particularly acute. One early connoisseur of Russian music history, Vladimir Odoevskii, had already voiced Findeizen's concern seventy years earlier while compiling entries for the massive Entsiklopedicheskii leksikon. In an 1836 letter to the composer Verstovskii he confessed the difficulties of obtaining biographical information on eighteenth-century Russian musicians:14 "Thanks to our carelessness, everything is lost; you just cannot imagine how much work it involves. [...] It is necessary for us to seek out any and all material about famous people of our fatherland."15

In many instances, Findeizen's articles strike today's scholar as thoroughly modern endeavors, particularly in his efforts to retrieve otherwise unavailable published items; examples include the full-length reprint of Von Shetelin's eighteenth-century observations on theatre and dance production in Russia (Vol. III/1a) and a collection of excerpts from newspaper reports on music in the provinces in 1809 and 1812 (Vol. III/2). The various bibliographic compilations in Muzykal'naia starina reinforce the impression of Findeizen as a visionary of future bibliographic practices. The remarkable list of Russian books on music printed in the hundred years between 1773 and 1873 contains unique and extremely rare entries, including the first Russian-language translations of Italian theoretical treatises (Vol. II/6). The collection of letters to the composer L'vov from "foreign" composers (Mendelssohn, Moscheles, Berlioz, Fétis) is of special interest (Vol. IV/3), as well as the delightful set of composer caricatures by Stepanov (Vol. III/3).

The most poignant article in any of the six issues is the biographical sketch penned by Findeizen as a tribute to his deceased friend Smolenskii, "a knight of honor and free thought" who, in the service of Russian art, fulfilled "the most urgent demands of love—for mankind, for knowledge, and for labor."16 Ever the bibliographer, Findeizen concludes his homage with a detailed listing of Smolenskii's writings as well as the titles and volume numbers of Smolenskii's publications in periodicals.

Unless otherwise noted, the articles in the six volumes of Muzykal'naia starina, listed below with brief annotation, are authored by Findeizen. Findeizen introduces each compilation of letters or documents with a preface. All full-page illustrations, indicated with a slash (/), appear on unpaginated pages placed before, after, or between numbered pages. The original Russian titles and captions appear in italics, followed by English translations where needed.

12Two Sheremetev brothers—Sergei Dmitrievich (1844-1918) and Aleksandr Dmitrievich (1859-1931)—were the reigning Counts Sheremetev during Smolenskii's lifetime. Aleksandr Dmitrievich is remembered for his contributions to St. Petersburg's musical life, sponsoring music societies, conducting, and even composing. Smolenskii, after a temporary move to Moscow (1889-1901) to teach courses in Russian church music at the Moscow Conservatory, became particularly close friends with the elder Sergei Dmitrievich. According to Findeizen (Muzykal'naia starina, V/1, p. 34), Smolenskii lived for three months in 1903 in the Sheremetev garden house (presumably researching material on the serf Degtiarev [see "Oratoriiia Step[an][a] Anik[ievicha] Degtiareva [...]" ibid., vol. IV/1]).
13The full title reads Katalog notnykh rukopisei, pisem, i portretov M. I. Glinki (A catalogue of Glinka's musical manuscripts, letters and extant portraits) preserved in the manuscript department of the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg (St. Petersburg, 1898).
14The first series of volumes for the Entsiklopedicheskii leksikon, according to the British Museum Catalogue (letter "E", vol. 61, p. 637), was issued between 1835 and 1841, encompassing "A" through "Dio."
FINDEIZEN'S BIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLE ON VINCENTE MARTIN Y SOLER COMBINES SECONDARY INFORMATION FROM FOREIGN SOURCES SUCH AS EITNER WITH NEW INFORMATION ON THE SPANISH COMPOSER WHO, BETWEEN 1790 AND 1794, SERVED AS THE COURT COMPOSER AND CHAPEL MASTER OF THE RUSSIAN IMPERIAL THEATRE. BEGINNING ON PAGE 62, FINDEIZEN LISTS FOURTEEN THEATRICAL WORKS OF MARTIN Y SOLER (CALLING IT A "COMPLETE LIST"), GIVING THE DATES AND LOCATIONS OF RUSSIAN PERFORMANCES.

**Portrait:**

a. 56/57. **Vincent Martin (1754-1806)**

FINDEIZEN PREPARES THIS ARTICLE BY WELCOMING THE RE-PRODUCTION OF TWO PORTRAITS OF GIUSEPPE SARTI, FOR WHOM PORTRAITS HAD HITHERTO BEEN UNKNOWN. THE BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL IS DIVIDED INTO TWO SECTIONS: (1729-1802), BASED ON INFORMATION COMPiled FROM SECONDARY SOURCES (FETIS, MENDEL AND OTHERS); AND **SARTI V ROSSI 1784-1803** (SARTI IN RUSSIA 1784-1802), A DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPOSER'S SUCCESSFUL SOJOURN IN RUSSIAN COURTS. THE APPENDIX (PP. 30-32) LISTES NINETEEN COMPOSITIONS: **NEKOTORYE PROIZVEDENIYA DZH. SARTI SOKHRANIUISHIIAIA V ROSSII** (SELECTED COMPOSITIONS BY GIUSEPPE SARTI PRESERVED IN RUSSIA).

**Portraits:**

a. **Dzhuzeppe Sarti**

This small engraving, sent to Findeizen by a music librarian at Peters Editions in Leipzig, introduces the volume.


This attractive medallion of the four composers' busts had been reproduced for the first time the previous year in the Berlin journal *Die Musik*.

2. 33-47. **Sonata di Cembalo per sua Altezza Imperiale Gran Duchess di Russia. Bortianskii. (1784)** (Title is rendered in Italian.)

A three-movement work: Allegro moderato (C major); Adagio (F major); Rondo: Andantino (C major).

3. 49-56. **Iunosheskiiia proizvedeniia Bortianskogo (Zame-tka).** The youthful compositions of Bortianskii (Remarks).

FINDEIZEN REPORTS ON A DISCOVERY MADE BY STEPLAN SMOLENSKII IN 1901 OF SEVERAL AUTOGRAPH COMPOSITIONS DATING FROM BORTNIANSKIY'S YOUTH. AMONG THESE IS A MANUSCRIPT CONTAINING EIGHT CEMBALO SONATAS (ONE OF WHICH APPEARS ABOVE) AND SEVERAL CHAMBER WORKS. ALSO DISCOVERED WERE AUTOGRAPH SCORES OF THE OPERAS **ALCIDE** (1778) AND **QUINTO FABIA** (1779), AS WELL AS SACRED COMPOSITIONS DATING FROM THE PERIOD OF BORTNIANSKII'S STUDY WITH BALDASSARE GALUPPI (1706-1785). THE MANUSCRIPTS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF A 1787 QUINTETT AND A 1790 SYMPHONY, WERE ALL FOUND IN THE LIBRARY OF THE ST. PETERSBURG **PRIDVORNAYA PEVCHESKAIA KAPELLA** (IMPERIAL CHAPEL).

4. 57-66. **Vincent Martin 1754-1806.**

FINDEIZEN'S BIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLE ON VINCENTE MARTIN Y SOLER COMBINES SECONDARY INFORMATION FROM FOREIGN SOURCES SUCH AS EITNER WITH NEW INFORMATION ON THE SPANISH COMPOSER WHO, BETWEEN 1790 AND 1794, SERVED AS THE COURT COMPOSER AND CHAPEL MASTER OF THE RUSSIAN IMPERIAL THEATRE. BEGINNING ON PAGE 62, FINDEIZEN LISTS FOURTEEN THEATRICAL WORKS OF MARTIN Y SOLER (CALLING IT A "COMPLETE LIST"), GIVING THE DATES AND LOCATIONS OF RUSSIAN PERFORMANCES.

**Portrait:**

a. 56/57. **Vincent Martin (1754-1806)**

FINDEIZEN PREPARES THIS ARTICLE BY WELCOMING THE RE-PRODUCTION OF TWO PORTRAITS OF GIUSEPPE SARTI, FOR WHOM PORTRAITS HAD HITHERTO BEEN UNKNOWN. THE BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL IS DIVIDED INTO TWO SECTIONS: (1729-1802), BASED ON INFORMATION COMPiled FROM SECONDARY SOURCES (FETIS, MENDEL AND OTHERS); AND **SARTI V ROSSI 1784-1803** (SARTI IN RUSSIA 1784-1802), A DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPOSER'S SUCCESSFUL SOJOURN IN RUSSIAN COURTS. THE APPENDIX (PP. 30-32) LISTES NINETEEN COMPOSITIONS: **NEKOTORYE PROIZVEDENIYA DZH. SARTI SOKHRANIUISHIIAIA V ROSSII** (SELECTED COMPOSITIONS BY GIUSEPPE SARTI PRESERVED IN RUSSIA).

**Portraits:**

a. **Dzhuzeppe Sarti**

This small engraving, sent to Findeizen by a music librarian at Peters Editions in Leipzig, introduces the volume.


This attractive medallion of the four composers' busts had been reproduced for the first time the previous year in the Berlin journal *Die Musik*.
i. Iogan Maresh (1719-1794)

A Czech horn player and chapel master, Jan Antonín Maresh is credited with originating the concept of the rogovi orkestr in the early 1750s, developing the horns, and establishing several ensembles for Russian aristocrats.

ii. Izobretение rogovogo orkestra.— Tekhnicheskoe ustroistvo ego. Invention of the rogovi orkestr.— Technical construction.

iii. Razvitie rogovogo muzyki. The development of horn music.

iv. Izobrazhenie rogovykh orkestrov trekh tsarstvovanii.— Starinnye roga iz Koburga (v musee "Pridvornogo orkestra").— Poslednee vozobnovlenie rogovoi muzyki. The spread of horn bands through the reigns of three tsars.— Old horns from Koburg (in the museum of the Imperial Orchestra).— The latest revival of horn music.

Illustrations:

a. 1: Rogovi orkestr v tsarstvovanii Imp. Pavla I. A horn band from the reign of Emperor Paul I.


c. 117. Byvshie koburgskie roga v musee Pridvornogo orkestra v S.P.B. Older horns from Koburg in the museum of the Imperial Orchestra in St. Petersburg.

d. 118. Obratets notnykh partii koburgskago rogovo orkestra. Example of a notated score from the Koburg horn band.


Title as rendered mixes Cyrillic and Roman alphabets (iz and Partitura are in Cyrillic).


This short article touches on three points: 1) Find-eizen publishes a rare portrait of the composer done on porcelain dated approximately 1820 which had emerged from the private collection of one Muscovite Bakhrushin; 2) he bemoans the lack of information about Titov’s musically talented family, including the father, sister, brother and uncle—any one of whom may have authored the nineteen compositions given in a list of works attributable only to a “Titov,” among which is 3) an opera Andromeda et Perse, dated 1802 and apparently written by Aleksei Nikolaevich Titov, father of the “romanticist-dilettante.”

Portrait:


A collection of nineteen letters written by the singer known on stage as Mikhailov (1817-1849) and sent from Paris, London and Florence. The letters relate his passionate observations on current trends in Italian opera, as well as anecdotes of artists such as singer Giovanni Rubini (1794-1854).


