INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8516424

Murphy, Kerry Rosaleen

THE FORMATION OF THE MUSIC CRITICISM OF HECTOR BERLIOZ (1823-1837)

University of Melbourne (Australia) PH.D. 1984

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985

by

Murphy, Kerry Rosaleen

All Rights Reserved

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

THE FORMATION OF THE MUSIC CRITICISM OF HECTOR BERLIOZ (1823-1837)

by

KERRY ROSALEEN MURPHY

June 1984

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Music of Melbourne University in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

© 1985

KERRY ROSALEEN MURPHY

All Rights Reserved

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Corrigendum

p. 128, note 55. Later information suggests that the letter of 20 February 1862 to Louis Berlioz is probably a forgery.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

KERRY MURPHY

Ph. D.
University of Melbourne
June 1984

THE FORMATION OF THE MUSIC CRITICISM OF HECTOR BERLIOZ (1823-1837)

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to trace the beginnings of Berlioz's career as a music critic and the reasons behind his becoming a critic. In the title of the thesis I use the word "formation". I could alternatively have talked of "the early music criticism of Hector Berlioz" as no formation in terms of growth or development can really be traced in the early reviews. Berlioz is bold, self-assured, and opinionated from his first article, and his prose style consistently shows remarkable fluency and ease. The word "formation", however, applies more to the consolidation of Berlioz's position as a professional critic, from his first letters to the editor of 1823 to full-time criticism written concurrently for numerous papers from 1834 onwards. I have chosen to stop at 1837. This is the year that Berlioz edited the Revue et Gazette Musicale, which is an indication of the extent to which he had become established as a journalist and critic.

The thesis falls into two parts. In the first part I study Berlioz's activity as a critic within the general context of music criticism at the time. I have studied the music criticism of a number of critics contemporary with Berlioz in political as well as literary papers in order to try to arrive at an understanding of the scope and limitations of the music criticism of the time. I have examined Berlioz's relationship to each of the journals to which he contributed and the ways the critical malpractices of the day affected his criticism.

The second half of the thesis looks more directly at Berlioz's criticism and specifically at his criticism of his contemporary composers. The majority of Berlioz's reviews of this period are of the Opéra, Opéra-Comique, and instrumental concerts, mainly the Conservatoire concerts. This reflects not so much Berlioz's tastes as those of the Parisian public and the editors of the various journals to which he contributed. These reviews form the basis of the study of Berlioz's views about his contemporaries.

A major issue that emerges from the study of these early reviews is Berlioz's ceaseless struggle between diplomacy and honesty. Yet the most enduring impression one has of Berlioz is that of an idealist whose love of music was so passionate and governed his life to such an extent that even the treadmill of daily criticism could not dull its ardour.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep gratitude to the following people for all their help and encouragement--Meredith Moon and François Lesure; Hugh Macdonald, Peter Bloom, and Kay Dreyfus. I would also like to thank Jeff Macdonell from the Melbourne University Computer centre for his help with the Word Processor, and the Melbourne University Music Faculty for providing me with the means to travel to France to check my sources. Finally I would like to thank my long-suffering family and husband Russell, without whose help and support this thesis would never have been finished.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations----------v

Introduction----------1

Part One

The Role of the Music Critic in the Early Nineteenth-Century Press

I. Music Criticism in the Early Nineteenth Century----------15

II. Berlioz's Position as a Critic----------71

III. Critical Practices of the Day----------106

Part Two

Berlioz's Criticism of his Contemporaries

IV. Vocal Music: Opéra-Comique----------144

V. Vocal Music: Grand Opera----------178

VI. Instrumental and Orchestral Music: Conservatoire Concert Series----------228

Conclusion----------257

Appendices

A. Bibliography of Berlioz's Articles (1823-1837)----------278

B. Problems of Attribution: Some Unsigned Articles of Berlioz in the Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris (1834-1837)----------343

C. Béatrice et Bénédict: Why Did Berlioz Write an Opéra-Comique?----------392

Bibliography----------409

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABBREVIATIONS

For complete references, please see the Bibliography.

I. Reference works

DicL	Dictionnaire des littérateurs
GDEL	Grand Dictionnaire Encyclopédique Larousse
GLE	Grand Larousse Encyclopédique
NG	New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians
19th-Century Larousse	Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe siècle
20th-Century Larousse	Larousse du XXe siècle

II. Periodicals to which Berlioz Contributed

GM	Gazette Musicale
JD	Journal des Débats Politiques et Littéraires
Le Rén.	Le Rénovateur
RGM	Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris

III. Berlioz's Writings

ATC	A Travers Chants
CG I	Correspondance générale, ed. P. Citron
CG II	Correspondance générale, ed. F. Robert
CG III	Correspondance générale, ed. P. Citron
CG IV	Correspondance générale, ed. P. Citron, Y. Gérard, and H. Macdonald
Corr. inéd.	Correspondance inédite, ed. D. Bernard
Mém.	Mémoires, 2 vols., ed. Pierre Citron
Mem.	The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, trans. and ed. David Cairns
MM	Les Musiciens et la musique
SO	Soirées d'Orchestre, ed. Léon Guichard
SW	Briefe an die Fürstin Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein
VM	Voyage musical en Allemagne et en Italie

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PART ONE

THE ROLE OF THE MUSIC CRITIC IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH-CENTURY PRESS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Introduction

i. Overview of the literature

Research concerning Berlioz has been dominated by three major events; first the publication of Jacques Barzun's monumental Berlioz and the Romantic Century, second the foundation of the New Berlioz Edition (NBE) under the general editorship of Hugh Macdonald, and third the publication of Berlioz's Correspondance générale under the general editorship of Pierre Citron.[1] For anyone working on Berlioz's literary works the new editions of his Les Soirées de l'orchestre (1852), Les Grotesques de la musique (1859), and A Travers Chants (1862) are also significant.[2] D. Kern Holoman's 1975 survey of Berlioz research presents an excellent summary and qualitative assessment of research done on Berlioz up until 1975.[3]

Since Holoman's article, not much supplementary material has appeared about Berlioz as a writer. As part of the Berlioz Festival of 1980, a colloquium on Berlioz's literary and critical works was held at the University of Grenoble. The proceedings of this colloquium are obtainable from the Festival organizers at Lyons. In addition

---

[1] Berlioz and the Romantic Century, 2 vols., New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1969. NBE is published by Bärenreiter-Verlag. Four volumes of the Correspondance générale have so far appeared; first volume (1972) and third volume (1978) ed. Pierre Citron, second volume (1975) ed. Frédéric Robert, and fourth volume (1983) ed. Pierre Citron, Yves Gérard, and Hugh Macdonald. All are published in Paris by Flammarion.

[2] Les Soirées de l'orchestre, ed. Léon Guichard (1852; Paris: Gründ, 1968); Les Grotesques de la musique, ed. Léon Guichard (1859; Paris: Gründ, 1969); and A Travers Chants, ed. Léon Guichard (1862; Paris: Gründ, 1971).

[3] "The Present State of Berlioz Research", Acta Musicologica, 47 (1975), 30-67. One point in Holoman's article with which I particularly agree is his call for an unbiassed approach to the early French biographer of Berlioz, Adolphe Boschot. See Adolphe Boschot, L'Histoire d'un romantique, 3 vols. (Paris: Plon, 1906-1913).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a paper on Berlioz's music criticism was given by Katherine Kolb Reeve as part of an international conference on Music in Paris in the 1830s held at Smith College, Massachusetts, U.S.A., in April 1982.[4]

Two recent American dissertations have been written specifically on Berlioz's music criticism. These are H. Robert Cohen's "Berlioz on the Opera (1829-1849): A Study in Music Criticism" and Katherine Kolb Reeve's "The Poetics of the Orchestra in the Writings of Hector Berlioz".[5] Two other relevant American dissertations in related areas are Dorothy Hagan's "French Music Criticism Between the Revolutions (1830-1848)" and Peter A. Bloom's "François-Joseph Fétis and the Revue Musicale, (1827-1835)".[6] I shall comment briefly on these dissertations as I define and clarify what I am attempting to achieve in my own thesis.

Dorothy Hagan's dissertation studies both the music and the music criticism of the July monarchy in terms of their reflection of the age. She portrays the artistic imagination of the day as preoccupied with plans for social progress and utopian dreams, and the contemporary music criticism as a product of that imagination. Her synopsis of contemporary French socialism, in particular the theories

---

[4] These papers will be edited by Peter A. Bloom and published as Vol. X of La Vie musicale en France au XIX Siècle: Etudes et documents. (To be published by Pendragon Press in arrangement with Les Presses de l'Université Laval.)

[5] H. Robert Cohen, "Berlioz on the Opera (1829-1849): A Study in Music Criticism", Diss. New York University 1973. Katherine Kolb Reeve, "The Poetics of the Orchestra in the Writings of Hector Berlioz", Diss. Yale 1978.

[6] Dorothy Hagan, "French Music Criticism Between the Revolutions (1830-1848)", Diss. Illinois 1965.
Peter A. Bloom, "François-Joseph Fétis and the Revue Musicale, (1827-1835)", Diss. Pennsylvania 1972.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Saint-Simon and Lamennais, is useful.[7] Peter A. Bloom's dissertation on Fétis is an essential guide when approaching the theories and interests of an individual critic, and also when trying to understand the beginnings of serious musical criticism in Paris in the nineteenth century.

H. Robert Cohen's dissertation questions whether there is any central unifying aesthetic in Berlioz's criticism and argues that there is a system in Berlioz's criticism of opera during the period 1829-1849, a system that centered on "dramatic appropriateness", whereby a work's merit lay in its fidelity to its dramatic implications. Katherine Kolb Reeve's dissertation "The Poetics of the Orchestra" is particularly rewarding for its literary background and its positioning of Berlioz's ideas in reference to nineteenth-century literary figures, most notably Victor Hugo and E. T. A. Hoffmann. Although she draws on Berlioz's entire critical output, she concentrates largely on his articles on Beethoven and Gluck as being those most relevant to her study of the "poetics" of the orchestra.

Apart from those reviews published in the three volumes A Travers Chants, Soirées de l'Orchestre, and Grotesques de la musique and in a recent selection made by Gérard Condé,[8] most of Berlioz's articles

---

[7] In my opinion she overestimates the influence of socialist theories on the music critics of the time, except perhaps in the case of Fétis and d'Ortigue. A more recent dissertation dealing with music of this period and the influence of Saint-Simon is Ralph P. Locke's "Music and the Saint-Simonians: The Involvement of Félicien David and Other Musicians in a Utopian Socialist Movement", Diss. Chicago 1980.

[8] Gérard Condé, ed. Hector Berlioz: Cauchemars et passions (Paris: J.-C. Lattès, 1981). Unfortunately Condé alters the text at times; to quote him: "Que faire si Berlioz commet une erreur de date (à condition, bien entendu, qu'il n'en tire aucune conclusion). . . . rectifier, comme l'auteur l'aurait fait lui-même?" ("What should one do if Berlioz makes an error in a date (given of course that he does not draw any conclusions from it). . . . rectify it, as the author would have done himself?") (Preface, p. 27). This is indeed what Condé has

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

still lie hidden in the numerous newspapers and journals in which they were first published. This situation is in the process of being rectified. For some years now a joint team of researchers from the Université Laval, the University of British Columbia, and the Paris Conservatoire, under the dual direction of H. Robert Cohen and Yves Gérard, has been working on a publication of Berlioz's reviews. The aim of the project is to make the complete Berlioz criticism available to the public as soon as possible. To this end, no editing will be done; the aim is simply to reproduce a facsimile edition of the articles themselves. Eventually a two-volume critical apparatus and a computerized index will also be published. Workers in the team are being scrupulous in their attempts to track down every article written by Berlioz.[9]

I have compiled my own bibliography of Berlioz's articles of 1823 to 1837 (Appendix A), using J.-G. Prod'homme's rather inaccurate bibliography of 1956 as a guide.[10] Since compiling my bibliography I have checked it against two other bibliographies currently in progress, one a bibliography of Berlioz's criticism which will appear as part of D. Kern Holoman's forthcoming thematic catalogue[11] and the

---

[8](continued)
done; also he forms single articles from several articles that are concerned with the same issues. This of course makes the collection not very useful for a scholar. However, it is obviously not intended as a scholarly edition and it serves the purpose well of making known to the general public a large number of articles by Berlioz.

[9] To be published as Volume VI of La Vie musicale en France au XIXe siècle: La Critique musicale d'Hector Berlioz, 10 vol. text, 2 vol. critical apparatus, under the auspices of the Association Nationale Hector Berlioz.

[10] "Bibliographie berliozienne", Revue Musicale, No. 233 (1956), pp. 97-147.