Excerpt reprinted from an 1818 monograph Zhizn’ kavalera don Zhuana Paesiello [sic], znamenitago sochinitelia muzyki [...]. (The life of Don Juan Paisiello, renowned composer of music) by Ivan de Dominich.


Data on the earliest rehearsals of Glinka’s famous opera Ruslan i Liudmila (1842), including the names of the players at the first run-through on 10 August 1842 at the apartment of Glinka’s mother; also the schedule of rehearsals during the winter of 1842-1843.


Reprint of a placard from an 1842 performance of the opera.


A program from an 1853 muzykal’noe utro (musical morning) given by the young Balakirev (seventeen years old) at 2:00 p.m. on 22 March 1853 in a private St. Petersburg home. The program included works by Mendelssohn,
Schubert, Glinka, Dargomyzhskii, Ivan Fedorovich Laskovskii (1799-1855) and three compositions by Balakirev.


A remarkable ten-page bibliographic listing which includes eighty-four titles, providing in most cases author, date and place of publication, format and collation.

VYPUSK III (Volume III) 1907
1. 1-40. Iakov Fon-Shtelin (1712-1785).

Findeizen gives a brief preface (pp. 1-3) to the reprinting of two bibliographic rarities written by the German-born Russian art historian Jacob von Staehlin:

A. 4-25. Kratkoe izvestie—o teatral'nykh predstavleniakh v Rossi; ot nachala ikh do 1768 goda, sochinnennena na nemetskom deisvitel'nym statskim sovetnikom Ia. Shtelinyam. Short report on theatrical productions in Russia from their beginnings until 1768, composed in German by the state advisor Ia[kob] [von] Shtelin.


Portrait:
/I. Iakov Fon-Shtelin Shtomeburg (1712-1785).

2. 41-54. Teatr i muzyka v provintsii v nachale XIX v (1809, 1812 gg.). Theatre and music in the provinces in the beginning of the nineteenth century (1809, 1812).

Quoting directly from the pages of 1809 and 1812 issues of the St. Petersburg journal Severnaia pochta, Findeizen presents excerpts of articles describing the musical activities of nineteen Russian provinces.


Findeizen expresses special pleasure at bringing to the readership of Muzykal'naia starina a selection of caricatures by Stepanov (the brother-in-law of composer Dargomyzhskii) which illustrated a long out-of-print Muzykal'nyi al'omb (1819). Particularly the caricatures of singer Kastrioto Skanderbek and critic/composer Tolstoi were, in Findeizen’s opinion, rare prints.

Caricatures reproduced (without pagination):


VYPUSK IV (Volume IV) 1907

Smolenskii introduces the krepostnoi khudozhnik (serf artist) Stepan Degtirev (1766-1813) and his patriotic oratorio Minin i Pozharskii (1811). The article includes a narrative analysis of the numbers in the three-act work.


Musical examples in piano-vocal score from Minin i Pozharskii: Act II, instrumental introduction, opening recitative (Minin, Pozharskii and Palitsyn) and first aria (Palitsyn); Act III, instrumental introduction.


A prefatory section by Findeizen introduces the publication of forty-six letters housed in the Imperial Public Library written to Prince Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevskii by the composers L’vov (thirty-four letters between 1835 and 1866, pp. 92-117) and Serov (twelve letters between 1859 and 1868, pp. 118-141).


The original letters, housed in the Imperial Public Library, were sent to L’vov by a variety of foreign artists
including Luigi Cherubini (n.d.), Hector Berlioz (1845), Felix Mendelssohn (1840, 1845), Giovanni Rubini (1843), Giacomo Meyerbeer (1841), Ignatius Moscheles (1848), François Fétis (1855), Peter Lindpainter (1852).

* * *

VYPUSK V (Volume V) 1911


A lengthy biographical article summarizing the career and scholarship of Findeizen's recently deceased friend and colleague. The article is richly illustrated by the following photographs:


b. 16/17. S. V. Smolenskii i S. A. Rachinskii na balkone Tatevskago doma (snimok kontsa 1880-x godov). S. V. Smolenskii and S. A. Rachinski on the balcony of the Tatevsky house (taken at the end of the 1880s).


d. 32/33. Faksimile pis'ma S. V. Smolenskago, adresovannago redaktsii Russkoi muzykal'noi gazety, 26 iulia 1901. Petergov. Faksimile of a letter from S. V. Smolenskii addressed to the editor of the Russkaiia muzykal'naia gazeta, dated 26 July 1901. Peterhof [Petropavlosk].

e. 33/34. Rabochii kabinet S. V. Smolenskago v S. Peterburge. S. V. Smolenskii's office in St. Petersburg.


Findeizen compiles a detailed bibliography listing forty-five of Smolenskii's writings. The bibliography concludes (p. 46) with a section designated Periodicheskaia izdania v kolikh pechatalis' stat'i S. V. Smolenskago (Periodicals in which articles by S. V. Smolenskii have been printed).


Findeizen reproduces an extensive example of Smolenskii's finest liturgical scholarship in an article completed by Smolenskii in 1908, the year before his death.


Twenty-four choral examples illustrate Smolenskii's text.

* * *

VYPUSK VI (Volume VI) 1911


The correspondence from composer Verstovskii to his academic friend Stepan Petrovich Shevyrev (1806-1864), a professor at Moscow University, consists of nine letters spanning a period of thirty-three years. Findeizen, in his preface (pp. 103-105), notes that only twelve of Vestovskii's letters had hitherto been published, an unfortunate situation due to the fact that Verstovskii was the earliest Russian composer at that point for whom a body of correspondence existed. These particular letters were housed in the Imperial Public Library and were brought to Findeizen's attention by a librarian.


A preface (pp. 116-117) introduces letters involving Ulybyshchev's correspondence with two noted nineteenth-century music figures:


These three letters (translated into Russian from the original French) from Ulybyshchev (1794-1858) to the littérauteur Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevskii (1804-1869), emanate from the years when Ulybyshchev was writing his early three-volume biography of Mozart, Nouvelle biographie de Mozart, suivie d’un aperçu de l’histoire générale de la musique et de l’analyse des principales œuvres de Mozart (Moscow, 1843).

Findeizen reprints fourteen letters (in the original Russian) from Ulybyshev to Balakirev (1836-1910), dating from 1856 to 1858.

Illustrations:

a. /103 A. D. Ulybyshev (1794-1858).


Balakirev served as Shestakova’s agent when Ruslan i Liudmila was first produced in Prague on 5 February 1867 by the Czech National Theatre. He traveled twice to Prague to arrange and oversee the production, during which time he sent Shestakova these letters reporting on his actions. Findeizen obtained copies of the sixteen letters from Shestakova herself (the originals were held in the St. Petersburg Glinka Museum). Into this correspondence are interpolated two brief letters of interest.

i. 146-147. Prilozhenie (pis’mo O. Kallarzha k L. Shestakovoi). Supplement (a letter from O. Kallarzha to L. Shestakova).

A letter to Liudmila Shestakova from Osip Kollarzh, the translator of Ruslan i Liudmila into Czech.


A letter from an unidentified A. Pater acknowledging receipt of a sketch book for Ruslan i Liudmila.


Brief notes on new discoveries regarding Dargomyzhskii’s ancestors.

Southern Methodist University
"Politics" and the Musical Press in 1830

Peter Bloom
(Northampton, Massachusetts)

The enormous resources of the periodical press may be appreciated in essentially two ways: in and of themselves, as primary, public, literary, and sometimes visual documents representative of previous cultures; and, indirectly, as instruments that shed additional light on subjects illuminated by other documents—sketches, drafts, autograph manuscripts, published scores, letters, paintings, prints—long studied by musical scholars. Systematic musicology, as the “Benjamin” in the family of art- and literary-historical disciplines, has only recently begun seriously to consider the press as something other than material with which to fatten a footnote. For the period considered here (the end of the Bourbon Restoration in France and the beginning of the July Monarchy) the press—catalyst of the three-day revolution of 1830 and outlet for the continuing political emotionalism during the nervous opening of the reign of Louis-Philippe—is of especial importance. Indeed, the restrictions and censorship imposed upon the press at the end of the reign of Charles X were followed, after the Revolution, by a five-year period of relative freedom and independence, with newspapers and magazines celebrating a new-found liberty that Eugène Delacroix captured in his famous painting of 1830, La Liberté guidant le peuple.¹ To study in microcosm the role the press plays in our understanding of the musical history of this volatile period, I shall examine, within this context, the work of two figures prominent at the time—both writers, both composers.

At the opening of 1830, F.-J. Fétis’s La Musique mise à la portée de tout le monde went on sale. It is a text on what we have come to call “music appreciation” and was one of the first of its kind.² At the close of 1830, Hector Berlioz’s Symphonie fantastique was performed for the first time. As a large-scale symphonic composition with a richly imaginative literary program, it too was one of the first of its kind. These works—Fétis’s book and especially Berlioz’s symphony—have been frequently scrutinized by students of nineteenth-century French music. Both marked turning points in their authors’ careers, Fétis reaching out to a broad musical public in order to satisfy what he took to be an increased “need to know,” Berlioz putting forth his ultra-modern and difficult composition in order to announce publicly both the termination of his student days and the invention of a new kind of music, the “genre instrumental expressif.”³ Fétis’s book was later subject to a certain amount of ironic commentary and even a bit of ridicule because of its curious subtitle, “exposé succinct de tout ce qui est nécessaire pour juger de cet art, et pour en parler sans l’avoir étudié.” Berlioz’s symphony, with its curious program, “Épisode de la vie d’un artiste,” was likewise flouted as an attempt to produce an effect more realistic than that of which pure instrumental music was deemed capable. And the comparison of these two works might be fruitfully pursued, if only to heighten the irony of the animosity that arose between their authors and that endured for nearly two decades: for Fétis, Berlioz became the incarnation of everything in modern music that was “bizarre” and “fantastique”; for Berlioz, Fétis became the embodiment of everything in the musical world that was reactionary, academic and wrong.⁴ Be this as it may, one thing is certain: during the two decades that followed the Revolution of 1830, and even beyond, Fétis was known in certain circles primarily as the author of La Musique mise à la portée de tout le monde; Berlioz, throughout his lifetime and until relatively recent years, was likewise essentially known as the composer of the Symphonie fantastique.

Of pre-eminent importance in establishing such enduring attributions and in setting these authors’ reputations in motion, were the first reviews of La Musique and the Fantastique. Were these reviews influenced by considerations other than the inherent values of the works as perceived by the reviewers? Most definitely. The notion of the aesthetic object as entirely divorced from its creator’s life and culture was not to be articulated until a later generation. Furthermore, it would be utterly naive to minimize or ignore the importance of personal friendship, intrigue, and what we would call corruption in the journalistic-reviewing process of nineteenth-century France: the correspondence of all the great romantic writers, to say nothing of works such as Balzac’s Les Illusions perdues, proves this beyond the shadow of a doubt. It is likewise certain that “politics,” loosely defined, played a role.⁵ But this role is difficult to define, for the art columns in the journals of the period were en principe non-political. Indeed, the marvellously ambiguous French expression en principe is here entirely apt: what is en principe the case is often simply not.

The political battlegrounds of 1830 included the supporters of the hereditary Bourbon monarchy and of

¹In addition, it is worthy of note that Charles X’s 1830 restrictions met with vigorous resistance precisely because the press had had a taste of freedom in 1828 and 1829 as a result of the liberal law of 19 June 1828, enacted during the ministry of the Vicomte de Martignac.


³My use of the word “politics” is intentionally loose, so as to include the overlapping realms of morals and religion. These three realms, after all, were the primary concerns of the censors at the time. See, for example, Odile Krakovitch, Les Pièces de théâtre soumises à la censure (1800-1830) (Paris, 1982).

⁴The symphony was the embodiment of the new genre. Berlioz wrote about it six weeks prior to the première in his article “Aperçu sur la musique classique et la musique romantique,” Le Correspondant (22 October 1830): 110-112.

⁵The original respectful relationship between the two men was rekindled in the 1850s by a mutual admiration for Gluck and a mutual distrust of Wagner.
Charles X, roi de France; the supporters of the Orléans branch of the royal family and—after the July Revolution—of Louis-Philippe, roi des Français; the advocates of a second republic, modeled either on aspects of the first, or on the American model; the advocates of a return to power of the Bonapartes and of a Napoleonic kind of rule; and the advocates of social Catholicism or of other species of “utopian” socialism. Overlaid on these general categories were the tensions among the nobility, the inevitably “rising” bourgeoisie, and the “people”; the tensions between those devoutly of the Catholic faith and those who espoused other faiths or other flags; and the more subtle tensions within some of these groups, most importantly—this was the central political issue of the day—those between the constitutional monarchists who wanted most power in the custody of the document, and the constitutional monarchists who wanted most power in the clutches of the man. For the modern Western reader who might tend automatically to assume that change away from divine-right monarchy and towards “democracy” was a proverbial “good thing,” I should like to add a small proviso. The period of the Bourbon Restoration—the reigns of Louis XVII (1814-1824) and Charles X (1824-1830)—was far from a continuously repressive and totalitarian one. The most noted authority on the period claims that a skillful foreign policy rapidly restored France to a leading position in Europe, that the constitutional charter issued by Louis XVIII in 1824 led to an important experience in parliamentary government, and that the general atmosphere proved conducive to a good deal of artistic and intellectual vitality. Indeed, from my own work on Berlioz and Fétis, I have seen that with the departure of Charles X and his Director of Fine Arts, the Vicomte Sosthène de La Rochefoucauld—who had been something of a protector for both the young composer and the seasoned professor, and who was partially responsible for the renovation of the Opéra in the

---

late 1820s and the creation of the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire—the wheels of the arts turned more slowly for the next several years. Berlioz’s prediction—"cette révolution est faite exprès pour la liberté des arts; je parvien-drai dix fois plus tôt que je n’eusse fait sans elle"—did not, in fact, come true. Indeed, at the end of 1830, Balzac went so far as to say that "la liberté rend tout impossible en littérature. La Révolution n’a pas donné un seul chef-d’œuvre, parce qu’on pouvait tout faire et tout dire, et que les littérateurs ne brillent que par l’attaque ou la résistance."  

The following newspapers and magazines have been checked for reviews of the works by Berlioz and Fétié under consideration here. All were in existence during at least a part of 1830, when La Musique and/or the Fantastique appeared. Establishing the dates of the existence of nineteenth-century French periodicals is by no means an easy task. Changes of title, subtitle and ownership were frequent. The dates in parentheses below are those of the relevant continuous series, under one principal title, as indicated in the Catalogue collectif des périodiques at the Bibliothèque Nationale (constantly under revision) in Paris. An asterisk precedes the names of the principal daily newspapers. My grouping in three broad categories—sufficient, perhaps, for musical purposes, but certainly not for subtle political analysis—is based both on my own reading of some of these periodicals and on a selection of research that I have found especially useful. The grouping is valid uniquely for 1830: it was not long before certain “militant liberals” of that year (Adolphe Thiers and François Guizot, for example) began to be regarded in some quarters as reactionary enemies of democracy. This list includes the principal newspapers and magazines of Paris in 1830, but it is not exhaustive. It does, I believe, include all periodicals in which reviews of musical matters were likely to appear. Generally “for” the constitutional monarchy of Louis-Philippe:
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the time—only about 30% of the French population was literate around 1830—I present as well the circulation statistics for October 1830 given by Le Mercure des salons, a fashionable review, in December 1830:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Constitutionnel</td>
<td>18,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Journal des débats</td>
<td>11,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Gazette de France</td>
<td>9,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Courrier français</td>
<td>5,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Temps</td>
<td>5,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Quotidienne</td>
<td>5,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le National</td>
<td>2,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Figaro</td>
<td>2,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tribune des départements</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Révolution de 1830</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Le Mercure des salons, 4 December 1830)

While these figures do not indicate total press runs, they do make clear why Fétis—whose own magazine, the Revue musicale had an approximate average circulation of 300 copies—maintained an interest in writing music criticism for two daily newspapers, Le Temps and Le National. Berlioz too, as a writer for the specialized Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris—whose circulation was also in the hundreds, not thousands—reached many more general readers as music critic for the Journal des débats.

I have thus far found reviews of Fétis's La Musique in the following publications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Date, Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Gazette littéraire</td>
<td>7 January 1830 (pp. 82-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Figaro</td>
<td>8 January 1830 (pp. 1-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the première of the Symphonie fantastique (5 December 1830) I have located reviews as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Date, Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le National</td>
<td>6 December 1830 (p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Figaro</td>
<td>7 December 1830 (pp. 3-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue musicale</td>
<td>11 December 1830 (pp. 89-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Temps</td>
<td>26 December 1830 (col. 5637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue de Paris</td>
<td>December 1830 (pp. 120-123)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that further reviews will be found by others: some, far from being set off in the journals by headlines of italics, are couched in mid-column—one more item of many variétés or faits divers. The explanation of the relatively small number of reviews listed here is revealing: books on music, no matter how non-technical, were hardly "popular" at the time, although Fétis's La Musique was by any measure a "success." As for Berlioz's symphony, the première took place on the very day—in one of the grand ironic twists of music history—on which an exceptional benefit performance was given at the Opéra for none other than Harriet Smithson! Newspapers were accustomed to covering the Opéra, as they were all the lyric and dramatic theaters of the capital, including the lesser ones on the boulevard. Concerts at the Conservatoire, however, where Berlioz gave the Fantastique, were on few journalists' regular beat. Furthermore, as Berlioz himself said at the time, and as any reader of the 1830 newspapers would agree, everyone was mesmerized during the autumn by the forthcoming trial of the former ministers of Charles X. In his diary entry for 6 December 1830, the Austrian Ambassador to France, Comte Antoine-Rodolphe Apponyi, jotted down the following:

On ne parle que du procès des anciens ministres; l'agitation qu'on éprouve à l'approche de cette époque tout redoutée par tous ceux qui aiment le repos, se communique maintenant même aux plus intrépides. . . . en un mot, Paris, de plus en plus, prend un aspect inquiétant et sinistre; on voit partout comme surgissant de la terre, de ces figures horribles de la Révolution, présage effrayant d'émeutes populaires.13

12The 1830 edition of La Musique—a printing of some 2,000 copies—was sold out in less than two years. The second edition (Paris, 1834) appeared in an exceptional run of 4,000 copies—exceptional because at the time even a "best-selling" author could hope to sell at most some 1,200 copies of a new work. See the Préface to the third edition of La Musique (Paris, 1847); and Jean-Yves Mollier, Michel & Calmann Lévy ou la naissance de l'éditeur moderne (Paris, 1984), p. 53.

On the same day, *Le Courrier français* observed:

Les circonstances sont trop graves, les événements se pressent avec trop de rapidité, pour que nous entretenions longuement nos lecteurs des jeux frivoles du théâtre. Les directeurs de spectacles devraient, dans l'intérêt même de leurs entreprises, ajourner la première représentation des ouvrages qui présentent quelques chances de succès.  

In short, Berlioz's symphony, whose dramatic mixture of balls and pastoral scenes and witches and executions so aptly reflects the social, political and artistic atmosphere of the fall of 1830, could not have been premièred at a less opportune moment. In spite of the extraordinary and unprecedented program of this work, whose raison d'être as an attention-getter was even more urgent in December than it was in June (when the symphony was originally scheduled to be performed), everything conspired to keep the interest of the public and the press on a reality, rather than a symphony, that was "fantastique." It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the work performed at the Conservatoire on 5 December 1830 became both the exordium of its composer's reputation and the emblem of nineteenth-century French instrumental music.

Is there anything blatantly "political" about the several reviews of the première of the *Symphonie fantastique*? In the case of the best known review, from the pen of the editor of the *Revue musicale*, himself an ardent supporter of the July Revolution and the Orleanist monarchy, the answer is no. F.-J. Fétis applauded *Un Bal* and the *Marche du supplice*; he suggested that the other movements stimulated more astonishment than pleasure, and he concluded with a mixture of moderate praise and advice. The short, unsigned, and fully positive article anticipated in the recent revolution is not surprising from the pen of this aristocrat (whose father, incidentally, was the dedicatee of Haydn's string quartets, Opp. 71 and 74).

Berlioz initially qualified the symphony's march as "du supplice." Only when the full score was printed (in 1844) did he change the title to "Marche au supplice." The first version of the program of the symphony, contained in the letter of 16 April 1830 to Humbert Ferrand, says "au." This is an error on the part of the nineteenth-century editor of the *Lettres intimes* (Paris, 1882)—an error followed by the editor of the Berlioz's new *Correspondance générale* I (op. cit., p. 319). The versions of the program printed in *Le Figaro* (21 May 1830) and the *Journal des comédiens* (23 May 1830), as well as all eight subsequent versions of the program up to 1844, say "du supplice," as do the early reviews.

This small difference may not be related to the subject considered here, but it is important for the interpretation of the literary program of Berlioz's symphony: "Marche au supplice" is readily translated—and apparently means—"March to the scaffold," that is, march to the guillotine, to the instrument of execution. "March du supplice" is not easily rendered in English; "supplice," here, takes on the more general meaning of "torure" or "agony." A "marche du supplice" is presumably a "death march." The point is that the earlier title is less specifically descriptive of an action, and more generally descriptive of a state of mind.

in *Le National* (possibly sketched by Fétis as well) is likewise devoid of "doctrine": the symphony "n'est pas moins remarquable par la hardiesse et l'originalité des idées, que par la nouveauté de la forme." *Le Figaro*, very encouraging when it published the program of the symphony on 21 May 1830 and here, again, fully positive, makes indirect reference to the intransigence of "officiodalm" (which refused Berlioz permission to enjoy the benefits of his Prix de Rome while remaining in Paris) by saying that "cinq ou six salves d'applaudissements et des trépignements d'admiration ont dédommagé M. Berlioz des obstacles sans nombre dont la routine a hérissé les premiers pas de sa carrière." Equally important is the preview of the symphony that appeared in *Le Figaro* one day prior to the concert, on 4 December 1830, likening the *Fantastique* to Goethe's novel, *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, and crediting Berlioz—because of the parody of the *Dies irae* in his finale—with having invented a new genre: not "la musique sacrée," but rather "la musique impie." In the December issue of the *Revue de Paris*, a lengthy, anonymous, and thoroughly negative review gives a part of the program of the symphony and concludes that "par amour de l'art et de ses progrès, on [ne] doit faire aucune grâce à ces recherches d'effets placés en dehors de l'art lui-même." Finally, on 26 December 1830—three weeks after the première—*Le Temps* published a long, eloquent, and enthusiastic review of the concert, one that included a description of the composer as an extraordinarily bold and impetuous young man, too headstrong to consider obeying the traditional rules of the so-called "vrai beau," too busy during the concert to acknowledge the frantic applause of the audience.