[11] This is to be published as part of the NBE. Hugh Macdonald generously let me study the bibliography from 1823 to 1837.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

other the list of Berlioz's articles compiled by the team working on the edition of Berlioz's criticism.[12] Divergence between my bibliography and these bibliographies was very slight.

My thesis is divided into two parts. In the first part I study Berlioz's activity as a critic within the general context of music criticism at the time. I have studied the music criticism of a number of critics contemporary with Berlioz in political as well as literary papers in order to try to arrive at an understanding of the scope and limitations of the music reviewer at the time. To this end I have also studied the music criticism published in several Saint-Simonian journals. Whereas Dorothy Hagan was concerned with the influence of Saint-Simon on the general music critic, I am examining how the already converted Saint-Simonian reviewed music. Some account of the work of Dorothy Hagan and Ralph P. Locke will be given here.

I have given a brief summary of the journals to which Berlioz contributed and examined his relationship to each and the motivations behind his criticism. Criticism of the day involved a degree of corruption. Malpractices will be discussed separately and also in relation to Berlioz's criticism. The question of whether Berlioz's role as a composer compromised his role as a critic arises here also.

The first half of the thesis is basically an examination of the machinations of the musical press in early nineteenth-century Paris, in which context I try to place Berlioz's criticism.

The second half of the thesis looks more directly at Berlioz's

---

[12] Yves Gérard kindly communicated this list to me.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

actual criticism and specifically at his criticism of his contemporary composers. The majority of Berlioz's reviews of this period are of the Opéra, Opéra-Comique, and instrumental concerts, mainly the Conservatoire concerts. This reflects not so much Berlioz's tastes but those of the Parisian public and of the editors of the various journals to which he contributed. These reviews form the basis of the study of Berlioz's views about his contemporaries. The Opéra, Opéra-Comique, and Conservatoire were also important social institutions and I have examined them separately. The Théâtre Italien, the other important concert venue at the time, is not included here, mainly because Berlioz reviewed Italian opera relatively infrequently.

In the title of this thesis I use the word "formation". I could alternatively have talked of "the early music criticism of Hector Berlioz" in that no formation in terms of growth or development can really be traced in the early reviews. Berlioz is bold, self-assured, and opinionated from his first article, and his prose style consistently shows remarkable fluency and ease. The word "formation", however, applies more to the consolidation of Berlioz's position as a professional critic, from his first letters to the editor of 1823 to full-time criticism written concurrently for numerous papers from 1834 onwards. I have chosen to stop at 1837. This is the year that Berlioz edited the Revue et Gazette Musicale, which is an indication of the extent to which he had become established as a journalist and critic. I have also drawn on Berlioz's references to criticism in his Mémoires and correspondence, which naturally spans a longer period than from 1823 to 1837.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ii. Historical Background

Berlioz's career as a critic began during the Restoration (1815-1830) and was consolidated during the reign of Louis-Philippe (1830-1848).

The Revolution of 1830 amounted to little more than a change of dynasty from the Bourbon to the Orleans line. Immediately before 1830, of a population of 29 million, only 90,000 were eligible to vote. After 1830, with the franchise law of 1831, 174,000 were eligible; hardly a significant increase.[13] The number of people who could read and write was just beginnning to outstrip the number totally illiterate when Louis-Philippe's reign was approaching its end.[14] The newspapers during the Restoration were fairly expensive and could be bought only on a quarterly subscription basis. The subscription figures were not high[15] and did not increase much during Louis-Philippe's reign.[16] However, the number of people who followed the press was larger than the subscription figures, since both provincial and Parisian libraries and reading rooms often ordered one copy of a paper which was then circulated amongst its members and sometimes even read aloud to those unable to read.[17]

---

[13] Irene Collins, ed. Government and Society in France, 1814-1848 (Great Britain: Edward Arnold, 1970), introd., pp. 2-4.

[14] Irene Collins, Government and Society, p. 1.

[15] A list given in the newspaper L'Echo du Soir of 1826 gives the total number of people subscribing to newspapers as 63,100, of which 21,000 were subscribers to the opposition paper Le Constitutionnel. (Quoted in Charles Ledré, La Presse à l'assault de la monarchie: 1815-1848, Kiosque series (Paris: Colin, 1960), p. 242n).

[16] Subscriptions for the year 1836 total 84,466 (Ledré, La Presse, p. 244).

[17] This happened most frequently with "left-wing" papers. A
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although politically the 1830 rebellion was fairly ineffectual, it did have an effect on public life, which became more "materialistic and immediate. The spectacular amateurs like Chateaubriand . . . gave way to a race of professional politicians like Duchâtel and Guizot".[18] We see a similar rise of the professional artist in the concert world. During the Restoration the concert life of Paris was relatively quiet, but this changed after 1830 when, to quote William Weber, "the salons of the upper-middle class and the Orleanist nobility suddenly leapt into prominence, and the dynamism they generated made Paris the musical capital of Europe for two decades".[19] Legitimists--that is, supporters of the Bourbon monarchy--and their families tended to stay away from concerts during the 1830s, though a certain number continued to frequent the Théâtre Italien. During the Restoration this was thought to be a safe place to take a "well brought-up" young girl who, it was assumed, would not understand the words.[20]

The weakening of aristocratic influence and dominance during the reign of Louis-Philippe (something which had been happening since the Revolution) and consequent lessening of amateur sponsorship gave free reign to the development of middle-class commercialism in Paris. Musical life became competitive and music came to be seen as a saleable commodity available to a general public. This period also

---

[17] (continued)
police report of 1830 stated that one copy of Le Constitutionnel might have as many as 100 readers, whereas one copy of La Quotidienne would have at most a family of readers (Ledré, La Presse, p. 16).

[18] Irene Collins, Government and Society, p. 6.

[19] Music and the Middle Class (London: Croom Helm, 1975), p. 48.

[20] This is according to Marie d'Agoult's Mémoires, quoted in Catherine Join-Dieterle, "L'Opéra et son public à l'époque romantique", L'Oeil, Nos. 288-289 (July 1979), p. 33n.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

saw the consolidation of the printing press and publishing industry, and a consequent outpouring of books, sheet music, and periodicals. The emergence of music criticism was a sign of the number of people now participating in an active concert life.

The "burgeoning middle class" is a phrase used so often in reference to this period that it has become a cliché. However, the term "middle class" has to be treated with caution, as William Weber has pointed out in his excellent article "The Muddle of the Middle Classes".[21] According to Weber the middle-class public that became so prominent in concert life during the reign of Louis-Philippe was in fact a select upper-middle class, a group of people who for some considerable time before 1830 had been taking part in a similar life-style to that of the aristocracy and now were merging with them to form a new "upper" class.[22]

The term "middle class" or "bourgeoisie" was a generic term used to refer to an enormous number of diverse groups that included industrialists, financiers, merchants, tax-farmers, lawyers, civil servants and so on, and generally all wealthy non-titled families. Such groups had widely differing interests, though, to quote Weber, they did begin to take on

> a set of roles and styles seen most clearly in family life, leisure pursuits, and professional organization. The burgeoning book and magazine trade, which preached the virtues of these trends, made the sense of a middle-class way of life a powerful force in the manners

---

[21] "The Muddle of the Middle Classes", 19th-Century Music, 3 (Nov. 1979), 175-185.

[22] Weber makes two clarifications in reference to the repeated use of the adjective "rising" in discussion of the "middle class" in this period. He stresses first that the "middle class" did not suddenly rise during the 1830s but had been rising since the Renaissance, and second that the word "rising" should be understood in the context of the descent of the aristocracy.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and morals of the time.[23]

However, Weber pleads with us not to "personify it as a middle-class spirit". The overlapping interests and activities of, for instance, aristocrats and artisans makes such labels unwise. In my subsequent use of the term "middle class" I would like Weber's clarifications to be borne in mind.[24]

The concert life of the 1830s centered around the Opéra, Théâtre Italien, Opéra-Comique, Conservatoire concerts, and numerous private concerts given in salons of the day. The private salons which had previously featured exclusively amateurs now often had the attraction of a professional virtuoso. Music performed at these salon concerts was varied; it could include popular romances, piano arrangements of current opera highlights, operatic arias, and instrumental pieces. Several of the professional musicians of the day also held private concerts where chamber music was performed.

Artists often gave benefit concerts either for themselves or for friends. These marked the beginning of the public concerts. The Conservatoire concerts or Société des concerts formed, in terms of management and performing practice, the first strictly professional series in Paris. Ironically, however, only a select elite were able to attend the concerts.

Popular music of the day centred around the romance, the popularity of which was enhanced both by the proliferation of sheet music now available and the arrival of the upright piano as a stalwart

---

[23] Weber, "The Muddle of the Middle Classes", p. 185.

[24] Weber expands very interestingly on the notion of the commercially-minded aristocrat of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

member of the middle-class household. There were a number of cheap orchestral concerts, for instance the Musard series, promenade concerts, and outdoor concerts. An English woman visiting Paris in 1835 described a Musard concert in the following terms:

> At half-past seven o'clock, you lounge into a fine, large, well-lighted room, which is rapidly filled with company: a full and good orchestra give you during a couple of hours some of the best and most popular music of the season; and then you lounge out again, in time to dress for a party, or eat ices at Tortoni's, or soberly to go home for a do·estic tea-drinking and early rest. For this concert you pay a franc. . . .[25]

J. M. Bailbé, through an exhaustive examination of secondary novelists of the day, demonstrates the important role played by music in the leisure activity of the middle classes and in the literary imagination of the day. Bailbé argues that many of the romanciers he studied were knowledgeable dilettantes, quite discerning in their musical judgments, and able to give reasons for their appreciations.[26] Some attempt must be made to define the word "dilettante" since it is constantly used in all the literature of the day, including Berlioz's criticism.

The term "dilettante" appears to have been first used during the Restoration in reference to someone who was a passionate devotee of the Italian opera: "Le dilettante, depuis la Restauration jusqu'à la fin du second Empire, c'est l'homme du monde, amateur passionné de musique italienne" ("The dilettante, from the Restoration up until the end of the second empire, was the man of the world, the passionate

---

[25] Frances Trollope, Paris and the Parisians in 1835, I (Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1836), p. 56.

[26] Joseph Marc Bailbé, Le Roman et la musique en France sous la monarchie de juillet (Paris: Lettres modernes, 1969).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

lover of Italian music").[27] The Parisian Théâtre Italien was most popular during the Restoration, when Rossini's operas dominated the musical scene. During the reign of Louis-Philippe, Rossini's supremacy was severely challenged by Meyerbeer, and the word "dilettante" began to be used in reference to devotees of Meyerbeer and Halévy, though it was also used occasionally to designate enthusiastic followers of the professional virtuosi, such as Liszt, Chopin, and Paganini. It would appear that though the term was originally used only in reference to the Théâtre Italien it came to be used for an enthusiastic follower of whatever was fashionable in music. It also came to be used to refer to other arts.[28]

The term "dilettante" was most frequently used during the July monarchy for followers of opera, and it necessarily implied a certain fanaticism.[29] Evidently, however, the dilettante's knowledge of music was on the whole extensive. He was probably, after all, the most avid follower of the music critic. As Vincent Duckles says in an article on the historiography of nineteenth-century music: "[T]he influence of the dilettante was, on the whole, a salutary one in the development of

---

[27] Definition given by Henri Girard in his book Emile Deschamps: dilettante (Paris: Champion, 1921), p. vii.

[28] This evolution of the term corresponds well with its description in the Littré dictionary: "Amateur de musique, surtout de musique italienne. Par extension, celui qui s'occupe d'une chose en amateur" ("The lover of music, especially of Italian music, and by extension someone who is involved with something as an amateur").

[29] Edmond Hippeau remarks that the fanaticism of the dilettante was indeed very similar to the furious enthusiasms that Berlioz had for his idols Gluck and Beethoven. The difference lay in the manner in which Berlioz analyzed his emotions; he was interested in "la vérité dramatique au lieu de l'art du chant" ("dramatic truth instead of the art of singing"). Edmond Hippeau, Berlioz et son temps (Paris: P. Ollendorff, 1890), p. 50.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the discipline".[30]

Sometimes the word "dilettante" is used as a synonym for "amateur". Cecilia Hopkins Porter in an article on the Lower Rhine Music Festivals talks of a "dilettante singing society" and of the "enduring dilettantism" of the eighteenth century.[31] The use of the term in early nineteenth-century France, with its connotation of enthusiasm, its original association with Italian music, and lingering association with opera in general, counts against it being taken as synonymous only with amateur. The etymology of the word is listed in Trésor de la langue française as "celui qui trouve plaisir à quelque-chose".[32] Some confusion could arise here over the two meanings of amateur in French, one the opposite of professional and the other referring to someone who takes pleasure in something. The second meaning is much closer to dilettante than the first. The French use of the term, particularly when used by Berlioz, at times took on slightly denigratory connotations; it implied a certain superficiality and a following of music for the sake of fashion. Berlioz describes the dilettantes as

> [c]es gens chez lesquels le sens musical se réduit à l'appréciation de la justesse d'un son, abstraction faite de tous ses autres rapports avec l'ensemble d'un ouvrage, ces gens qui trouvent du charme à des productions composées dans l'unique but de recréer l'oreille, en froissant sans ménagement tout ce qui ne sert pas directement à l'effet matériel.

---

30 "Patterns in the Historiography of 19th-Century Music", Acta Musicologica, 42 (1970), 77.

31 Cecilia Hopkins Porter, "The New Public and the Reordering of the Musical Establishment: The Lower Rhine Music Festivals, 1818-1867", 19th-Century Music, 3 (March 1980), 211-224.

32 The Trésor de la langue française states that dilettante is an Italian word dating from the end of the fifteenth century or beginning of the sixteenth century, and was first used in France in 1740 by Ch. de Brosses in his Lettres d'Italie.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> ([t]hose people for whom musical sense is reduced to the appreciation of the accuracy of a sound, abstracting from all its other relations with the ensemble of a work; those people who find charm in productions composed with the unique aim of diverting the ear, in discarding without consideration all that does not directly serve the material effect.)[33]

This anticipates its twentieth-century usage, which is frequently pejorative and implies shallow knowledge and a lack of real involvement.

Berlioz did not find writing music criticism particularly congenial, yet his activity as a critic became an essential part of his life. Many people at the time appreciated his criticism more than his music. The role of critic was a difficult one to maintain with integrity. I shall trace the difficulties and rewards encountered by Berlioz in his tightrope walk between diplomacy and honesty.

---

[33] GM, 1 Feb. 1835, p. 41.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER I

Music Criticism in the Early Nineteenth Century

i. Survey of the music criticism in contemporary journals and newspapers

During the first part of the Restoration, musical press in Paris was very sparse. The newspapers did have a theatrical-musical coverage, and the post of reviewer was a sought-after job because of its small perquisites of free admission and the like. This position was not reserved for someone with the necessary knowledge, but was open to all, the prerequisites if any being a lively writing style and a turn of wit. Lucien de Rubempré, that fashionable journalist in Balzac's Illusions Perdues, remains the most vivid, if cynical, portrayal of the fundamental decadence of the theatre critic of the time.

It was some time before any critical distinction was made between dramatic and operatic theatre; both were seen as belonging to the domain of the literary critic. The most striking consequence of this lack of differentiation was that criticism of opera tended to be a criticism of the libretto only. It was against this in particular that Castil-Blaze, the first self-consciously styled "music" critic of the time, was rebelling.[1] François Castil-Blaze, or "xxx" as he first

---

[1] François Henri Joseph Castil-Blaze (1784-1857), French writer on music, librettist and composer who contributed to many journals and newspapers including Revue de Paris, Le Constitutionnel, Le Ménestrel, RGM, and France Musicale. He translated and adapted numerous operas such as Le nozze di Figaro, Die Zauberflöte, Don Giovanni, and Il barbiere di Siviglia. His books include De l'Opéra en France (1820) and a Dictionnaire de musique moderne (1821). (NG) A recent article by an "Equipe littérature-musique" from the Université de Paris IV ("Les Notes d'un dilettante de Stendhal", Revue de Musicologie, 67 (1983), 187-208) argues that the first professional music criticism in Paris was the criticism written by Stendhal for the Journal de Paris (1824-1826). Since Stendhal's criticism is of Italian opera only, and

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

signed his name, was most renowned for his arrangements and adaptations of other people's works, which he undertook with the aim of making them accessible to the general Parisian public. His most infamous arrangement was Robin des bois, based on Weber's Der Freischütz.[2] Castil-Blaze took over the post of music critic for the Journal des Débats from two literary critics, Geoffroy (1800-1814)[3] and Duviquet (1814-1820),[4] and in his first article categorically announced his departure from his predecessors: "Cette chronique sera exclusivement consacrée à la musique. Les opéras anciens et nouveaux y seront (uniquement sous le rapport musical) examinés, analysés avec soin et d'après les principes de la bonne école" ("This chronicle will be devoted exclusively to music. Both new and old operas will be examined here (only in their musical aspects), analysed with care, and according to the principles of the correct school.")[5] He broadened the scope of the review to include areas other than opera such as

---

[1](continued)
by a professed dilettante at that, I would still maintain that Castil-Blaze was the first professional music critic.

[2] Some of his adaptations took the form of pastiches, for instance, La Fausse Agnès, opéra-bouffon en 3 actes, d'après Destouches, paroles ajustées sur la musique de Cimarosa, Rossini, Meyerbeer, Pucitta, Federici, etc., 1834. Léon Guichard quipped that "Choron servait la musique. Castil-Blaze s'en servit." Léon Guichard, La Musique et les lettres au temps du romantisme (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1955), p. 168.

[3] Julien-Louis Geoffroy (1743-1814), French literary critic. In 1800 he took charge of the literary and drama feuilleton for the JD, changing the conception of the column in greatly broadening its scope. He was of classical orientation. (DicL) His favorite genre was the opéra-comique of Grétry and he had little knowledge of music.

[4] Pierre Duviquet (1766-1835), French writer and politician and, like Geoffroy, of strong classical orientation. (19th-Century Larousse)

[5] Quoted in Ernest Reyer, "La Critique musicale", in Le Livre du centenaire du Journal des Débats, 1789-1889 (Paris: Plon, 1889), p. 429.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

chamber music, orchestral music, and religious vocal music, areas which in general required a more technical musical knowledge. Castil-Blaze also wrote on theoretical issues such as the "literary music critic".[6] Despite his background, Castil-Blaze's musical analysis in these early reviews is fairly rudimentary. He tends to be descriptive rather than analytical and uses a number of emotive adjectives which add little to the readers' knowledge of the work. To give a short example from a review of a concerto of Viotti:

> [D]ans le nouveau concerto de M. Viotti, les tutti en sont pleins de vigueur, le premier morceau est brillant, et de ce style large qui caractérise la manière de cet illustre violoniste. L'adagio est délicieux mais le rondeau n'a pas assez de noblesse.
>
> ([I]n the new concerto of M. Viotti, the tuttis are full of vigour, the first movement is brilliant, and of that broad style that is characteristic of this illustrious violinist's style. The adagio is delicious, but the rondo does not have enough nobility.)[7]

Later in his life Castil-Blaze's articles became less descriptive with sometimes quite detailed and extended examination of the music.

These early articles did not set a standard for exemplary criticism, but they did set a precedent in music criticism at that time. The fact that Castil-Blaze wrote for an important political newspaper was significant also, since it meant that he was reaching a fairly substantial audience and establishing new expectations of what areas should be the concern of the music critic.

The other major contributor to the development of a distinct

---

[6] See for instance his article "Don Juan" (14 March 1821), in Chronique musicale du Journal des Débats (Paris: Publ. by the author, 1830), pp. 49-52. Despite its title the article discusses the literary music critic.

[7] Castil-Blaze, "Concert spirituel. Retraite de juillet", JD, 30 April 1821, in Castil-Blaze, Chronique musicale, p. 67.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

music criticism was François-Joseph Fétis.[8] Fétis became influential at a later date than Castil-Blaze, and it was in 1827 that he founded (and ran almost single-handed for the next five years) his Revue Musicale. Before the founding of the Revue Musicale, no other music journal had existed for more than a two year period in France, with the exception of the Correspondance des amateurs musiciens.[9]

Fétis's reviews were scholarly and serious. In writing for a presumably informed and limited audience he was obliged to make few concessions to the musically uneducated public. He covered a broad spectrum of areas with an emphasis on researched historical articles on music. Reviews of current concerts were included, but were by no means the most important section of the magazine. During the 1830s Fétis began writing articles for political newspapers as well, usually on serious musical issues rather than reviews of concerts. It has already been mentioned that detailed analysis of Fétis as a critic can be found in Peter A. Bloom's excellent unpublished thesis on Fétis and the Revue Musicale.

Thus, it was during the second half of the Restoration that music criticism as a separate discipline began in the Paris newspapers and that the first serious music journal was established. As said in the introduction, the late 1820s saw the emergence of a purely

---

[8] François-Joseph Fétis (1784-1871), Belgian musicologist, critic, teacher, and composer. He was renowned for his Biographie universelle des musiciens, the most comprehensive biographical dictionary of its time. He had a special interest in early music, for example he ran Concerts historiques in Paris from 1832. In 1833 he was appointed head of the Conservatoire in Brussels. He wrote a large number of books, many pedagogically oriented, and helped to lay the basis for contemporary musicology and ethnomusicology. (NG)

[9] Peter A. Bloom, "Fétis and the Revue Musicale", p. 21. Correspondance des amateurs musiciens appeared in 167 numbers over the three-year period 1802-1805.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

instrumental musical genre and the development of orchestral concerts, which demanded a new critical response and played an important role in expanding the scope of the music review. By the reign of Louis-Philippe most newspapers had at least an occasional separate music review. The lists of free Entrées for theatres conserved at the Archives Nationales in Paris show an interesting change between 1831 and 1836.[10] The 1831 list comprises composers, performers, police, doctors, and professors at the Conservatoire, with a few critics such as Fétis. The 1836 list has the same basic outline, but with the major difference that a large number of journalists are now included, whose names are listed quite formally alongside the names of the newspapers they represented.[11] Not very many critics signed their articles during the late Restoration or the early years of Louis-Philippe. They either left their reviews unsigned, or initialled, or else signed with a pseudonym. But by 1835 many specialized critics started signing their names in full, Berlioz included.

Music criticism in Paris in the 1830s was not of a very high standard, yet some interesting work was being done that should not be totally ignored. In order to place Berlioz's criticism in its contemporary context, I have looked at music criticism in a number of journals and newspapers of the time, most of them from the period of 1834 to 1836, the year Berlioz started his full-time occupation as a critic. However, he did not work in a professional capacity for any

---

[10] Archives Nationales de Paris, AJ. 13, 218.

[11] Free entries quickly became the music critic's prerogative. When, in 1854, a new director of the Opéra, Perrin, tried to withdraw the free entries, music critics declared a war of silence and refused to review the Opéra until their rights were restored. (Berlioz, letter of 1854, CG IV, 575).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of these publications.

Before starting this brief summary of the press, it is necessary to give some sort of explanation of terms. Music criticism in newspapers and journals appeared under various headings, such as: "Chronique musicale", "Bulletin musical", "Spectacles de Paris", "Chronique de Paris", "Revue musicale", "Critique musicale", and "Feuilleton musical". The first four of these headings referred basically to the same thing, an overview of the week's musical and sometimes also theatrical events. The last three headings are usually used interchangeably to refer to music criticism in general. That is, under these headings, one might find a theoretical essay on music, a review of a recent concert, or an historical article on a particular composer. Originally, the term "Feuilleton" supposedly referred specifically to a review of a performance of the previous night. Jules Janin cutely defined it as "un petit cri de joie que nous arrache le spectacle du jour" ("a little cry of joy that the spectacle of the day tears from us").[12] Given that it was only in the mid 1830s that articles on music other than opera and opéra-comique began to appear regularly, the title "Feuilleton musical" did on the whole retain its original definition. However, it also came to be used to refer to any sort of music criticism. As Ursula Eckart-Bäcker remarks about Berlioz, when Berlioz called himself a feuilletoniste, this could have signified any of the following: music critic, music journalist, and writer on music. All of these terms were synonomous.[13]

---

[12] Quoted in Emile Faguet, "La Critique de 1820 à 1850", in Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française, ed. Petit de Julleville, VII (Paris: Armand Colin, 1899), p. 658.

[13] Ursula Eckart-Bäcker, Frankreichs Musik zwischen Romantik und Moderne, die Zeit im Spiegel der Kritik (Regensburg: G. Bosse Verlag, 1965), p. 17.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The plain heading of "Feuilleton", as distinct from "Feuilleton musical", in the political newspapers usually referred to a column devoted to the arts in some form or another--literature, drama, music--that contrasted with the political content of the rest of the paper.

In this brief survey the political newspapers consulted were: Le Constitutionnel, Journal de Paris, La Mode, Le Moniteur Universal, Le National, La Presse (founded in 1836), La Quotidienne, Le Siècle (founded in 1836), and Le Temps.[14] La Quotidienne and La Mode were Legitimist; Le Constitutionnel, Le Moniteur Universel, Journal de Paris, La Presse, and Le Siècle were supporters of Louis-Philippe, though the last two were more nominal than active political supporters. Le Temps, which had been formed by Jacques Coste in 1829 to combat the retrograde tendencies of Charles X's government, was in the process of becoming a "journal encyclopédique" (mini encyclopaedia) during the mid 1830s. It claimed to be independent of political allegiance but tended generally to support the government. Le National was Republican during this period.