Most important to observe here is that the several newspapers and magazines which considered Berlioz's concert even worthy of mention were either firm supporters of the new régime or leaning to its "left" (*Le National*). Perhaps further research will demonstrate that the reactionary press continued to ignore instrumental music throughout the nineteenth century. Otherwise it need only be said that the issue on which the appreciation of Berlioz's symphony turned was the aesthetic question of "program music" and the relative distinctness of the arts. By choosing to distribute the story of the "Episode de la vie d'un artiste," Berlioz issued a kind of manifesto about the expressive powers of instrumental music, and he "forced" his early reviewers to take a stand on mat-
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15 Berlioz initially qualified the symphony's march as "du supplice." Only when the full score was printed (in 1844) did he change the title to "Marche au supplice." The first version of the program of the symphony, contained in the letter of 16 April 1830 to Humbert Ferrand, says "au." This is an error on the part of the nineteenth-century editor of the *Lettres intimes* (Paris, 1882)—an error followed by the editor of the Berlioz's new *Correspondance générale* I (op. cit., p. 319). The versions of the program printed in *Le Figaro* (21 May 1830) and the *Journal des comédiens* (23 May 1830), as well as all eight subsequent versions of the program up to 1844, say "du supplice," as do the early reviews.

16 The writer suggests that "la musique impie" would be a "sujet de pleurs et de grincement de dents pour la Gazette"—a reference to the solemn religious sentiments of the *Gazette de France*.

17 This article apparently made something of a sensation. It is referred to in a letter from Elise Julhiet to Nanci Berlioz, dated 30 January 1831. (See David Cairns, "Reflections on the Symphonie fantastique of 1830," in Peter Bloom, ed. *Music in Paris in the Eighteen-Thirties* [New York: Pendragon Press, 1987], p. 81-96.) It is possible that the author was Berlioz's friend Ernest Legouvé. In his *Soixante ans de souvenirs* (Paris, 1886), Legouvé wrote of the *Symphonie fantastique*: "Elle n'avait été exécutée qu'une fois encore en public et j'avais écrit sur l'œuvre et sur l'auteur un article plein d'espérance enthousiaste." (vol. 1, p. 295.)
ters other than the intrinsic merits of the score as they heard it. The legacy of this choice is still with us: in any discussion of program music, the Fantastique is certain to appear.

The first review of Fétis's La Musique was published in the distinguished weekly, La Gazette littéraire. In six columns of fine print (a competitor remarked that the Gazette was "un excellent journal pour essayer des lunettes"), the anonymous critic praises the purpose, organization, and style of the book, and gives a summary of its contents. "C'est pour la foule de ceux qui aiment la musique sans l'avoir apprise que M. Fétis a composé son ouvrage," he writes: "Nous l'en remercions bien sincèrement tant en notre nom qu'en celui de la grande majorité des amateurs de musique." Le Figaro printed a cleverly written review on 8 January, complimenting Fétis for having published a most instructive work with the weighty solemnity of the professor, but with the light touch of a friendly guide—thus inspiring in the reader the desire to attempt to base musical judgements on knowledge rather than on prejudice. The third review appeared in Fétis's "own" journal, Le Temps. In a lengthy and thoroughly positive article, the writer recognizes the absolute novelty of introducing music to all classes of society (Bach, Handel, and even Cherubini would be shocked, he says), and he suggests that this is a progressive step in the history of the arts, one much in tune with the times. "Il faut, avant tout, être de son temps, ou, comme dit le proverbe, hurler avec les loups." He furthermore notes, as did the writer for Le Figaro, that by indirectly challenging the authority of certain "professional" critics, who considered themselves the final arbiters of taste, Fétis only sharpened the boldness of his endeavour.

The fourth review of La Musique, unsigned, appeared in Le Courrier français; it is as laudatory as the first three, but criticizes Fétis on two points for which modern musicological readers would give him credit. Fétis had kind words for the castrato voice; our reviewer finds the very thought of the attendant operation immoral and reprehensible. Fétis praised J. S. Bach as "l'un de ces rares génies qui sont comme des phares immenses placés au milieu des siècles pour les éclairer"; our reviewer finds such praise exaggerated. Otherwise he is pleased that some of those who make judgements will now be able to do so on the basis of at least a minimum amount of knowledge and instruction. The fifth review, which appeared in Le Globe, was written by François Loève-Veimars, a well known journalist at the time and the translator of the works of E. T. A. Hoffman (which were to know a tremendous success in France).18 After gently poking fun at Fétis's subtitle by suggesting that the French were already expert at speaking magniloquently on subjects of which they were ignorant, Loève-Veimars goes on to praise the book as a kind of grammar, or glossary, that would equip the public to appreciate both music itself and the increasingly sophisticated music criticism of the periodical press. The final review of the first edition of Fétis's La Musique, now coupled to a complementary volume entitled Curiosités de la musique (Paris, 1830), appeared in Le National, in two parts, over the initials "L.P." These volumes are deemed worthy of praise both as works of "science" and as works of literature. Fétis's view of the diminished state of music in France, in comparison with the prosperity of the art enjoyed in Germany, is vigorously seconded by the critic.

It is once again more by where they appear than by precisely what they say that these reviews may be seen to have a certain "political" significance, since all appeared in journals clearly on the "left" during the final months of the reign of Charles X. It is noteworthy indeed that the initial reaction to an unprecedented work by an apparently conservative professor was uniformly positive. One may assume that the notion of music "pour tout le monde," the notion of music "explained to the world," as the English translators would put it, was fully in accordance with the wishes of those who would reform the system of privilege at the time by means of a more constitutional, or democratic, form of government.

The "democratization" of music was an ideal towards which Fétis worked, as journalist, historian, theoretician, conductor, and teacher, throughout his eighty-seven-year lifetime. Though something of an idealist himself in and around the year of the July Revolution, Berlioz would later satirize and depreciate political systems and institutions, disappointed as he was by their reception of ideas he considered worthy of support. Like Fétis's La Musique, however, Berlioz's Fantastique stands as a symbol of its creator's ideals in 1830. In order to explain the force which set in motion the historical mechanism that caused such symbols to endure, we must view them in light of the first reaction they produced, conscious, at least, of the potential influence "politics" might have exerted. In the exceptional cases studied here—in the musical world of this period, anything other than opera and ballet may be considered "exceptional"—the influence of politics is not ample. Nor is it totally absent. With this information, and with more information about the owners, editors, and columnists of these publications—separate and enormous subjects that I have studiously avoided here—we may take a step, admittedly infinitesimal, towards greater understanding of the relationship between politics and music. □

18 Though best known as the translator of Hoffman, Loève-Veimars was the veritable inaugurator of the political voice of the famous Revue des deux mondes. His pen was powerful, and apparently well paid for. See Gabriel de Broglie, op. cit., p. 30; and Maxime du Camp, Souvenirs littéraires (Paris, 1883).
The *Gazzetta musicale di Napoli* 1852-1868

Tiziana Grande (Naples)

In the autumn of 1838 a *Gazzetta musicale* edited by Alessandro Mampieri was printed at the Vesuvio Printing House in Naples. It was an unusual journal among the large number of the city's artistic-literary publications which, for the most part, were devoted to local theatrical and musical events. This new "weekly" gazette contained theatre news, biographies of musicians and unsophisticated articles on musical philosophy, and managed to publish its fifth issue in February 1839, without, however, its weekly deadline having ever been respected. In this issue the following notice to its readers appeared:

The task of [publishing] a musical gazette is an original enterprise in Italy, and of such great importance that for the time being the editor will only be able to publish two numbers a month. It is certain, however, that the *Gazzetta* will continue to be published.  

Despite this statement, no issues after the fifth are to be found in Neapolitan libraries, and probably none was ever published. This gazette was, as a matter of fact, the product of one man, its founder, director and writer all in one, Alessandro Mampieri. Such periodicals usually disappeared when their initial capital was exhausted. The musical milieu of the city, still too immature to appreciate such a remarkable enterprise, did not seem to regret its disappearance. The Neapolitan public was used to witnessing the rise and fall of an enormous number of journals and pamphlets. These publications contained, amongst other things, news and reports of musical events written by men of letters and poets who were habitués of the theatres, or articles by poison-pen critics writing under such pseudonyms as Sem, Flik, Flok, Arlecchino or Mefistofele.

The Neapolitan newspaper environment of the first half of the 19th century lacked journalism of any refinement. Above all it lacked a refined public at which such journalistic efforts might be aimed. This lack, however, was compensated for to a certain extent, by the use of humor, biting commentary and an omnipresent irony. Newspapers paid greater attention to style and form than to actual content. In the field of musical criticism in particular, the characteristic of vagueness so permeated the style as to allow technical ignorance to be disguised in a more or less stereotyped language. As is well known, "music" at that time was practically a synonym for "opera," and among the many elements of a theatrical performance (singing, action, scenery, costumes, etc.) music was the most neglected in the reviews.

Therefore, the aims Alessandro Mampieri declared in that first issue of the *Gazzetta musicale* were all the more pioneering:

[...] the opera critic must be a man of great knowledge, and as at each moment in every scene, many forms of art converge [...], it behooves the critic with shrewd discernment to address himself in his review to the artistic merits rather than to mere description; wherefore it is well that [...] he be highly instructed in the most exact notions of music.

Only in the second half of the 19th century is the amateur music critic replaced by the professional; the "one-man" periodical gives way to a more organized arrangement and one sees the start of more industrialized production techniques in journals aimed at a particular segment of the public. The periodical issued under the name of *Gazzetta musicale di Napoli* started its publication on 3 July 1852 at the Girard & Co. printing house. This periodical can undoubtedly be considered the first Neapolitan music journal in the modern sense of the word. It had a clear editorial structure and commercial framework, a certain coherence and continuity of editorial staff, and a distinct readership—for the most part involved in the musical world—all of which guaranteed the success of the gazette and allowed it to survive for sixteen years.

The main reason for the good fortune of the *Gazzetta* can in large part be attributed to its editor-owner Teodoro Cottrau (see illustration), an imaginative and far-sighted spirit with a highly developed business sense, a musician in his own right who had a profound knowledge of the musical and intellectual life of the city. In
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1 "La intrapresa di una Gazzetta di musica è lavoro originale in Italia e di si grande importanza che per ora lo estensore non potrà pubblicare che due fogli al mese. È certo però che il giornale avrà continuazione [...]" *Gazzetta musicale* 1, no. 5 (20 February 1839): 20.

2 The few extant numbers of this journal can be found in the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli.


4 See the catalogue of the exhibition *La satira politica nei giornali napoletani, 1869-1899* (Naples, Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali – Biblioteca Universitaria, 1986).