Many of the newspapers of the time often changed political allegiance over the course of the century, so it must be stressed that the period under consideration is that from 1834 to 1836 only. Three literary journals were also consulted: the Revue de Paris, Revue des Deux Mondes, and L'Artiste.

Music criticism in these newspapers and journals was still dominated by critics with preponderantly literary rather than musical

---

[14] La Mode was a journal rather than a newspaper, but has been listed here because of its political leanings.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

backgrounds. However, there was generally not just one critic employed, but several different people. There was also a small group of "serious" critics--Mainzer, Desnoyers, Castil-Blaze, Blaze de Bury, d'Ortigue, and Fétis--whose work stands out from the rest. For the sake of convenience I shall refer consistently to this group as "the serious critics", in order to differentiate them from their less serious colleagues in music journalism. The qualification of "serious" is of course only comparative. Jules Janin is for example a less serious music critic.[15] A spirited, witty writer, Janin is reputed to have "dit du mal de tout ce dont il avait dit du bien" ("said something bad about everything of which he had said something good").[16] He wrote frequently on music.

In his column the one critic often covered Opéra, Opéra-Comique, Théâtres--including Variétés and Vaudeville--and the occasional book review.[17] Some papers and journals had a chronicle of the week's (or month's) events, including musical events, which appeared alongside extended articles or reviews of music. Such chronicles often included the other areas mentioned above, as well as gossip about well-known singers, actors, and actresses. The Revue de Paris and Revue des Deux Mondes had brief "Chronique" sections, though in neither case was it a

---

[15] Jules Janin (1804-1874), French literary critic and author. He wrote for Figaro, La Quotidienne, Le Messager, JD, RGM, and others; his feuilletons in the JD were more renowned for their spirit and verve than for their conviction and method. (DicL) He was a very good friend to Berlioz. He wrote numerous books, the most interesting in relation to music being Le Gâteau des rois (1847) and Les Symphonies d'hiver (1857).

[16] Quoted in Edmond Texier, Histoire des journaux. Biographie des journalistes (Paris: Pagnerre, 1850), p. 44.

[17] For instance, "P." in Le Moniteur Universel and "J. T." in La Quotidienne. Katherine Kolb Reeve suggests that "J. T." was possibly Joseph d'Ortigue. See "A Berliozian Spoof", Berlioz Society Bulletin, 106 (Winter 1979-80), p. 10, n. 15.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

regular feature. In the Revue des Deux Mondes it was the editor Buloz who wrote the "Chronique", which was entitled "Chronique de la quinzaine" and covered recent political events and literature as well as music.[18]

The literary journals the Revue de Paris and Revue des Deux Mondes had some serious articles on music, several historical essays, such as Castil-Blaze's articles on Lully for the Revue de Paris,[19] and Blaze de Bury's Poètes et musiciens de l'Allemagne series in the Revue des Deux Mondes (1836). However, articles on music were sparse in both journals and not every issue would have something on music. The same was true of the feuilleton in Le Siècle, largely written by Louis Viardot and Louis Desnoyers.[20] Though it had interesting articles on a variety of areas from time to time, including the occasional Conservatoire concert, the number of articles was very limited.

The three newspapers with the best music criticism--in terms of the areas covered and the quality of the writing--were Le Temps, Le National, and L'Artiste. According to Eugène Hatin, after 1830 Le Temps

> déclara se "vouer uniquement à la profession des vrais principes, au progrès des idées, au maintien de l'ordre et de la liberté, indépendamment des hommes et des partis qui triompheraient ou qui succomberaient.

---

[18] François Buloz (1804-1877), French publicist and director of journals. In 1831 he took over directorship of the RDM and in 1834 the Revue de Paris. He was gifted in detecting the budding talent of for instance Musset and Sand. (DicL)

[19] "Lulli", Parts 1 and 2, Revue de Paris, 8 (Aug. 1845), pp. 73-98 and 145-169.

[20] Louis Desnoyers (1802-1868), French journalist and novelist. In 1829 and 1830 he founded various journals of a liberal tendency. (DicL) In the 1830s he contributed to La Caricature, Le Corsaire, Charivari, and Le National and in 1836 was put in charge of the literary feuilleton for Le Siècle. He published a book on the Opéra, De l'Opéra en 1847 (1847), a collection of his Le Siècle articles.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Recuillir des idées progressives, les mûrir, les développer, tels seraient sa tâche et l'esprit de sa polémique."
>
> (announced that it would "dedicate itself to the profession of true principles, to the progress of ideas, to the maintenance of order and liberty, independently of the men and parties that triumph or fall. To collect progressive ideas, bring them to maturity, and develop them, such will be its task and the spirit of its polemic.")[21]

An ambitious programme, and one perhaps not altogether feasible at the time, since the paper, needing to capture the middle-class reading public to survive, had, to some extent, to gear itself to that market.

In its music reviews Le Temps included general articles on music and also encompassed a broad range of musical genres--opera, orchestral music, including Berlioz's concerts and the Conservatoire concerts, chamber music, and, given the least coverage of all, opéra-comique. Le Temps had a large collection of people contributing to its music criticism, including Loève-Veimars,[22] Adolphe Guéroult,[23] Fétis, and d'Ortigue. To an extent writers took charge of specific areas. Loève-Veimars, for instance, wrote on the Théâtre Italien, d'Ortigue on the Conservatoire Concerts, and Fétis wrote more general

---

[21] Bibliographie historique et critique de la presse périodique française (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1866), p. 368.

[22] François-Adolphe Loève-Veimars (1801-1854), French literary commentator. A fluent German speaker, he published numerous articles on German literature, for instance, his book Résumé de l'histoire de la littérature allemande (1826). He also translated Wieland and most importantly E. T. A. Hoffmann's Contes fantastiques and Contes nocturnes (1829-1830). (DicL) He wrote music criticism for Le Temps during the 1830s.

[23] Adolphe Guéroult (1810-1872), French politician, publicist, and journalist. An early sympathiser of Saint-Simon, he wrote literary articles for Le Globe and literary and musical reviews for Le Temps during the 1830s. He was involved in founding several journals, including La République and l'Opinion Nationale. (19th-Century Larousse)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

articles with such titles as "Philosophie de la musique".[24] Chamber music was irregularly reviewed. Most of the important musical events were covered and there were articles on the German opera performed at the Théâtre Ventadour in 1834 and on music performed at the Gymnase Musical.[25] Fétis and d'Ortigue were the only two critics to have any musical training. Although the other critics had a literary formation, their criticism was always enthusiastic and concerned and, while on occasion revealing the need for greater musical knowledge, showed a fair musical understanding.

Le National had two critics. One who signed himself "x" reviewed the opéra-comique and other lighter works; the other, Louis Desnoyers in 1834 and 1835 and Joseph Mainzer in 1836, reviewed opera and wrote general, speculative articles on music. Mainzer's reviews were broader in scope, for instance, he regularly reviewed the Conservatoire concerts. Both he and Desnoyers clearly spent a great deal of time on their articles, taking them seriously and even at times with a pedagogical zeal.

It is interesting that of the papers covered in this survey the two with the best criticism, Le Temps and Le National, were politically the least conservative. The frequency and length--Desnoyers' articles for Le National often extended over nine columns at the bottom of three pages--of music reviews in both papers suggest enlightened editors. Both newspapers also had people on their staff who had been involved in, or were sympathetic to, the Saint-Simonian movement. The important role assigned to music by the Saint-Simonians

---

[24] Le Temps, 22 Dec. 1834, pp. 1-2.

[25] The Gymnase Musical was an orchestral society established in 1835 to perform serious music. It lasted only a short time because it could not obtain permission to perform vocal music.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

had perhaps influenced the papers' attitude towards music criticism. In both papers there was more than one critic, and individual writers were allowed to cover their own areas of interest and expertise.

L'Artiste was a literary journal founded in 1831. It had a number of excellent critics writing for it such as Gustave Planche and Théophile Gautier. Its best criticism was in the areas of literature and fine-arts, and though Fétis wrote the occasional article for it the majority of music reviews were unsigned or written by literary critics. The striking feature of the music criticism was its abundance and scope; all the Conservatoire concerts were reviewed, as were the occasional chamber music concert and all major operas and opéra-comiques. L'Artiste and Le Temps were the only two newspapers in this survey to cover the Conservatoire concerts regularly, but the standard of criticism was not particularly high. At times it was aggressively anti-analytical and often written in a rhetorical and florid fashion. A striking feature was the tone of religiosity and awe the critics adopted whenever they discussed Beethoven. As was almost always the case with the literary music critics, intense scorn was expressed for Scribe's libretti.

Some of the criticism in these newspapers is harsh in its criticism of works that were generally popular. Louis Desnoyers, for instance, wrote several highly critical articles on Meyerbeer's Les Huguenots (1836). François Buloz defended his own condemnation of Halévy's La Juive with the self-righteous remark:

> Que si vous nous trouvez sévères envers un homme de conscience et de talent, nous répondrons que devant la critique honnête et pure, il n'existe que les oeuvres bonnes ou méchantes, et que c'est son devoir de cultiver les unes, et de les émonder, afin qu'elles fleurissent au soleil, et d'arracher les autres sans pitié.
>
> (If you find us severe towards a conscientious and talented man, we will reply that for an honest and pure

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> critic there exists only works that are good or bad, and that it is our duty to cultivate the former and prune them so that they blossom in the sun, and to pull out the latter without pity.)[26]

Such discussion of the critic's role was quite common. Often writers talked of various styles of criticism, the three main ones being termed the analytical, the impressionistic, and the admiratif.

The analytical or more scholarly style of criticism was usually seen by the average music critic as stemming from Fétis and considered dry, pedantic, and unsuited to a newspaper or literary journal. In discussing the possibility of using this style a critic for Le Temps wrote,

> Dieu me garde de me lancer dans l'analyse d'une symphonie à moins que je ne copie la Revue musicale, et que je ne dise après elle que le retour dans le ton principal est preparé par un accord parfait sur fa dièze, dominant du ton de si naturel: langage qui convient à merveille aux lecteurs spéciaux de la Revue, mais qui ne me va pas à moi, ignorant, qui ne va pas mieux à la majorité non spéciale des abonnés du Temps.
>
> God keep me from embarking upon the analysis of a symphony, unless I copy the Revue Musicale, and say, as it does, that the return in the principal key is prepared by a perfect cadence on F sharp, the dominant of the key of B natural: a language that marvellously suits the specialized readers of the Revue, but not me, ignorant as I am, and that suits the non-specialized audience of Le Temps no better.)[27]

Despite this claim, Fétis did not in fact use very much analytical terminology in his newspaper articles.

The impressionistic style, the obverse of the analytical,

---

[26] "Revue. Chronique. Théâtres", RDM, 4th Series, 1 (1835), 595.

[27] "Ch. L." (pseudonym for Mme Girardin) in an article "Société des concerts.—Symphonies de Beethoven", 27 Feb. 1834, p. 2. Delphine Girardin—née Gay (1804-1855), French poet, novelist and dramatist, who also worked as a journalist under the name of Vicomte de Launay. (DicL)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

involved discussing music purely in terms of the writer's emotional responses and taking it as a stimulus for poetic reverie. The following remark on Beethoven is a good example:

> En effet, toutes les créations de Beethoven ne vous causent-elles pas et cette tristesse infinie et cette exaltation de l'ame [sic] qui éprouve le besoin de s'unir avec Dieu!
>
> (In fact, do not all Beethoven's works evoke in you both that infinite sadness and that exaltation of the soul that feels the need to unite with God!)[28]

L'Artiste specialised in this rhetorical style and saw such an approach to music as a superior one; witness the following doting comment on the audience at a Conservatoire concert: "[U]n public qui ne cherche pas à analyser après coup une ouverture ou une symphonie, qui comprend spontanément les pensées du compositeur" ("[A] public that doesn't attempt afterwards to analyse an overture or a symphony, that spontaneously understands the thoughts of the composer").[29] This approach to music criticism was typical of the literary critic with the dilettante's knowledge of music. Even Blaze de Bury,[30] one of the finest literary music critics of the time, whom Arthur Pougin called a "dilettante passionné qui a pris la peine de réfléchir avant d'exprimer sa pensée" ("impassioned dilettante who took the trouble to

---

[28] "Société des concerts du Conservatoire de musique", L'Artiste, 7, No. 3 (1834), p. 26. The article is unsigned.

[29] "Société des concerts du Conservatoire de musique", L'Artiste, 7, No. 1 (1834), p. 5. The article is unsigned.

[30] Henri Blaze de Bury, often called Henri Blaze (1818-1888), French literary figure, son of Castil-Blaze. He was music critic for the RDM and published numerous books among which were: Musiciens contemporains (1856), Rossini et son temps (1862), Meyerbeer et son temps (1865), and Musiciens du passé, du présent et de l'avenir (1880). (20th-Century Larousse) In his early years he wrote under the name of Hans Werner.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reflect before expressing his thoughts"),[31] felt that the best critic was not one who analysed but one who "felt". Blaze de Bury summed this up in his maxim, "Juger c'est comprendre, comprendre c'est sentir" ("To judge is to understand, to understand is to feel").[32] The following quotation from a review of the overture to Der Freischütz gives a brief example of Blaze de Bury's style: "Ecoutez ces sons voilés des cors, cet exorde mystérieux si profondément empreint de cette vie mâle et forestière dont le tableau va se dérouler devant vous" ("Listen to the veiled sounds of the horns, this mysterious beginning so profoundly imprinted with that virile forest-life the tableau of which is going to unfold before you").[33]

Not all the literary music critics had the same approach to criticism, however. A notable exception was Gustave Planche, whose approach could be classified as classical, certainly in comparison to Blaze de Bury's approach.[34] Planche's claim was for a "disinterested"

---

[31] De la littérature musicale en France (Paris: Alfred Ikelmer, 1867), p. 29. H. Robert Cohen categorizes Blaze de Bury as a "critic historian" (see "The Nineteenth-Century French Press", 19th-Century Music, 7 (Fall, 1983), p. 142) and perhaps he was to an extent; but he also wrote quite extensively on literature as well as music. He certainly could not be put in the same class as Fétis who was a true "critic historian".

[32] Henri Blaze de Bury, Musiciens contemporains (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1856), p. x.

[33] Blaze de Bury, Musiciens contemporains, p. 32.

[34] Gustave Planche (1808-1857), French literary critic, who wrote on music and fine-arts as well as literature. He wrote for Le Globe (1830-31), RDM, and L'Artiste. He was called the "adversaire des Romantiques", whose works he judged severely, making enemies of such men as Victor Hugo. (DicL) He remained friendly with Sand, de Vigny, and Balzac, for whom he relaxed his high critical standards. His most important book was Etudes sur les arts (1855). René Wellek says of Planche's classicism, "He is not a classicist in the sense of idolizing the 17th century or defending the rules. He is rather a fiercely independent upholder of 'good sense', which in practice turns out to be a denial of imagination and poetry" (quoted in History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950, III, 17).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

criticism which would always retain control over its feelings:

> La critique désintéressée, une fois sûre de la sincérité de son opinion, doit se faire coquette et passionnée; elle doit chercher l'élégance et la parure, comme si elle ne voulait qu'amuser; elle doit se composer des colères et des enthousiasmes, comme si elle voulait renverser ou édifier.
>
> (Disinterested criticism, once sure of the sincerity of its feelings, should make itself coquettish and ardent; it must seek elegance and ornament, as if it only wanted to amuse; it should compose its own angers and its enthusiasms as if it wanted to astonish or edify.)[35]

There was no spontaneous or untutored flow of feeling in Planche's criticism.

In the body of his criticism Louis Desnoyers frequently harangued against what he called the "style admiratif" or the "prostitution d'éloge". This referred basically to the critic's indiscriminate use of adjectives such as "admirable", "sublime", "magnifique"--words used to such an extent as to rob them of any real meaning. Desnoyers' plea for rational, not delirious, enthusiasm was perfectly justified, as the average music review of the day was filled with strings of such adjectives often accompanied by equally long strings of exclamation marks. Berlioz occasionally used the "style admiratif" as it is described here, but in moderation;[36] and he at times complained of its indiscriminate use by other critics. Berlioz also wrote in this style in responding to the works of three specific composers: Beethoven, Gluck, and Weber. In these instances the "style admiratif" refers not just to the use of certain adjectives but to a whole mode of eulogy.

Several general preoccupations can be gleaned from the small body

---

[35] "Du Role de la critique", L'Artiste, 10, No. 15 (1835), p. 168.

[36] This is discussed in Appendix B.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of "serious" critics discussed in this survey. The most predominant preoccupation was an interest in and concern for the role of music criticism and the critic's mission or goal. All these critics felt they had some responsibility to guide the public taste; they aimed at providing more than a merely diverting account of a spectacle.

Castil-Blaze was very aware that his musical "expertise" equipped him to make stern judgements on a composer's technique. He continually flaunted the extent of his knowledge and delighted in finding passages in a work that he felt came from the work of another composer. This practice was possibly allied to his work as an arranger and adapter of other people's music, as also was his continual, vain challenge to the public to identify which sections in one of his arrangements were by a certain composer (for instance Weber) and which were Castil-Blaze's imitation of that composer. Throughout his criticism Castil-Blaze spent considerable energy in both directly and indirectly defending his own compositions and arrangements. This was perhaps the unconscious goal behind his criticism. His conscious goal as a critic seems to have been the enlightenment of the public and artists on the "true" nature of musical composition, which could only be perceived by someone with the necessary training.

The critic's role was much more clearly perceived by Mainzer and particularly by Desnoyers and d'Ortigue who both wrote at length on the subject.[37] All three saw the critic's role as an ethical one,

---

[37] See, in particular, Desnoyers' article, "Théâtre Italien. Récapitulation des premiers travaux de la saison. Considérations sur la critique musicale actuelle", Le National, 7 Nov. 1834, pp. 1-3, and d'Ortigue's "De la critique musicale. Dans ses rapports avec l'état actuel de l'art", RGM, 18 Sept. 1836, pp. 326-328, and 25 Sept. 1836, pp. 338-341.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that of intelligently and correctly guiding the public taste.

Mainzer's belief in the critic's pedagogical role interplayed with his desire to propagate choral singing amongst the working classes.[38] Since he believed that the critic did have the power to influence the public, he naturally attempted to use his column as a means of promoting the idea of singing for the people. This did not mean writing only about his own efforts, but also about any concerts in Paris or the provinces that had been mounted by some group or other of singers.[39] Mainzer obviously saw his personal mission as being to promote singing for the people wherever possible. Papers such as Le National and the Revue des Deux Mondes gave him free rein to do just that.

Desnoyers perceived the critic's goal in more general terms. He felt that the critic's aim should be to "instruire" and "éclairer"--a simple aim, but one which he felt had been completely neglected by his contemporary critics. Desnoyers saw his colleagues' criticism as bound by limited time and space and as lapsing into the mere description, comprised of banal and meaningless clichés, of performances. He gives the following as an example: "[R]ien n'égale la beauté du spectacle, . . . le finale produit un effet impossible à

---

[38] Joseph Mainzer (1801-1851), German music critic, teacher and musician. He went into political exile in Paris in 1834, where he worked as a critic and gave free singing classes for workers. The classes were banned in 1839 and Mainzer left Paris and went to England where he continued his activities and founded Mainzer's Musical Times (which became the present-day Musical Times). (NG) He worked as a journalist in Paris for the RGM, Le Reformateur, and Le National and published several books and many choruses designed for teaching purposes.

[39] See, for instance, the titles of his two reviews in Le National, "Education musicale. Concert des jeunes aveugles", 29 April 1837, pp. 1-3, and "Début de M. Duprez dans Les Hugenots. Ecole chorale à Nantes", 19 May 1837, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

décrire . . . [et] la mise en scène est d'une magnificence qui fait l'éloge de l'habile directeur" ("[N]othing equals the beauty of this spectacle,. . . the finale produces an effect impossible to describe . . . [and] the magnificence of the mise-en-scène pays hommage to the talented director").[40] He does not suggest that extra time and space be allotted to the critic, which is odd since he must have been aware of the advantages of both these factors. Instead he claimed that for music criticism to achieve its mission of forming and guiding the public taste, it had to be more analytical and precise, so as to examine why certain effects were produced. Desnoyers' own carefully considered and researched criticism certainly attempted to achieve this aim to the best of his ability, and it is a pity that he did not have a more developed musical formation and broader musical interests.

Of the three men, d'Ortigue was the most involved with the question of the critic's mission.[41] He was concerned with the critic's perception and understanding of the ethical content of music and the way in which that content, if present, was to be conveyed to the public.

D'Ortigue was a friend and follower of Lamennais,[42] with whom he

---

[40] Desnoyers, "Considérations sur la critique musicale", Le National, 7 Nov. 1834, p. 2.

[41] Joseph d'Ortigue (1802-1866), French writer on music, with a strong interest in religious and church music. He wrote for over twenty journals, including editing Le Ménestral in 1863, and took over from Berlioz on the JD (1864). His major books include: De la guerre des dilettanti (1829), Le Balcon de l'Opéra (1833), Dictionnaire liturgique, historique et théorique de plain-chant et de musique de l'église (1853). (NG)

[42] Félicité de Lamennais (1782-1854), French priest and author. He began as a Royalist but changed after 1830 when he saw that injustices continued. In 1830 he founded a journal called L'Avenir in favour of separation of church and state, freedom of the press, and education. For the rest of his life he fought for humanitarian ideals and issues such as universal suffrage, with which he felt the church

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

worked during 1830 on devising a theory of the arts in which platonic precepts were intermingled with new ideals of social progress.[43] Art was seen as expressive of the natural world and as an educative tool in the moral upbringing of the people.[44] D'Ortigue puzzled over the possibility of music criticism being based on an immutable law of Beauty, which would govern all good compositions. Although he concluded that such a law did exist, his conclusions on its critical application remain vague and confused.[45] It was supposedly aligned with nature and in contact both with the infinite (God) and humanity (the people). The critic was to use this law as a criterion by which to assess the value of a composition. No concrete indications of how this assessment might be achieved were given, as it was assumed to be an intuitive process. D'Ortigue's continual concern for the moral implications of music and music criticism bears a resemblance to the Saint-Simonian approach to music, as shall be shown in the following section of this chapter.

J. M. Bailbé, in his excellent book Le Roman et la musique sous la monarchie de juillet, mentions many instances of the popularity of Beethoven's music in the works of nineteenth-century French romanciers. The following extract from Balzac's short story Gambara gives a good example of the manner in which Beethoven's music was described at the time:

---

[42] (continued)
should be actively involved. (GLE) His book, Paroles d'un croyant (1833), influenced artists such as Hugo, George Sand, Lamartine, and Vigny.

[43] Dorothy Hagan, "French Music Criticism", p. 18.

[44] Dorothy Hagen, "French Music Criticism", pp. 19-20.

[45] Discussed in d'Ortigue's articles for the RGM, "De la critique musicale".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> En ouvrant la Symphonie en ut mineur de Beethoven, un homme de musique est bientôt transporté dans le monde de la Fantaisie sur les ailes d'or du thème en sol naturel, répété en mi par les cors. Il voit toute une nature tour à tour éclairée par éblouissantes gerbes de lumières, assombrie par des nuages de mélancolie, égayée par des chants divins.
>
> (In opening Beethoven's Symphony in C minor a musical man is soon transported into the world of Fantasy on the golden wings of the theme in G natural, repeated in E by the horns. He sees the whole of nature which alternately is lit up by sprays of light, darkened by clouds of melancholy, and brightened by the divine songs.)[46]

The literary music critics during the 1830s were also enamoured with Beethoven. Blaze de Bury compared a Beethoven symphony with Shakespeare's Hamlet, Goethe's Faust and Werther, and Chateaubriand's René--all works that, for Blaze de Bury, expressed the troubles, melancholy, despairs, and hopes of modern man.[47] As orchestral and instrumental music were not, as already mentioned, always regularly reviewed by critics, d'Ortigue must be commended for his continual espousal of the Conservatoire concerts. He said in his introduction to the Balcon de l'Opéra, for example, that one Conservatoire concert was worth more than three months of performances at the Théâtre Italien.[48] Both d'Ortigue and Mainzer spread their reviews of orchestral music over a number of newspapers. This might have been because editors asked them specifically to review these concerts, though it also might have been that they themselves insisted upon

---

[46] Honoré de Balzac, Le Chef-d'oeuvre inconnu. Gambara. Massimilla Doni, introd. and notes Marc Eigeldinger and Max Milner (Paris: Flammarion, 1981), p. 92.

[47] Henri Blaze de Bury, Meyerbeer et son temps (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1856), p. 4.

[48] Joseph d'Ortigue, Le Balcon de l'Opéra (Paris: E. Renduel, 1833), p. vii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which areas they would review.