5 "[... ] il censore dell'opera in musica a grandi conoscenze è tenuto, e siccome in ogni momento, in ogni scena, tante arite fra di loro convengono [...] è d'uopo che debbe il censore con avveduto divisamento versarsi in la rivista sull'arte anziché sulla semplice descrizione: lasciale è di mettere che [...] sia egli altamente istruito nelle più esatte nozioni di musica."

6 This journal can be found in Naples in the following libraries: Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica "S. Pietro a Majella" (years 1852-1868); Biblioteca dell'Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici "B. Croce" (years 1852-1858); Biblioteca Universitaria (years 1853-1855).

1847 Cottrau succeeded his father as director of the Girard Press Co. and transformed it into the highly successful Stabilimento Musicale Partenopeo di Teodoro Cottrau, the most important Neapolitan musical publishing house of the 19th century. The publication of the Gazzetta very soon revealed itself to be a real commercial success, surprising even Cottrau, who directed the journal from 1856 to 1860. Cottrau succeeded Pasquale Trisolini, the journal’s first director who also served as writer and editor-in-chief from 1852 to 1859. The Gazzetta, which was published weekly, had doubled in length by the twenty-second issue of its first year. Cottrau, because of his investment in the journal, possessed a powerful method of advertising the various musical publications of his Stabilimento Partenopeo. About this time Italy was witnessing the birth of many of its most important musical magazines of the century, magazines which were published by its main music publishers: the Gazzetta musicale di Milano published by Ricordi (1842-1848; 1850-1862; 1866-1912); L’Italia musicale published by Lucca (1847-1859); the Gazzetta musicale di Firenze published by Guidi (1853-1855). Apart from the large amount of space given to advertisements, it is easy to see that the choice of articles was often linked to recently published musical scores. In the Gazzetta musicale di Napoli we find, for instance, a review extended over four issues dedicated to Elena di Tolosa by Petrella, performed at the Real Teatro del Fondo on 12 August 1852. This score was published by the Girard Press Company, which owned the copyright and performance rights in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. On another occasion, when Cottrau published posthumously a Method for the Pianoforte by Francesco Lanza, there immediately appeared a biography on the Neapolitan maestro in the journal.

The Gazzetta was often accused by other journals of this sort of commercial conflict of interest, which indeed characterized the gazette. Omnibus, for example, in its issue of 20 February 1856 insinuated that the Gazzetta did not agree with the program choices of the Royal Theatre management since its editor had an economic interest in seeing selected only scores published by the Stabilimento Partenopeo. The Gazzetta professed shock at the accusation that they would exploit artistic values for mere commercial gain, and proudly answered that the Stabilimento Partenopeo already had an excellent contract with that management, and therefore had no need of further publicity. Such a proud and independent attitude characterized the sixteen years of the paper’s publication and its four directors.

The Gazzetta’s greatest strength was the competence of its writers: We would like to remind those who call us pedants or who accuse us of excessive severity, that the Gazzetta musicale has a very different mission from that of other periodicals which are not specifically musical [...] We have nothing against those literary, humorous or fashion publications which expose in their articles the impressions that a composition or an artist have produced on a public, and to give judgments that their more or less refined taste may suggest. We cannot, however, allow ourselves to deal with Art from a limited point of view. The aim of our paper is Art’s importance, its progress and its perfection.
Gazzetta Musicale di Napoli
EDITA DAL PRIVILEGIATO STABILIMENTO MUSICALI PARTECIPATO

9 Maggio 1857
Ufficio: Strada S. Pietro a Majella, 31
Anno VI. N° 15

Giungono a Ferragosto dal Gran Duca di Toscana le ultime notizie di apprezzamento della sua squisita collezione musicale, non manca alcun motivo per meravigliarsi della sua capacità e del suo gusto in questo campo intellettuale.

La Gazzetta Musicale ha sempre mantenuto la sua posizione di primissimo piano, tanto per l'importanza delle informazioni che ne pubblica, quanto per l'attenzione e la cura che vi mette.

Storia de' teatri musicali di Parigi

VIII

Il PARIGI, VERO CFINE DELLA MUSICA

Gazzetta musicale di Napoli 7, no. 1 (2 January 1858): 3.

Glancing through the rather short list of writers, one can find quite a few individuals involved in the Conservatory and in the Neapolitan musical world. But before
ci accusa di rigorismo, che la Gazzetta Musicale ha una missioni

14 For a better understanding of the Neapolitan environment of the time see F. Florimo, La scuola musicale di Napoli e i suoi con

dealing with them individually, one must first take into consideration the atmosphere and the spirit of musical activity in Naples, a city whose musical life during this period was suspended halfway between tradition and attempts at a renewal of taste, a city very much the victim of a narrow-minded and provincial environment. Mu-
sical activity was fervent, however, and there was a sincere wish for change, exemplified in the Gazzetta’s many attempts at musical criticism, in its articles on history and on musical aesthetics, and in its expressions of faith that a renewal of the teaching methods in and outside the Conservatory could lead to an improvement in musical taste: “We can only hope that the leaves of a periodical may have an influence on the Neapolitan music schools.” In fact since its very first issue it had published proposals for the reform of musical teaching and articles dealing with musical pedagogy. After 1856 the greater part of them had been written by Michele Ruta, one of the most important figures in the musical milieu of the period. In addition, other music teachers on the editorial staff also contributed articles on musical pedagogy. We still have some of their didactic pamphlets, several projects for various musical reforms. One such writer is Ferdinando Taglioni, editor-in-chief of the Gazzetta (together with Trisolini) from 1856 to 1859, and director of the theatrical agency which Teodoro Cottrau—like many other newspaper directors—founded in 1856. Taglioni wrote many articles on music theory and music history in addition to music criticism, but his principal responsibility was for the column entitled “Settimana musicale napoletana,” a review of the city’s most important musical events. During the period of Cottrau’s direction we note in the Gazzetta a clear-cut organization of the different reviews, and a precise but not rigid division of roles among its more faithful contributors. Taglioni was responsible for theatrical reviews and essays on musical criticism and history; Salvatore Pappalardo, a prolific composer and the composition teacher of Cottrau, wrote analyses of recent publications; Giuseppe Siesto, a singing teacher wrote theatre reviews and reported on the singing situation and its teaching problems; the reviews of major events in Paris were assigned to Felice Cottrau, Teodoro’s uncle; Giorgio Kastner wrote articles on physics, acoustics and musical instruments; Emanuele Krakamp, a flute virtuoso, reviewed band and wind instrument concerts; Raffaele Colucci, a literary musicologist, wrote biographies of musicians. In addition to these regular writers, the Gazzetta always had room for many other occasional contributors, and granted them the utmost freedom to express their personal opinions.

In the articles bearing the author’s signature, each individual writer is responsible for his own opinions, and the Gazzetta, by rendering public these opinions, simply requires that its contributors respect the general and fundamental principles of Art, and that the utmost worship be given to the greatest musical geniuses. Only the articles that are not signed are the sole responsibility of the Gazzetta itself.

It is difficult, however, to assess how open-minded the attitude of the Gazzetta actually was towards highly personal opinions. It is after all understandable that excessive differences could not be tolerated by a magazine whose aim it was to be the “official music journal” of Naples. This, however, did not necessarily mean refusing certain contributors. Even a declared detractor of Verdi like the Neapolitan critic Andrea Martines had his column in the Gazzetta, but after three months of difficult collaboration and continuous quarrelling with Trisolini, he preferred to resign, justifying his resignation in an open letter to the director, published in the Gazzetta itself.

Under Cottrau’s direction the Gazzetta was characterized by quarrels amongst its contributors and with other papers, and by a great variety of subject matter and news, including both Italian and foreign reviews. The same characteristics of vitality are hardly to be found in the journal after Cottrau abandoned all editorial and musical activity and became involved in the political events of the sixties. The Gazzetta suspended publication from July 1860 to November 1861, after which date Ruta took over the direction of the journal, followed soon thereafter by Massone in 1862. During this period the Gazzetta becomes less interesting, had fewer regular columns, and is less engaged in matters of didactics, criticism and aesthetics. Such writers as Taglioni, Trisolini, Ruta, Colucci and Cottrau disappear from its pages and are replaced by names we know little of today: Girardi, Ghezzi, etc.

18 Krakamp is also the author of methods for flute, oboe, clarinet and bassoon.
19 “Negli articoli firmati, ciascuno de’ scrittori è responsabile di quel che scrive e la Gazzetta rendendo pubbliche le individuali opinioni de’ suoi compositori si serbi la unità de’ principi generali e fondamentali dell’arte, vuol che si serbi il culto dovuto ai sommi ingegni musicali. E solo gli articoli collettivi e non firmati si presentano come programma del giornale.”
20 Gazzetta musicale di Napoli 6, no. 29 (25 July 1857): 225.
21 Cottrau later became a contributor to L’indipendente, giornale quotidiano, politico, letterario, published in Naples from 1860 to 1870.
In the 1860s Italy witnessed the growth of instrumental concerts and the creation of new musical associations which were considered to be the only method of putting into action the commendable proposals needed to increase interest in Art. All the major Italian cities saw the birth of these associations, about which the pianist Giuseppe Mascia wrote in the Gazzetta:

[...] we cannot insist on patronage [...] Nowadays the noble class, with a few exceptions, is no longer interested in science, letters or the fine arts [...] Therefore, lacking its praiseworthy passion, it is useless for artists and maestros to seek such protection. They can only expect fruitless admiration and praise. On the grounds of these considerations we suggest, as the most obvious and efficacious means of discovering geniuses and of allowing them to reach the highest levels of fame, that every city foundphilharmonic associations of men of letters and lovers of musical science and art.[22]

In Naples, within a few years, many associations were founded: the Società del Quartetto and the Accademia di musica periodica in 1862; the Circolo artistico musicale Bonamici in 1863; the Società anonima per la diffusione delle opere musicali and the Società filarmonica Partenopea in 1864. These associations all found space in the pages of the Gazzetta for their programs, their communiqués and their activities. Entire numbers of the years 1864-1865 are dedicated to the publication of the minutes of the First Congress of Italian Musicians promoted by Ferdinando Bonamici in 1864.

The birth of these many institutions was testimony to a highly intense period of musical activity. But if, on the one hand, such activity had the merit of exposing instrumental music to a large section of the public and of helping young musicians to make a name for themselves, it also on the other hand created many closed musical circles which defended their own ideas and protégés, which furthered factional quarrelling and which soon undid their own efforts.

Even the Gazzetta, which had always declared itself uninvolved in partisan activity, could not avoid all sorts of accusations, and indeed it would be difficult to believe that this publication had no connection whatsoever with the many controversies which ensued from the musical productions of those years. Following is the reply of the Gazzetta to the magazine La scena of Trieste, which accused it of preferring the pot-pourris of the Circolo Bonamici to the classical offerings of the Società del Quartetto:

The Circolo is the environment where Modern Art and all its progress take place. The Quartetto is the study of a sole genre. The Circolo is a continuous and varied school; the Quartetto is the great master studied in isolation.23

Even though Mazzone vigorously defended himself by claiming the merit of having changed the Gazzetta from being the organ of the Stabilimento Musicale Partenopeo into a free and independent journal, it was quite easy to infer that the interests of the journal still lay in publicizing the works of contemporary Neapolitan composers, as the latter were all published by that same firm. By the end of 1864, however, the Gazzetta stopped publishing the procedural record of the meetings of the Circolo Bonamici.24

The new direction given to the paper by Mazzone is evident on each page. His motto was to “make the Gazzetta everyone’s journal.” But the excessive search for objectivity led to a lack of verve in the paper and probably to a decrease in its popularity and a return to its original number of columns. By limiting itself solely to the publication of the official procedural record of the city’s musical associations, and by trying to avoid wherever possible all of the commercial compromises which had led to its prosperity, the Gazzetta soon came to an end. Mazzone’s intentions of stubbornly carrying on with such policies, despite possible harm to the material interests of the journal, were frequently stated in the journal itself.