D'Ortigue felt that orchestral music was by its very nature more open to contemplation and more likely to propel one into the realms of the infinite. This view was common at the time and is, for instance, found in the writings of E. T. A. Hoffmann. For d'Ortigue instrumental music was life in microcosm:

> La musique instrumentale réunit les diverses inspirations qui ont présidé aux différentes périodes de l'art, l'inspiration religieuse, l'inspiration dramatique, l'inspiration lyrique; elle absorbe à la fois la musique sacrée et la musique d'opéra; elle résume les traditions, s'élance dans les âges; elle mêle l'art catholique à l'art d'émancipation, la foi à la science; elle est sociale et individuelle; elle est tour à tour méditative, contemplative, mystique, sublime, pittoresque et colorée, passionnée et dévergondée.
>
> (Instrumental music unites the diverse inspirations that have presided over different periods of art, religious inspiration, dramatic inspiration, lyrical inspiration; at the same time it absorbs sacred music and operatic music; it resumes traditions, launches into the ages; it mixes Catholic art with the art of emancipation, faith with science; it is social and individual; it is alternately meditative, contemplative, mystic, sublime, picturesque and colourful, impassioned and shameless.)[49]

In his reviews of such music d'Ortigue always attempted a detailed analysis in which he aimed not so much at understanding the relationship between the sounds and sensations as at following what he felt to be the composer's "idea", through the different instrumental combinations and contrasts.[50]

D'Ortigue also wrote at length on the Théâtre Italien and the influence of Rossini. In places he suggests a real appreciation of Rossini, in particular Guillaume Tell, but he also constantly remarks

---

[49] D'Ortigue, Le Balcon, p. vi.

[50] D'Ortigue, Le Balcon, p. vii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on what he saw as the fundamental superficiality of Rossini's music, which he felt could lead only to decadence. According to d'Ortigue, Rossini was like Voltaire; he had a great deal of "esprit" but little heart.[51] Yet, in d'Ortigue's opinion, Rossini had carried these superficial and brilliant qualities to their highest degree and, when performed by the world's greatest singers (as was almost always the case), Rossini's music was attractive even to someone convinced of its immorality.[52] Other critics were more favourable towards the Théâtre Italien. For instance, Desnoyers' book, De l'Opéra en 1837, is a defence of Rossini.[53] In general during this period the Théâtre Italien was more highly esteemed than the Opéra. As J. M. Bailbé remarks: "[D]e l'Opéra aux Italiens, on a l'impression d'avoir franchi un échelon dans le domaine de la pénétration et de l'intelligence musicale" ("[F]rom the Opéra to the Italiens one has the impression of having climbed up a rung in the domain of penetration and musical intelligence").[54]

Of all the critics mentioned, the only one to remain consistently supportive of and encouraging to Berlioz as both composer and critic was d'Ortigue. While Fétis, Castil-Blaze, and Mainzer supported Berlioz at various stages they all eventually turned against him. Peter A. Bloom demonstrates that Fétis had good reason for doing so as Berlioz had himself unjustly attacked Fétis.[55] Desnoyers and Mainzer

---

[51] D'Ortigue, Le Balcon, p. 21.

[52] D'Ortigue, Le Balcon, p. 10.

[53] Louis Desnoyers, De l'Opéra en 1847 (Paris: E.-B. Delanchy, 1847).

[54] Bailbé, Le Roman et la musique, p. 33.

[55] Peter A. Bloom, "Fétis and the Revue Musicale", p. 239. Later in his life Berlioz attempted a reconciliation with Fétis. This is demonstrated by a letter Berlioz wrote to Fétis in 1860, published by
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

both made virulent attacks on Berlioz. Although they did criticize his music, their attacks, surprising in their vehemence, were directed more at his criticism and personality.

Desnoyers' attack forms part of his book, De l'Opéra en 1847. He attacks Berlioz's use of language, his enthusiasms, his use of puns, and what he saw as Berlioz's self-preoccupation in his reviews.[56] Desnoyers' tone is petty and he makes some grave errors, such as mistaking all of Castil-Blaze's reviews in the Journal des Débats 1820s for reviews by Berlioz.

Mainzer devoted the whole issue of a journal he founded, the Chronique Musicale de Paris, to an attack on Berlioz.[57] Given that this was the only issue of the journal ever to appear, one cannot help wondering whether Mainzer created it solely to have a venue in which to attack Berlioz. For the most part Mainzer's attack is ill-founded. He misinterprets Berlioz's views on Grétry, Choron, and the Mozart Requiem, to name just a few items. Mainzer shows himself to be intensely jealous of Berlioz's position of critic for the Journal des Débats and dwells at length on the perniciousness of having someone with Berlioz's opinions working for such an important paper. Mainzer mentions one interesting point however, which is his knowledge of Berlioz's self-borrowings in reviews of the same concerts for

---

[55](continued)
Ralph Locke in "New Letters of Berlioz", 19th-Century Music, 1 (July 1977), 71-84.

[56] Desnoyers commented, "Entre autres découvertes instrumentales, M. Berlioz a inventé ainsi un heureux instrument de rhétorique, qu'on peut appeler le calembour à jet continu" (" amongst other instrumental discoveries, M. Berlioz has thus invented a happy rhetorical instrument, that one could call a continuous stream of puns") (De l'Opéra, p. 53n).

[57] Joseph Mainzer, "M. Berlioz", Chronique Musicale de Paris, No. 1, 1838, pp. 1-95.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

different papers. Although Mainzer exaggerated the scope of the self-borrowings, the fundamental point was valid and rarely commented on by the critics of the time.[58] Berlioz was aware of having offended Mainzer: "Je redoute un article [sur le Requiem] dans le National de cet ours mal léché de Mainzer, parce que je n'ai pas employé ses choeurs d'ouvriers; il en a été très vexé et il ne manquera pas de s'en venger" ("I dread an article [on the Requiem] in Le National from that gross Mainzer, because I did not use his workers' choir; he was very cross and will not fail to take his revenge").[59] The harshness of the revenge is rather surprising as Mainzer did not normally give vent to such small-minded attacks.60

D'Ortigue's loyalty to Berlioz as a composer was not undiscriminating. He could for instance question certain aspects of the Te Deum that worried him.[61] However, d'Ortigue's criticism appears to have been influenced quite extensively by Berlioz. There is early evidence of Berlioz's influence in d'Ortigue's article on Berlioz for the Revue de Paris in 1832, which is composed almost

---

[58] Peter A. Bloom observes that Fétis also used self-borrowings. His articles for Le National were "almost but not exactly the same as those that appeared simultaneously in his own Revue Musicale" (Bloom, "Fétis and the Revue Musicale", p. 55).

[59] CG II, 1837, 384. Mainzer states in his Chronique that Berlioz had requested his choirs and then not used them at the last moment.

[60] There is however another instance of Mainzer's pettiness. In a letter to his father (CG II, 1837, 384) Berlioz claims that Mainzer had written an article against Duprez without having heard him, purely because Duprez had not sent him a free ticket for his opening night.

[61] Mentioned in d'Ortigue's book, La Musique à l'église (Paris: Didier, 1861), pp. 244-253.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

entirely from notes written by Berlioz.[62] This sort of occurrence was quite common. Berlioz was for instance continually writing little advertisements for his forthcoming concerts, or notices about his concerts outside France, and sending them to newspapers and journals. Other composers engaged in similar practices; Meyerbeer had perfected the art of self-advertisement, though usually his secretary wrote the notices. In later articles, however, d'Ortigue expresses ideas, such as his opinion of the Dies Ires from the Mozart Requiem and of Fidelio, that are uncannily similar to those of Berlioz.[63] And in an article about the Opéra-Comique he quotes at length an unidentified opinion on the changes that needed to be made to the Opéra-Comique. Although he qualifies his quotation simply with "[v]oilà ce qui a été dit, et bien dit" ("[t]his is what has been said, and well said"), the nature of the comments unambiguously points to Berlioz.[64] On the whole d'Ortigue's writing style is pedantic and heavy. Pougin sums it up in saying,

> [N]on que d'Ortigue fut sans quelque talent, mais ce petit homme un peu replet dont l'apparence bossasse [sic] cachait un tempérament assez bilieux, n'avait aucune espèce d'originalité, il ne prenait point place dans les grandes lettres françaises.
>
> ([N]ot that d'Ortigue was without talent, but this dumpy little man whose hump-backed appearance hid a quite bilious temperament had no sort of originality and took no place in great French literature.)[65]

---

[62] The article, "Galerie Biographique, des artistes françaises et étrangers. V.--Hector Berlioz", Revue de Paris, 23 Dec. 1832, pp. 281-298, comes from the Berlioz autograph (Bibliothèque Nationale, papiers divers, No. 38). Over half the article is taken up by the direct transcription of this autograph.

[63] D'Ortigue, Le Balcon, (Opinion on the Mozart Requiem), pp. 55-57, (Opinion on Fidelio), pp. 214-222. Berlioz and d'Ortigue did however disagree fundamentally about expression in church music.

[64] D'Ortigue, Le Balcon, p. 140.

[65] Arthur Pougin, "D'Ortigue", Dossier des Correspondants: Note

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This clearly very personal opinion is rather harsh, for d'Ortigue was important, even if only for his constant championing of instrumental music (including that by Berlioz). His profound interest in religious music was also something to be respected, particularly given the general tendency of the day towards the lighter musical forms such as the opéra-comique and romance.

Although Fétis, Mainzer, and Castil-Blaze all, to an extent, wrote or arranged music, Berlioz was the only critic during the 1830s who was really an active composer as well as critic. Desnoyers and Blaze de Bury were basically literary critics interested in music, and I would agree with Robert Cohen's classification of Fétis and d'Ortigue as critic-historians.[66] In conclusion, though most papers and journals at this time (1834-36) did not have regular and informed criticism, there was still a move towards achieving it and, certainly amongst a small group of critics, an awareness and interest in the present and future role of the music critic.

ii. The Saint-Simonian music critic

Saint-Simonism both directly and indirectly influenced many of the artists, musicians, and writers of the 1830s, including several music critics. The movement also produced its own music criticism which, though of not very high standard, forms an interesting element

---

[65] (continued)
de M. Arthur Pougin, Autograph MS letters, Bibliothèque de l'Opéra (Paris).

[66] H. Robert Cohen, "The Nineteenth-Century French Press", 19th-Century Music, 7 (Fall, 1983), 142. See footnote 31, p. 29.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in the overall pattern of music criticism of the time.

Henri, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825), was one of the founders of French utopian socialism. He called for the construction of a new society which, with science and industry as its stalwart pillars, would have the abolition of all privileges of birth and the universal fraternity of mankind as two of its principal aims. This social reorganization would be based in industrial co-operation, managerial efficiency, and the development of a technocratic elite. Saint-Simon envisaged a society in which industry owners and workers would harmoniously work together, with the workers having faith in the managers' judgements and decisions, and in which stability, not equality, was the object.[67]

An article written by Saint-Simon in 1825, "Le Nouveau christianisme", contained two important developments: first Saint-Simonism was described in terms of a religious movement with its own structure and hierarchy, and second the artist assumed an important role within the organization of society.[68] Both these aspects became increasingly important to followers of the movement, and by 1830, after the death of Saint-Simon himself, Saint-Simonism was spoken of by many as a religion, with artists as its prophets.[69] This "religious" promotion of the artist had its roots in the

---

[67] An interesting discussion of this point can be found in Jane Fulcher, "Music and the Communal Order: The Vision of Utopian Socialism in France", Current Musicology, No. 27 (1979), p. 28.

[68] One of the points made by Ralph Locke in his dissertation on Music and Saint-Simonism, is that Saint-Simon had been concerned for a long time, and not just in his last years, with the active role that art could play in the process of social regeneration.

[69] In 1828 the movement had been tranformed into an "Eglise" (church) with two "pères suprêmes" (supreme fathers), Bazard and Enfantin.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Post-Revolutionary Catholicism of Chateaubriand and Ballanche[70] and their quasi-mystical perception of the artist, and in the theories of Lamennais and his view of the artist's social and moral importance.[71] Paul Bénichou comments, "Le développement religieux de l'utopie scientifique ne peut guère se faire sur un autre terrain que celui de la sensibilité esthétique" ("The religious development of scientific utopia can scarcely be effected on any other ground than that of aesthetic sensibility").[72] The major article dealing with the Saint-Simonian conception of the artist's role is by Emile Barrault and entitled Aux Artistes: Du passé et de l'avenir des beaux-arts.[73]

Barrault developed the Saint-Simonian conception of history as comprised of two distinct periods, an organic and a critical one. In the former the artist was integral to society, and his work was directed towards the moral improvement and uplifting of society. The most dramatic example of this organic period was the middle-ages, with the Gothic Cathedral the central "art-work". In a critical period, on the other hand, the artist was isolated from society and concerned with the self rather than society. Barrault considered his own time as very much a critical one, with its escapist lyric poetry (Byron being the principal offender here), and the technical, showy feats of the virtuosi, and with architects turning all their skill to the

---

[70] Paul Bénichou, Le Temps des prophètes (Paris: Gallimard, 1977), p. 60.

[71] Lamennais's views on art and the role of the artist are most conveniently to be studied in his De l'art et du beau (Paris: Garnier, 1865). This was originally part of his Esquisse d'une philosophie, 4 vols., 1840-1846.

[72] Bénichou, p. 260.

[73] Aux Artistes: Du passé et de l'avenir des beaux-arts. (Doctrine de Saint-Simon) (Paris: A. Mesnier, 1830).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

glorification of private homes instead of cathedrals.

Saint-Simonians were not alone in their concern over the "decadence" of contemporary art. Several conservative literary critics, most importantly Desiré Nisard (1806-1888), were also writing about the moral debility of contemporary literature. Nisard wrote a study in 1834 entitled Etudes de moeurs et de critique sur les poètes latins de la décadence which concluded that modern French poetry was in a parallel state of decadence to that of late antiquity.[74]

Barrault's article, which contains his famous catchphrase, "les beaux-arts sont le culte, et l'artiste est le prêtre" ("the fine-arts are the cult and the artist is the priest"), is an appeal to artists to come and take their place as leaders of humanity.[75] Barrault described the artist as a unique being possessed of special spiritual privileges, with an intuitive understanding of social problems and of God and an ability to convey this understanding to humanity at large by means of his direct appeal to the emotions. Enfantin,[76] the leader of the movement after the death of Saint-Simon, also wrote on the role of the artist, though he tends to be chiefly remembered for his extravagant theories on sexual equality and the liberation of sexual impulses, which were somehow derived from Saint-Simon's attempts to

---

[74] Mentioned in René Wellek, A History of Modern Criticism 1750-1950, III (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1965), p. 19.

[75] Barrault, Aux Artistes, p. 84.

[76] Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864), called "le père Enfantin", became the new leader of the Saint-Simonian movement after the death of Saint-Simon. He founded Le Producteur and created a model commune at Ménilmontant. From 1831 onwards he turned to mysticism and lost many of his followers. He spent some time in Egypt where he had the idea of building a canal at Suez. He ended up as administrator of a railway company, the Lyons line. (GDEL)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

restore dignity and social status to physical labor.[77] Enfantin had defined the artist as "l'homme qui ramène toujours les autres à l'unité sociale. La sympathie sociale, en d'autres termes, l'Amour de Dieu, lui dicte seul ses actes et ses paroles" ("the man who always leads others to social unity. Social sympathy, or in other words, the Love of God, alone dictates to him his acts and his words").[78] Of all the arts, music was cited by Barrault as the most powerful in that it was the only language common to all men. Music symbolized the harmonious society and it soared above the rational and intellectual spheres, uniting men on a purely emotional level. Barrault, as spokesman for the Saint-Simonian movement, was asking the artist to become a leader of society under the guidance of the movement; as one writer ironically put it, the arts were being requisitioned as the best publicity agent.[79]

One of the most puzzling elements of this rather confused conception of the artist's role in society is what exactly was meant by the word "artist". From Barrault's article one has the impression that the artist is not in any way someone with a technical skill, with a craft. His power seems rather to be a disembodied emotional gift.[80] More significantly, after espousing his belief in the great role to which the artist is destined, Barrault cries, "Et nous aussi, nous sommes artistes!", where the "we" presumably refers to himself and the

---

[77] This point is made by Ralph P. Locke in "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure", 19th-Century Music, 4 (Spring 1981), 216.

[78] Quoted in Bénichou, p. 292.

[79] Marguerite Thibert, Le Rôle social de l'art d'après les Saint-Simoniens (Paris: M. Rivière, 1926), pp. 12-13.

[80] Barrault defines poetry for example as the secret soul 'l'âme secrète' of the arts (Barrault, p. 15).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

other leaders of the Saint-Simonian movement.[81] His final appeal to the artist reads: "Viennent, viennent donc à nous tous ceux dont le coeur sait aimer, et le front s'enflammer d'une noble espérance! associons nos efforts pour entraîner l'humanité vers cet avenir. . . ." ("Come, come then to us, all those whose hearts know how to love, and whose brows to be inflamed by noble hope! Let us join our efforts to lead humanity towards this future . . ").[82] The concept of what constitutes an artist is obviously very broad; he appears to be defined more by his attitude to society than by any particular skill. As Paul Bénichou astutely questions, was the artist to become a priest or vice-versa? Barrault's description of himself as an artist suggests the latter, at least if one takes "priest" as referring to a priest of the religion of Saint-Simonism. Bénichou felt that Enfantin's concept of the artist was more applicable to Enfantin himself than to people such as Delacroix or Hugo.[83] Another Saint-Simonian tract quoted men such as Moses, Jesus, and Luther as poets alongside such prophets as Rabelais, Molière, Byron, Napoléon, and others.[84]

Artists did not in general respond to the Saint-Simonian appeal, which is not surprising given this confusion over what constituted an artist. The artists were in fact being asked to serve a new system. To quote Bénichou once more, the Saint-Simonians "préconisaient, au fond, une autorité une et sans limites, et ils aimaient à la dire

---

[81] Barrault, p. 79.

[82] Barrault, p. 84.

[83] Bénichou, p. 293.

[84] Préface, Caliban, par deux ermites de Ménilmontant rentrés dans le monde (Paris: 1833), pp. xvii-xviii (quoted by Bénichou, p. 293, and p. 293, n. 88).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

spirituelle, voulant s'autoriser du grand précédent catholique pour imposer un dogme et une hiérarchie" ("advocated basically one authority, sole and without limits, and they liked to call it spiritual, wanting to justify imposing a dogma and a hierarchy, with the great Catholic precedent").[85] This aim was a long way from the desires of the artists of liberal France.[86]

This is not to say that artists were not interested in the Saint-Simonian movement, but only to explain why they did not join in large numbers. In fact quite a number of artists were interested in the theories of Saint-Simon during the 1830s: Vigny, Sainte-Beuve, Sand, Heine, Liszt, Nourrit, Leon Halévy, Hiller, Mendelssohn, Félicien David, and even Berlioz. The composer Félicien David was the only one to commit himself whole-heartedly to the movement.[87] Pierre Leroux, a successful literary critic, was also involved with the movement. In Leroux's works, to quote René Wellek, "a shrewd analysis of the mal du siècle goes hand in hand with a symbolist theory of poetry and a concept of the poet as a prophet and upholder of the new society of the future".[88]

Liszt's involvement with the movement is intriguing, and has been

---

[85] Bénichou, p. 309.

[86] Another view of the role of the artist during this period is expressed by Arnold Perris in his thesis, "Music in France during the Reign of Louis-Philippe: Art as 'A Substitute for the Heroic Experience'". Diss. Northwestern 1967. Perris argues that in the static, unexciting reign of the July monarchy the artist or his work served as the vicarious heroic experience (pp. 311-313).

[87] Félicien David (1810-1876), French composer and dedicated follower of Saint-Simon and Enfantin. He composed music for Enfantin's commune at Ménilmontant. His later sejourn in Turkey and Egypt influenced his music, including his most famous work, the Ode Symphonique, Le Désert. (NG)

[88] A History of Modern Criticism, III, p. 29.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

examined by Thérèse Marix-Spire and more recently by Ralph P. Locke.[89] Though himself fêted by society, Liszt was very aware of the subordinate role society accorded artists in general and found the notion of the artist as "priest" and leader very appealing. He wrote a series of controversial articles on the role of the artist-musician in society. These articles showed great concern for the way in which art seemed to be heading, but also for the way in which artists, in particular performing artists, were treated by society.[90] Ralph P. Locke's excellent article on Liszt and Saint-Simonism explains that although Liszt disassociated himself vigorously from the movement during the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s, at the end of his life he admitted the influence Saint-Simon had had on him.[91] This influence (alongside the influence of Lamennais) is apparent in Liszt's life if one looks at the way he abandoned his virtuosic career for a life of serious

---

[89] Thérèse Marix-Spire, "Du piano à l'action sociale. Franz Liszt et George Sand, militante socialiste", Renaissance Extrait, 2 and 3, New York (1944-45), pp. 187-216. Ralph P. Locke's article, "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure", and dissertation, "Music and the Saint-Simonians: The Involvement of Félicien David and Other Musicians in a Utopian Socialist Movement".

[90] "De la situation des artistes et de leur condition dans la société", GM 1835, rpt. in Pages romantiques, ed. Jean Chantavoine (Paris: Alcan, 1912), pp. 1- 83; "Lettres d'un bachelier ès-musique", RGM, 1837-1840, rpt. in Pages romantiques, pp. 97-288.

The articles are controversial because they were thought for some time to be written by Marie d'Agoult. See Emile Harazsti's article on Liszt, "Franz Liszt--Author Despite Himself: The History of a Mystification" (Musical Quarterly, 33 (1947), 490-516). It is now suggested that the bachelier articles were the result of an active collaboration by the two, Liszt's ideas expressed "in his companions fluent prose" with passages of "pure d'Agoult" (see Locke's article on Liszt, p. 223). The discovery of the situation articles' autographs has proved them to be by Liszt (see Edward N. Waters, "Sur la piste de Liszt", Notes, 27 (1970-71), 665-670).

[91] "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure", p. 211.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

composition of orchestral and piano music,[92] at his deep concern for innovations in church music, his general philanthropic attitude, and his habit of giving free piano lessons, benefit concerts, and the like.[93]

Berlioz's brief interchange with Saint-Simonism has also been charted admirably by Ralph P. Locke.[94] Locke states that despite the fact that Berlioz's name does not figure in any of the Saint-Simonian Archives,[95] he displayed an interest in the movement which extended beyond the famous letter he wrote to the Saint-Simonian Charles Duveyrier.[96] The letter, written in 1831, is full of hot-blooded enthusiasm for the social side of the movement, though Berlioz always retained his scepticism for religion of any genre. Locke instances several areas which he felt could be interpreted as demonstrating Berlioz's sympathy for the cause, such as his continued friendship with the Saint-Simonian Tajan-Rogé,[97] the scenario in his proposed

---

[92] The Princess Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein also strongly influenced Liszt in his decision to abandon his virtuosic career.

[93] Ralph P. Locke, "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure", p. 226. An example of a benefit concert is a concert he gave with Nourrit for the workers at Lyons, 3 Aug. 1837.

[94] "Berlioz et les Saint-Simoniens", Revue de Musicologie, 63, No. 1-2 (1977), pp. 55-77, and 64, No. 2 (1978), p. 287.

[95] Held at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (Fonds Enfantin) in Paris.

[96] CG I, 476-478. Charles Duveyrier (1803-1866), French lawyer and writer, fervent Saint-Simonian and follower of Enfantin, collaborator for Le Globe in 1831 and 1832. This letter was thought to be the first reference to Berlioz's involvement with the Saint-Simonian movement. Ralph P. Locke has found one of Enfantin's letters showing that Berlioz was in fact in contact with the movement three months earlier ("Berlioz et les Saint-Simoniens", Revue de Musicologie, 64 (1978), p. 287).

[97] Dominique Tajan-Rogé (1803-1878), French cellist and writer, spent many years in Russia, and was a dedicated Saint-Simonian. In replying to a letter from Rogé, in which Rogé had criticized Berlioz

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

oratorio Le Dernier jour du monde, and his lifelong dream of an "Utopie fraternelle".[98]

At various times in the 1830s Berlioz's criticism does seem to show the influence of the Saint-Simonian movement. For instance, in discussing the powerful effect music has on people, he writes,

> [M]ais quand le gouvernement aura senti que de tous les moyens de civilisation l'étude de la musique est pour le peuple un des plus sûrs, un des plus prompts et des moins dangereux . . . on verra s'opérer dans nos moeurs une belle et grande révolution. . . .
>
> ([B]ut when the government has sensed that of all the means of civilization the study of music is for the people one of the surest, one of the most prompt and least dangerous . . . one will see a great and beautiful revolution operate on our morals. . . .)[99]

He also frequently wrote moralistically about the low standard of musical life in Paris. To give an example:

> L'Adagio en la bémol servant de repoussoir au quadrille de la brise du matin! Cela est indécent et ne peut exister que chez une nation aussi frivole que la nôtre, où la dignité de l'art et celle de l'artiste sont entièrement méconnues. Cette monstruosité ne peut paraître naturelle qu'à ces braves bourgeois qui s'amusent de tout et consentent volontiers à écouter un instant Beethoven dans les entr'actes du galop et de la valse parce qu'ils ont entendu dire que c'était un musicien allemand très fort.
>
> (The Adagio in A flat serving as a foil to the quadrille

---

[97] (continued)
for his embarrassment over an affair with a working-class girl, Berlioz answered remorsefully, "[O]n est si constamment entouré de gens à opinions vulgaires et rétrécies, que l'idée ne se présente jamais qu'il y a aussi quelques rares esprits droits et libres comme le vôtre" ("[O]ne is so constantly surrounded by people of narrow and vulgar opinions that the idea never occurs to one that there are also a few straight and free spirits like your own") (CG III, 498).