I didn’t care and I don’t care; I went ahead and I shall go ahead as long as I can [...] as long as I want.25

22 ["[...] i mecenati non possono pretendersi per forza [...]" Og­gidi la classe de'grandi, salvo le debite eccezioni, non si briga delle scienze, delle belle lettere, delle belle arti [...] Quindi mandando in generale quella lodevolissima passione, vanamente si sforzeranno i professori e gli artisti di trovare una protezione. Essi non possono sperare che ammirazioni e laudi infruttuose. Sigue da ciò il fondamento dell'idea da noi proposta, come il mezzo più ovvio ed efficace per poter conoscere i geni, e guaritarli fino a che non si spingono in alto. In ogni città dovrebbe costituirsi una società filarmonica di letterati, di amatori della scienza e dell'arte musicale." Gazzetta musicale di Milano 11, no. 29 (2 August 1863): 113.]

23 "Il Circolo è lo svolgimento dell'arte moderna in tutti i suoi progressi: il Quartetto è lo studio e l'ammirazione di un sol genere. Il Circolo è una scuola varia e continua, il Quartetto l'opera del grande autore che si studia isolatamente." Gazzetta musicale di Napoli 11, no. 48 (13 December 1863): 196. The following are representative programs of the two societies. SOCIETÀ DEL QUARTETTO (fifth matinée): Haydn, Quartet in A major, Op. 33; Bottesini, Quartet No. 2 in A major; Beethoven, Quartet No. 1. CIRCOLO BONAMICI (fourth musical meeting): Cerimele, Grand duetto brillante on Vespro siciliano for piano four hands; De Meglio, Romanza elegiaca from Ida for baritone; Lovreglio, Capriccio for piccolo on Neapolitan popular tunes; Traveni, Ro­manza for mezzosoprano; Guercia, "E non mi chiami?", melodia fblelile; Cimarosa, Terzetto from Il matrimonio segreto for soprano, mezzosoprano and contralto. For further information on the Circolo Bonamici see V. Vitale, "Il Circolo Bonamici." Nuova rivista musicale italiana 7, no. 1 (1973), reprinted in V. Vitale, Il pianoforte a Napoli nell'ottocento (Naples, 1983). 24 These were subsequently published in the Monitor, the Cir­colo's own paper.

25 "Io non mi curai e non mi curò, tirai innanzi e tirerò finché posso e [...] voglio!" Gazzetta musicale di Napoli 12, no. 38 (9 September 1864): 155.
This position caused relations between director and owner to become rather strained, and led Cottrau on 28 June 1868 to declare his intention to take over the direction of the Gazzetta once again, starting on 1 July of that same year. Curiously enough, though, the Gazzetta was never published again after that date and Luigi Mazzone, “hoping to continue his humble journalistic task as an homage to the art he praises,” went on to found and direct another journal “equally humble and dignified and independent,” the Napoli musicale.26

* * *

APPENDIX

The following is a list of some of the periodicals appearing in Naples during the period that the Gazzetta musicale di Napoli was published (1852-1868). This list does not pretend to be exhaustive. Following each title are given the inclusive dates of holdings in Neapolitan libraries; these dates do not necessarily correspond to publication runs.

Abate Taccarella (L’), rivista settimanale semiseria, politica, letteraria, artistica (1869)

Antologia contemporanea, giornale di scienze, lettere ed arti (1856-65)

Arca di Noè (L’), giornale umoristico politico quotidiano (1862-66)

Argo, giornale umoristico letterario (1857-58)

Artista (L’), giornale di pittura, scultura, architettura, musica, poesia, drammatica (1865)

Artista italiano (L’), giornale artistico-teatrale (1867-70)

Aurora (L’), rassegna scientifica, letteraria, artistica, teatrale con notizie politiche (1856)

Babilonia (La), artistico-teatrale (1861)

Babilonia teatrale, giornale letterario, umoristico, teatrale (1865)

Baci e calci, giornale di umori diversi, letterario, romantico-teatrale (1865)

Bazaar di scienze, lettere ed arti (1850-56)

Campanello (II), giornale umoristico-teatrale con illustrazioni e caricature (1859-60)

Compasso (II), giornale umoristico-teatrale (1867)

Corbellerie, storico-comiche artistico-teatrali (1861-63)

Corriere (II), giornale politico letterario commerciale artistico-teatrale (1860)

Corriere dei teatri (II) (1862-68)

Diogene, giornale letterario d’attualità ed arti (1866)

Diogene a teatro, giornale letterario-teatrale (1865-70)

Don Fattidio, giornale umoristico-teatrale (1865)

Donizetti (II), giornale letterario artistico teatrale (1865-73)

Eco del vulcani (L’), giornale politico, scientifico, artistico, industriale, teatrale (1860)

Eco del Parlamento (L’), giornale politico-teatrale della sera (1861)

Eco del sebeto (L’), giornale letterario-teatrale (1857)

Eruzioni (L’), giornale umoristico, politico, sociale, artistico, teatrale [...] con caricatura (1870)

Farfalla (La), giornale letterario, teatrale, ricreativo (1867)

Ficcanaso (II), giornale letterario teatrale (1868)

Frustata (La), giornale letterario teatrale (1857)

Gazzetta teatrale di Napoli, varietà e spettacoli universali (1864)

Genio e gusto, periodico artistico napoletano (1865)

Gustavo Modena, giornale di lettere, arti e spettacoli (1866)

Lume a gas (II), giornale della sera (1860)

Malelingue (Le), organo di una società anonima di mal­dicenti (1868-69)

Moda (La), appendice al Poliorama Pittorese (1839-53)

Monitor del Circolo Bonamici, settimanale irregolare (1865-67)

Musica (La), giornale letterario artistico teatrale (1855)

Musica (La), foglio periodico per l’incremento della scienza ed arte dei suoni (1857-59)

Nomade (II), giornale quotidiano (1860-64)

Nuova Civiltà (La), giornale di scienze, lettere, teatri (1867-68)

Nuovo Arlecchino (II), giornale umoristico e di effemeridi politiche, caricature, teatri (1860)

Omnibus (L’), giornale politico letterario teatrale (1833-83)

Omnibus pittorese (L’), enciclopedia artistica e letter­aria (1838-54)

Oppositore (L’), giornale letterario-teatrale (1866)

Pacini, giornale d’arti, spettacoli e varietà (1868-71)

Palazzo di cristallo (II), esposizione serale di lettere ed arti (1855-56)

Partini (II), giornale di amenità letterario artistiche (1867)

Partenope (La), giornale enciclopedico di lettere, scienze ed arti (1867)

Passatempo (II), giornale romantico-teatrale (1867)

Pessimista (II), giornale politico-teatrale (1860-61)

Pipistrello (II), giornale quotidiano critico-umoristico politico-teatrale (1864)

Platea (La), giornale d’attualità letterario-teatrale (1855-58)

Poliorama pittorese (1836-60)

Poncio (II), giornale umoristico, politico, teatrale (1864)

Programma giornaliero (see illustration) degli spettacoli, balli, feste, concerti ed altri divertimenti (1838-90)

Pungolo (II) (1860-61)

Rivista teatrale, giornale artistico-teatrale (1865-68)

Rondinella (La), giornale letterario, artistico, teatrale settimanale (1855-65)

Rose e spine, giornale artistico-teatrale (1868-70)

Rossini, giornale artistico teatrale settimanale (1862-66)

Scena italiana (La), giornale critico, letterario, teatrale (1860)

---

26 Supplement to the Gazzetta musicale di Napoli 17, no. 12 (24 June 1868): 1.
Scene italiane (Le), periodico critico letterario teatrale (1866)
Settimana teatrale (La), rivista di teatri, arti e letteratura con illustrazioni (1865)
Smascheratore (Lo), giornale umoristico letterario teatrale (1864)

Stivale (Lo), giornale letterario-artistico teatrale (1865)
Teatro (II), giornale letterario teatrale (1856-60)
Telone (II), giornale veridico teatrale della sera (1868)
Università (L'), giornale di scienze, lettere, teatri (1867)
Verità e bugie, giornale umoristico (1854-61)
Vesuvio (II), giornale bisbetico con caricature (1863)
"Il celebre maestro ..." Reports on Liszt in the Gazzetta musicale di Milano in the years 1870-1886

Katalin Szerző
(Budapest)

The Gazzetta musicale di Milano, a general interest music journal, appeared weekly from 1842 until 1902. For sixty years it employed a staff of eminent editorial writers and was one of the most significant and influential music journals in Italy.

In order to portray the aesthetic position of the Gazzetta and to study its sensitivity to contemporary music and performance, it would seem appropriate to examine in some detail how the editors of the journal saw—and encouraged their readers to see—the musical assessments of Liszt as a person, and more particularly, as a composer? What position did they take through the image of Liszt they presented—in the controversies that repeatedly swept through the European press of the day, controversies rooted in conflicting assessments of Liszt as a person, and more particularly, as a composer?

The period examined here covers the last sixteen years of Liszt's life (1870-1886), during which time the composer was active in Budapest, Rome and Weimar. The Gazzetta, which had been founded by Giovanni Ricordi in 1842, had been run since 1866 by his grandson Giulio Ricordi. Antonio Ghizlansoni was editor until 1871, and Salvatore Farina from 1872 until 1886. Its staff included the most notable Milanese writers on music: Boito, Casamorata, Biaggi, Filippi, Parenz and Bettoli.

Liszt's relationship with the Ricordi firm was longstanding. It dated, in fact, from the composer's first visit to Milan in September 1837, during which Giovanni Ricordi welcomed Liszt warmly when the latter visited his shop. Liszt wrote later that he had never before met anyone like Ricordi, a man who practiced "hospitality with so little reserve and such great cordiality." Their relationship remained friendly over the years and Ricordi published several of Liszt's major works. This friendship and the friendship of Rossini proved to be Liszt's greatest life-long gains from his months in Milan.

The relationship between Liszt and his Milan audience was not nearly as harmonious. At his public concerts on 10 December 1837, and on 18 February and 20 March 1838, the audience appreciated only the virtuosity of Liszt's piano playing, and seemed bored while the serious works of the program were being performed. The ill will between Liszt and his Italian public was increased by an article which appeared in the Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris on 27 May 1838 under Liszt's name. This fateful piece of writing was bitingy sarcastic about the superficiality and lack of artistic standards at La Scala, a hallowed sanctum of the Milanese. In return, the Milan papers published a series of personal attacks on Liszt. A conciliatory statement published by Liszt in two newspapers came too late to reverse the damage done. Consequently, plans for another concert in Milan were cancelled due to lack of public interest.

By 1870—Liszt having been absent from the city for 32 years—all that was in the past. A new generation of concert-goers had grown up without having heard Liszt perform. This generation's image was formed only by press reports and by those of his works which they had encountered. A major role in this image-making process was played by press reports about Liszt which appeared in the Ricordi firm's own music magazine, the Gazzetta musicale di Milano.

Practically all of the writings about Liszt in the Gazzetta begin with phrases such as "il celebre maestro" and "il grande artista," designations accorded only to the greatest artists and expressive of the highest esteem. It was a matter of conscious editorial policy that the person and art of the aged maestro were dealt with not just occasionally, but regularly during the sixteen years examined here. News of Liszt was carried on a total of 152 occasions, mostly in the column entitled "Alla rin­ fusa," and to a lesser extent in essays and reviews. This news either came from the Gazzetta's own domestic and foreign correspondents or was taken from the European press—the latter procedure indicating an openness on the part of the Gazzetta to opinions circulating in the rest of Europe. The range of sources used is extremely wide. News from the Italian press and reports from the newspapers of Weimar, Leipzig, Paris, London, Brussels and Antwerp appear side by side with material from the linguistically far less accessible Hungarian press. In many cases the information used was derived from the German- or French-language newspapers of Budapest, such as the Neues Pester Journal or the Gazette de Hongrie. Thanks to one particular correspondent, the editors also received reports from papers in Hungarian. This anonymous correspondent is referred to in the Gazzetta on two occasions, one as the sender of a letter from Pest, and once as the sender of a telegram.

These reports kept Milan readers in the 1870s and 1880s informed regularly about the major events of Liszt's life in Budapest, Weimar and Rome, about the
great tours he made of western Europe in his last years, and about the critical response to them. A distinct image of Liszt is perceivable in these graphic and lively descriptions. What were the main features of this image?

A considerable proportion of these articles refer to Liszt as the giant or king of the piano, as a highly esteemed pianist at matinées, soirées and benefit concerts, and as the greatest living—and still unmatched—performer of the age. Rather than analysing his performing traits, they reviewed instead the listener's experience of Liszt's playing, often in superlatives. The periodical quotes Devillez of Antwerp as follows: "He remains the most marvellous pianist I have ever heard [...] Under his fingers the keyboard receives a force, authority, fascination and expressive power which I had not suspected hitherto to so great an extent."

One looks in vain for a more expert description of Liszt's playing from the Italian critics. They usually refer to it in a handful of ecstatic stock phrases. As an example, here is a brief report of a concert given by Liszt in January 1881 in Rome:

The celebrated pianist, the Abbé Liszt, is in Rome, where he has been received by His Holiness, after which he had lunch with Baron Keudell, the German ambassador. The guests included Cardinal Hohenlohe. After lunch the Abbé Liszt played, and it can be imagined how wonderfully. The piano was from the new factory of Carlo Ducci of Florence. The papers write that the instrument was worthy of the musician's talent.

The legend of Liszt the performer did not eclipse the figure of Liszt the composer in the Gazzetta. The journal carried regular reports on newly published compositions and on works in progress. In the issue of 8 March 1885, an anonymous critic examined the epoch-making significance of Liszt's compositions within his life's work as a whole. Subtitled "Giudicati dalla Critica tedesca" (Criticism in German reviews), its pointed formulation was obviously directed against the critics of Liszt in Germany. Typically, though, even this article in defense of Liszt's music ends on a controversial note.

Franz Liszt, the prince of pianists, devoted himself in his mature old age to creating serious symphonic compositions and proved in the face of many prestigious prophecies that he is endowed with an exceptional aesthetic grasp and an abundant imagination. It is perhaps he rather than Richard Wagner who can be called the founder of the so-called Neo-German school [...] Rejecting forms and scorning traditions, he experimented with the creation of a new artistic trend, in which, despite his errors, he achieved a partial success. He admired Berlioz as much as Wagner, although they were aiming at different ideals. These two ideals coalesced in Liszt, and on this basis alone we can call him the true father of the young German school. As a composer he is in any case very great, but sometimes he exhibits unduly an intellectual effort or a search for new points of departure that drives him towards the singular to such an extent that he abandons the quiet sources of his congenial inspiration, which nonetheless, whenever he so wishes, pours forth purely and richly from the utterly unique ebullience of his true nature. But these small errors do not detract sufficiently from his merits for posterity not to consider him one of the princes among creators and the king of the art of performance.

During the decade and a half examined here, Liszt's works appeared quite rarely on concert programs in Milan. One notable exception was a concert at the Milan Conservatory where Liszt's Hungarian Fantasia was played. Reviewing this concert in the 24 August 1873 issue, the Gazzetta critic, showing a rare acquaintance with Hungarian literature, wrote of Liszt's work:

This fantasia is certainly one of the most forceful compositions of the Gypsy-Abbé, and so is almost worthy of a place alongside the symphonic ode entitled Hungaria. It is as if it were a canto of the Zrínyiad, or a hymn by Timódi [sic]. Hungarian solemnity and gypsy

5 "Egli [...] rimane il pianista più meraviglioso che io abbia mai sentito [...] Sotto le sue dita, la tastiera prende una forza, un'autorità, un fascino, un'anima insomma che non sospettavo in lui a tal punto." GMM (11 June 1882): 212.


7 "Franz Liszt, il principe dei pianisti, nel darsi, in età già maturata, all'alta composizione sinfonica, ha provato contro molte e autorevoli previsioni, di essere dotato di una comprensività estetica eccezionale e di fervida forza inventiva. Meglio forse che Berlioz, egli può dirsi il fondatore della così detta neo-scuola germanica [...] Ribelle alla forma e spregiatore della tradizione, tentò su queste basi di creare il nuovo indirizzo dell'arte e in parte, malgrado errori, vi riuscì. Ammiratore di Berlioz quanto di Wagner, benché tendenti e per vie diverse, a diversi ideali, li fuse in sé, così da potersi dire per ciò il vero generatore della giovine scuola tedesca. Quele compositore, comunque altissimo, lascia talvolta troppo allo scoperto il lavoro della mente ovvero la ricerca del nuovo lo spinge allo strano così da abbandonare le placide fonti dell'ispirazione geniale, che pure scorrono, ove voglia, limpide e ricche da quella sua esuberante natura, certo più unica che rara. Ma queste mende leggere non tolgono ch'egli non sia e non debba passare alla posterità come fra i creatori, principe, fra gli interpreti, re" GMM (8 March 1885): 94.

8 Zrínyiad is the epic of Miklós Zrínyi (1620-1664), an Hungarian poet and general. Sebestiyén Tinódi (1510-1556) was the greatest figure of the Hungarian verse-chronicle literature of the 16th century.
fire alternate in a fantastic way. In places it is as if we heard, in the quiet that ensues after the cracking rhythms, the languishing voice of a despondent gypsy woman [...] A few days ago this amazing fantasia was performed at our conservatory. I liked this liberalism on the part of those responsible for programming, and it was greatly liked by the audience too, with only a few blockheads making faces.9

On 26 October 1879, the Gazzetta carried a long excerpt from Liszt's book on Chopin, running over two columns and entitled “Una serata in casa di Chopin” (An evening in Chopin’s home). Four years later, a lengthy article entitled “Liszt scrittore francese” analysed the significance of Liszt as a French writer.10 The occasion for the essay was the recent appearance in Paris and Leipzig of second editions of Liszt's books on Chopin and on the music of the gypsies in Hungary. The critic's analysis of Liszt's literary style in French has remained valid to this day:

[...] these two works [...] are written in a bizarre French, with neologisms whose meaning must be guessed at, but the musician-critic shows an expressive force of rare felicity; Liszt's writings have the same force, imagination and unbridled verve we so often applaud in Liszt the pianist; he writes as he plays, with incredible exuberance and fervour.11

Reports in the Gazzetta musicale di Milano often provide us with graphic portraits of the select company of pupils, friends and admirers who surrounded Liszt. Wherever he went he attracted a veritable court, consisting of the most eminent artists and church and lay dignitaires of his day. His extraordinary popularity was also reflected in the anecdotes that circulated about him and which appeared from time to time in colorful sketches in the Gazzetta.

The journal marked Liszt's birthday on 22 October each year, and in the autumn of 1873 it carried several reports on events in Pest, Weimar and Berlin marking the 50th year of his career. But great popularity had its price, and it seems to have placed heavier and heavier obligations on Liszt. Twice the Gazzetta reprinted statements of his from German papers in which he attempted to stem the flood of unsolicited mail from autograph hunters and new-fledged composers.12 Several items deal with Liszt's generosity, his open-handedness and the selfless nature of his friendship with Wagner.13 His benefit concerts for Beethoven's heirs, for Robert Franz, for the Bayreuth theatre, for the victims of the Szeged flood, for a Hummel memorial to be raised in Pozsony (Bratislava) and for other noble purposes are reported with warm approval.

Liszt's outward appearance is described as extremely charming and, even in the last months of his life, as youthful, although the reports do not fail to notice his pardonable weakness of vanity. Revealingly, there are several short news items about how proudly the Abbé Liszt wears his decorations, and how on some festive occasions his frock is covered with stars and crosses.14

His national origins are frequently mentioned. In most cases he is described as an Hungarian composer or Hungarian pianist, but the comment is often made that he does not speak the language of his own country. The following remarks, from a review of József Ságh's musical encyclopedia, certainly provoke a smile:

It is right that there should be a growing number of encyclopedias of musical biography, so that each country may have its own. No such thing has existed in Hungary so far, but the gap is soon to be filled. The publishers Taborsky and Parsch are publishing in Budapest a Magyar Zenészeti Lexicon (Hungarian dictionary of music), which has already reached its third volume. Unfortunately, the work has been written in Hungarian, a language understood by few except the Hungarians, and even some of them do not speak their national language. To give an example, Liszt, whose biography can be read in this same third volume of the encyclopedia, does not know a syllable of Hungarian.15

The news from Hungary included a rare gem. On 6 February 1881, the journal carried an article by an

9 "Questa fantasia è certo una delle più forti composizioni dello zingaro-abate, e ci par quasi degna di stare accanto all’ode sinfonica che porta per titolo: Ungaria. Pare un canto della zingara-abate, e ci par quasi degna di stare accanto all’odissea sinfonica che porta per titolo: Ungaria. Pare un canto della zingara-abate, e ci par quasi degna di stare accanto all’odissea sinfonica che porta per titolo: Ungaria."

10 I quote from an obituary in the Gazzetta.11

11 "[...] queste due opere [...] sono scritte tal volta in un francese bizzarro, con parole fabbricate, di cui bisogna indovinare il senso, ma il musicista-critico ha delle rare felicità di espressione, e si trova in Liszt scrittore la stessa potenza, la stessa fantasia, la stessa foga indomita che si è applaudito nel pianista; egli scrive come suona, con una esuberanza ed una furia incredibili." Ibid.


13 E.g., GMM (18 March 1883): 107.

14 GMM (30 November 1873): 384.

15 "É bene che si multiplichino i dizionari di biografia musicale, in modo che ogni paese abbia il proprio. Non ce n'era ancora in Ungheria, ma la lacuna sarà colmata fra poco. Gli editori Taborsky et Parsch di Buda-Pest, pubblicano un Magyar Zenészeti Lexicon (Dizionario musicale ungherese), che è oramai alla sua terza dispensa. Disgraziatamente, quest'opera è scritta in ungherese, lingua che pochissimi comprendono, oltre i magiai, i quali pure non parlano sempre il loro idioma nazionale. Per citare un esempio, Liszt, la cui biografia si legge appunto nella terza dispensa di questo dizionario non conosce una sillaba di ungherese." GMM (14 September 1879): 319.

26
unidentified correspondent which offers important new information for Liszt scholars. It concerns the popularity the aged maestro enjoyed in Hungary, and is supported by details of furniture for the home being prepared on the Sugár-boulevard in Budapest. So far as we know, the pieces of furniture and textiles listed in the article have since been lost; in fact, researchers have not even been aware that they had existed. So the Gazzetta article could provide valuable hints for reconstructing the suite of Liszt’s rooms in the Budapest Liszt Museum which opened in September 1986. The report reads:

Franz Liszt is expected in Buda-Pest, where his princely room is now being prepared in the palace of the Academy of Music. Ladies from high society have been working for months to decorate the salon reserved for the “king of the piano,” each having sent a little masterpiece of embroidery with her own monogram. Everything had been entrusted to an interior decorator who has arranged the objects in harmony with the style of the furniture. Worth particular note is an ottoman with a brown cloth cover, embroidered in gold by Countesses Mélanie and Lidia Zichy. The ladies Dionys de Pazmandy and de Guttmanthal have embroidered two Henry II style armchairs; Miss Pulszky has embroidered two swans on a leather background; Baroness Loránd Eoetvoes has provided two puffes, Mme Koloman de Voeroes a splendid table, whose gold brocade cover is the work of Mme de Végh; the Princess Wrede has given a game table, whose cloth is embroidered in blue and gold.

Recent Liszt research, principally by László Eösze, Desző Legány and Klára Hamburger, has revealed many new details about Liszt’s Rome years and his Italian contacts. Reports in the Gazzetta musicale di Milano may further extend our knowledge of the relationship between Liszt and Italy, adding new details of documentary value.

Material regarding Liszt’s Rome years, however, is far more modest than one would have expected. It is striking that while the journal took over news items about Liszt’s life in Pest and Weimar on a regular basis, and carried multi-column reports on his successes in Brussels, Antwerp, Paris and London in the 1880s, it devoted fairly little space to the events in Rome in the last decade and a half of his life. Of the 152 reports on Liszt which appeared in the Gazzetta between 1870 and 1876, ten came from the press of the day. As yet we do not know enough to say with certainty whether this may have been due to scant press coverage of Liszt in the Roman press or to the Gazzetta’s lack of sufficient contacts in Rome.

As for the few reports that did reach Milan from Rome, they dealt mainly with Liszt’s relations with the musical societies there. In 1874, the paper carried a brief excerpt from a letter Liszt wrote to the Rome Orchestral Society, headed by Ettore Pinelli; in the following year it gave news of the Hungarian Rhapsody which Liszt had orchestrated for the Society.17

In 1875, the Gazzetta published a letter of thanks which Liszt sent to the president of the Accademia di Santa Cecilia in Rome after being elected an honorary member of the Society. A typical comment was added by the editors in Milan, indicating that they were carrying Liszt’s letter in full because his remarks on Italian music “rende un giusto omaggio all’ arta italiana” (pay true homage to Italian artistry).18

Two reports, from 1879 and 1882 respectively, tell of Liszt’s visits to the library of the Accademia di Santa Cecilia. The report of 1882 draws an authentic portrait of the aged Liszt, who still maintained cordial relations with his contemporaries.

On Thursday, Liszt visited the Library of the Accademia di Santa Cecilia. After examining many of the modern foreign publications, he complimented Cavaliere Berwin on the extension of the library [...] and ordered through the Library, at his expense, three copies of Paler­rina’s Stabat Mater, with Wagner’s ex­planations, which had been published by the Leipzig firm of Kahnt.19

A characteristic episode in Liszt’s life in Italy was his visit to Venice, on which subject the Gazzetta published parts of an enthusiastic report in the Venice newspaper Venezia:

16 “Franz Liszt è aspettato a Buda-Pest, dove gli si preparano delle stanze principesche al palazzo dell’Accademia musicale. Le signore dell’alta società hanno lavorato da più mesi alla decorazione del salotto riservato ‘al re del pianoforte.’ Ciascuna signora ha fornito un piccolo capolavoro di ricamo portante il proprio monogramma. Tutto è stato affidato ad un decoratore artistico, che sta montando questi oggetti in mobili di stile. Si nota segnatamente un’ottomana di panno bruno coperta di ricami d’oro, eseguiti dalle contesse Mélanie e Lidia Zichy. Le signore Dionys de Pazmandy e de Guttmanthal han eseguito due seggioloni alla Enrico II; la signorina Pulszky ha ricamato due cigni sopra panno-cuoio; la signora baronessa Lorand Eoetvoes due poufs; la signora Koloman de Veroes ha dato una magnifica tavola, il cui tappeto di brocato d’oro è opera della signora de Végh; la principessa Wrede ha dato una tavola da giuoco, il cui panno verde è ricamato in azzurro ed oro.” GMM (6 February 1881): 62.

The day before yesterday, at 4 p.m., Franz Liszt, the famous pianist and composer, left Venice. This radiant star, who appeared in the intimate company of the Count and Countess Széchenyi, wished to leave a mark of his short sojourn among us, but he disappeared far too soon. On Sunday evening the Abbé Liszt played a few pieces for four hands with our eminent maestro Angelo Tessarin, which electrified the audience. The orchestral transcription of the great Goethe march was performed so perfectly by Liszt and Tessarin that it aroused in the distinguished society emotions which had never been felt before by any present. On finishing the piece and not knowing how to express his admiration for our fellow-countryman Tessarin,
Liszt, wearing the sword presented to him by the city of Buda—"Pest"
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the Abbé Liszt embraced him affectionately. [...] We are only sorry that this dear guest has left us so soon.\(^ \text{20} \)

The Gazzetta’s propaganda for Liszt, rooted in its editors’ personal convictions, created a legend around the aged master over the years, and fostered in Milan a public sympathetic to his person, and sincerely interested in his work. It was time to forget the old wounds and meet face to face again. In November 1882, after an absence of 44 years, Liszt visited Milan once again. The report published after his visit clearly shows that the interest between Milan and Liszt had been mutual, since the composer was quite familiar with all of the city’s major musicians. In part, the report reads:

Last Sunday, passing through Milan, Franz Liszt spent a few hours here, arriving from Zurich on his way to Venice, where he will remain till the end of the year. He spent the morning with Giulio Ricordi, in whose company he went to see the Teatro alla Scala, the Galleria Vittorio Emanuele, the Piazza del Duomo, and later the workshops of the Ricordi firm as well. The famous artist marvelled greatly at the progress of our city, which he considered beautified, lively and animated. [...] Liszt inquired with great interest after the current Milanese musical movements; he spoke with the highest esteem of Faccio and Boito, whom he would have liked to meet personally, had this been possible in the few hours of his stay here. He was pleased to hear that Bazzini had become the director of our Conservatory, and to him and also to Filippi he sent his most cordial regards. Liszt carries his years, which are numerous, with great ease. Full of vivacity, he still exhibits the greatest spirit and charm in his conversation; he still loves art with immense passion. He repeatedly regretted that he had had no opportunity to meet Verdi, whose works he admires enthusiastically, as he had proved by his many transcriptions of them. Before his departure for Venice, where he will stay until the end of the year as a guest of Wagner, he promised to do everything possible to allow a return to Milan next spring, to spend a few days here and to attend a concert of the orchestral society of La Scala.21

Unfortunately, the second promised visit to Milan could no longer take place. It is worth noting, however, that after 1882 there was an increase in the number of articles in which the Gazzetta championed Liszt’s art. Only the “epilogue” was marred by a slightly dissonant note: Liszt’s 1886 triumphal tour of Paris and London was commented upon in Milan with enthusiasm at first, but with growing malice later. On 25 April 1886 the Gazzetta carried a report by its London correspondent, summing up the London tour. The tone of this article moves from exaltation through gentle reproof to biting irony, yet ends on a positive note, admonishing readers not to overlook the fact that the object of London’s excessive lionizing remains nonetheless one of the greatest musicians of the age, a maestro comparable in Italy only to Verdi.

London, 18 April. “About Liszt again [...]”

Tomorrow the great Hungarian pianist will personally appear in public for the last time, at a concert given by Countess Sadowska at the Prince’s Hall, and the day after tomorrow he will leave for good to delight other peoples with the word of the Messiah, whose most fervent apostle he has been. For the last week I have not even opened the English papers, fearing to encounter some new garnish to the “Lisztian reputation.” Believe me, the public too has become satiated with it by now. The name of the famous virtuoso has become oppressively boring to everyone. To preserve his dignity, Liszt would have done better to have left after four or five days, after attending the performance of his oratorio St. Elizabeth and perhaps after a concert of his works by his most distinguished pupils. Excessive prolongation of his sojourn in the British metropolis has indeed been in the interest of the narrow circle around him, but to the detriment of opinions formed of his character. To have agreed at his age to daily exposure to the curiosity of the public on the platform of the concert halls, precisely as if they were showing a calf with two heads, has proved that his ambition has prevailed over his artistic and human dignity. What a contrast he presents to the radiant glory of our Italy, the author of Aida, who, as everyone knows, abhors noisy crowds and scorns adulators.22

21 “Domenica scorsa fu di passaggio a Milano, per poche ore, Francesco Liszt; giungeva da Zurigo e partì per Venezia ove rimarrà fino alla fine dell’anno corrente. Passò la mattinata con Giulio Ricordi, in compagnia del quale si recò a vedere il teatro alla Scala, la Galleria Vittorio Emanuele, la Piazza del Duomo, visitando poi altresì le officine dello stabilimento Ricordi. Il celebre artista restò altamente meravigliato dei progressi della nostra città, che trovò abbellita, piena di movimento, di brio; [...] Liszt s’informò con grande interesse dell’attuale movimento musicale milanese; parlò con grandissima stima di Faccio e di Boito, che avrebbe voluto conoscere personalmente, ove le poche ore di dimora lo avessero permesso: sentì con piacere che a direttore del nostro Conservatorio s’informò con grande interesse [...].”

22 “Londra, 18 Aprile. ‘Ancora di Liszt [...]’ Domani il grande pianista ungherese farà l’ultima sua comparsa in pubblico presentando il concerto che la contessa Sadowska darà alla Prince’s Hall e dopodomani se ne andrà finalmente ad allietare altri popoli col
Following this vitriolic piece of writing, the journal was offered an opportunity to make amends with tragic suddenness. A brief three and one half months later, after the death of Liszt, the Gazzetta musicale di Milano bade farewell in its obituary to the great man whose art it had supported, in its own way, with sincere conviction and real sympathy for so many years. Like the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik, edited by Brendel, and the Hungarian Zenészeti Lapok (Musical papers), edited by Kornél Abrányi, the Gazzetta musicale di Milano had transmitted Liszt’s artistic ideals, and had created and consistently nurtured a “Liszt cult” in one of Europe’s most musically important regions. As was to be demonstrated by Italian music of the fin de siècle, and by the music of Ferruccio Busoni, this work had not been in vain.

* * *
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