[98] Locke concludes that Berlioz realized that "Utopie fraternelle" was only a dream, but a sublime dream, and one that he could never forget.

[99] JD, 18 Sept. 1836, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> of la brise du matin! This is indecent and could only exist with a nation as frivolous as ours, where the dignity of art and that of the artist are entirely unrecognised. This monstrosity could only appear normal to those good bourgeois who are amused by everything and willingly consent to listen for a minute to Beethoven during the intervals of the gallop and the waltz because they have heard it said that he was a very good German musician.)[100]

However, despite the overtones of Saint-Simonism in these statements--due particularly to the vocabulary used--when examined alongside other opinions of Berlioz they take on a new aspect and appear to contradict other more elitist views expressed by Berlioz. I shall discuss these contradictions in more detail in the Conclusion.

Berlioz appeared to have felt some ambivalence about the power of the artist. On the one hand he could applaud Liszt's aim to bring music to the people, saying, "C'est le temps moins que jamais de s'isoler, puisqu'il y a une oeuvre à faire, et que les éléments sont là " ("Less than ever before is it the time to hold oneself aloof, since there is a job to do, and the materials are there").[101] On the other hand, in a review he denigrated the Saint-Simonian ambiance at the tenor Nourrit's funeral, saying, "Tout ce galimatias de théâtre, de théologie, de république et d'amour de la domination absolue dans l'art, me paraît prodigieusement absurde" ("All this jumble of theatre, theology, republicanism, and love of absolute domination seems to me to be prodigiously absurd").[102] Perhaps it was only the Saint-Simonian rhetoric to which Berlioz objected, for he continues his description of Nourrit's funeral: "Cela touche cependant et agite

---

100 Le Rén., 24 Aug. 1834, p. 1.

101 Chronique de Paris, 7 May 1837, p. 310.

102 CG II, 1839, 555.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

beaucoup ceux qui ont connu intimement ce malheureux" ("This is touching however and greatly disturbs those who have intimately known this unfortunate man").[103]

The early 1830s was probably the period in his life when Berlioz was most sympathetic towards any "socialist" ideas.[104] His accounts to his family of the July uprising are enthusiastic to the point of being slightly manic, talking of the "revolution magique" and the "peuple sublime!" Berlioz felt guilty that he had not been more actively involved in the uprising:

> Cette idée, que tant de braves gens ont payé de leur sang la conquête de nos libertés, pendant que je suis du nombre de ceux qui n'ont servi à rien, ne me laisse pas un instant de repos. C'est un supplice nouveau. . . .
>
> (This idea, that so many brave people have paid for the conquest of our liberties with their blood while I number amongst those who have done nothing, does not leave me a moment's rest. It is another torture. . . .)[105]

He was filled with naïve optimism for the future of the country, in particular for the arts:

> Heureusement, nous touchons à l'émancipation théâtrale; cette révolution est faite exprès pour la liberté des arts; je parviendrai dix fois plus tôt que je ne l'eusse fait sans elle.
>
> (Luckily we are dealing with theatrical emancipation;

---

[103] CG II, 1839, 555.

[104] In Berlioz's correspondence of 1844 (CG III) there is a letter from Berlioz to Emile Barrault (p. 208) and also a very friendly letter from Charles Duveyrier to Berlioz (pp. 209-210), both on the subject of Félicien David's work Le Désert, which Berlioz had praised in his feuilleton (JD, 15 Dec. 1844). These letters show that Berlioz remained friendly with several prominent Saint-Simonians. Ralph P. Locke mentions in his article on Berlioz and Saint-Simonism (Revue de Musicologie, 1977) that Berlioz later (1855) retracted his opinion of Le Désert, calling it "enfantin" (p. 75).

[105] CG I, 1830, 346.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> this revolution is made deliberately for the liberty of the arts; I will succeed ten times earlier than I would have done without it.)[106]

This was not the line taken by the political leaders of the July uprising, but suggests the strong influence of Saint-Simonism, thus indicating Berlioz's awareness of the movement. He also at a slightly later date expressed admiration for Lamennais whom he had met at d'Ortigue's house: "Lamennais; le génie le sèche, le ronge, le brûle!! Quel diable d'homme! il m'a fait vibrer d'admiration" ("Lamennais; genius consumes him, eats him up, burns in him!! What a devil of a man! He made me vibrate with admiration.")[107]

For a short period, then, Berlioz was quite emotionally involved with the concept of a political and artistic regeneration of society.[108] This did not last long, however. In fact the political view most consistently expressed by Berlioz is apoliticism. Pierre Citron postulates, correctly I think, that Berlioz's apoliticism was largely the result of distaste for the way in which the political

---

[106] CG I, 1830, 358. His enthusiasm apparently frightened his mother, for in a letter to her (CG I, 362) Berlioz denied political involvement of any kind, saying that such subjects only bored him, and for the rest of his life he was constantly to refer to his apoliticism, as he does for instance in the following quotation: "Tu sais peut-être que je fais le feuilleton musical du Rénovateur, journal légitimiste. J'ai envie de te le faire envoyer. . . . Comme je me moque des opinions politiques, tu penses que la couleur du journal ne me fait absolument rien. Je ne touche jamais à ce qui est en dehors de mon domaine" ("You know perhaps that I write the feuilleton musical for Le Rénovateur, a legitimist newspaper. I want to have it sent to you. . . . As I do not take political opinions seriously, you can imagine that the colour of the newspaper means absolutely nothing to me. I never touch on anything that is outside my domain.") (CG II, 1833, 145).

[107] CG II, 1834, 170.

[108] His correspondence of 1831 showed an interest in the workers' uprisings in both Lyons and Bristol. By 1832, however, his correspondence expressed scepticism about the productiveness of such uprisings (for example CG I, 1832, 519).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

uprisings turned out.[109] Certainly the July 1848 revolution evoked only disgust in Berlioz: "Paris . . . [est] un club de fous et de drôles, hurlant, gesticulant, conspirant, écrivant, sans savoir ce qu'ils crient, ce qu'ils griffonnent, ce qu'ils menacent et ce qu'ils demandent" ("Paris . . . [is] a club of madmen and idiots, shouting, gesticulating, conspiring, writing, without knowing what they yell, what they scribble, whom they menace, and what they demand"),[110] and despair for the future of art:

> [S]onger aux travaux paisibles de l'intelligence, à la recherche du beau dans la littérature et les arts, avec un pareil état de choses, c'est vouloir faire une partie de Billard sur un vaisseau battu par une tempête du Pôle antarctique, au moment où une voie d'eau s'est déclarée dans la cale et une insurrection de matelots dans l'entrepont.
>
> ([T]o dream of peaceful intelligent work, of the search for the beautiful in literature and the arts, with things in such a state, is like wanting to play a game of billiards on a ship broken by a storm at the Antartic pole at the moment when a leak is announced in the hold and an insurrection of sailors between decks.)[111]

Numerous publications were put out by the Saint-Simonians, such as Le Producteur, L'Organisateur, and Prédications, and all were basically propaganda sheets.[112] In October 1830 the Saint-Simonians bought and took over Le Globe as a "house" journal to propagate their

---

[109] CG I, 510, n. 1.

[110] CG III, 1848, 590.

[111] CG III, 1848, 594.

[112] Le Producteur, journal de l'industrie des sciences et des beaux-arts. 1825-1826.
L'Organisateur, journal des progrès de la science générale. 1829-1831.
Prédications (basically information sheets).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ideas, controlling it until April 1832.[113] It is interesting to look at the type of music criticism written for the paper during this time--the criticism, that is, written by full converts to the movement, not just people attracted to some of its ideas such as d'Ortigue.

Not all the criticism in Le Globe shows the influence of the paper's politics. In fact there are many reviews of the Opéra-Comique and the like that could have come from any of the daily political papers. Those reviews that were written with a Saint-Simonian slant are dramatically propagandist. Although these writers predictably disapproved of certain areas--such as the Opéra Balls and the Vaudeville that depicted only the felicity of peasant life, excluding the misery--on the whole they shared the subject choice of the average newspaper critic in reviewing almost only operatic music and giving paramount importance to the works of Rossini and Meyerbeer.

It is disappointing that the criticism appears not to have been written from within a theoretical framework, but rather to have had the theory applied to it as a structure superimposed on various points. The critic has to remind himself to bear in mind the ideological expectations of the journal. Highly rhetorical language is used at such points, and this is often disconcerting as it makes for an abrupt change of literary style.

A review in 1831 of Robert le Diable is a striking example of this. Three-quarters of the review comprises a straightforward description of libretto and music, both of which the author finds admirable, with a few exceptions. He is in the middle of the

---

[113] Le Globe, founded 15 Sept. 1824 by Dubois, was a doctrinaire Liberal journal until the Saint-Simonians took it over.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

description of the third act when suddenly he very self-consciously breaks the narrative and says,

> J'en étais là de mon récit, et je me laissais aller au goût et aux émotions de ce beau monde tout chargé de plumes, de fleurs et de pierreries, prenant plaisir à reproduire ainsi que je les ai senties les étranges beautés de ce grand drame où tous les prestiges des arts sont assemblés; mais voici qu'une nouvelle horrible a circulé. Les ouvriers de Lyon en plein révolte, le canon balayant les places et les rues; enfin le peuple tout mutilé et maître de la ville, faisant flotter sur les monuments public cette devise d'un nouveau genre:
>
> Vivre en travaillant
> Ou mourir en combattant.
>
> Je n'ai plus dans l'esprit ni Robert, ni mademoiselle Taglioni, ni les prodigieux décors de Ciceri. Le peuple hâve, amaigri, endolori; le peuple ignorant, maladif et grossier. . . .
>
> (I was up to here in my account, and I was yielding to the taste and to the emotions of this beautiful world loaded with feathers, flowers and precious stones, taking pleasure in reproducing in the same way that I felt, the strange beauties of this grand drama where all the prestiges of art are assembled; but just then some horrible news circulated. The workers of Lyons in full revolt, the canon sweeping the squares and the streets; finally, the people mutilated, and master of the town, hanging from the public monuments this slogan of a new type:
>
> Live working
> Or die fighting.
>
> I was no longer in the mood for either Robert, or Mademoiselle Taglioni, or the prodigious décor of Ciceri. The people emaciated, starving, in pain; the people ignorant, sickly and gross. . . .)[114]

The review of Robert le Diable is completely abandoned. The author continues by asking who will come to the aid of the workers of Lyons. He answers the question himself, with a flamboyant appeal to artists:

> O artistes! troupe brillante, exaltée; vous qui avez le génie de toutes les séductions et savez ravir les âmes affadies au spectacle de vos créations merveilleuses; vous qui faites votre vie de charmer les ennuis et de multiplier les joies des heureux du siècle, ne vous

---

[114] "Robert le Diable, grand opéra de M. Meyerbeer", Le Globe, 27 Nov. 1831, p. 1325. Article is unsigned.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> unirez-vous jamais pour les attendrir, pour les enflammer de l'amour des masses souffrantes. . . .
>
> (O artists! brilliant, exalted troup; you who have the genius of all seductions and know how to ravish insipid souls with the spectacle of your marvellous creations; you who make your life one of charming away troubles and multiplying the joys of the century's fortunate ones, will you never unite to make them tender, to enflame them with love for the suffering masses. . . .)[115]

It is not clear whether the writer is proposing that the artists should go to the aid of the workers in Lyons, or merely appealing to artists in general to direct their efforts at drawing the attention of the bourgeoisie to the plight of the masses.[116] It is as though the writer has introduced the situation of the workers at Lyons simply in order to talk about the social role of the artist.

Likewise a review of a concert of Paganini turns into a plaint on the "mals du siècle", followed by a recruitment call:

> Voici venir des chefs des nations, hommes puissants par le coeur, la tête et les bras, qui vous classeront selon votre capacité, vous aimeront en pères, vous combleront d'inspirations sociales, vous commanderont la gloire! Voyez autour de vous se grouper en chœur ces artistes nombreux pour prendre délicieusement avec vous, à la voix des pontifes de l'avenir, excitant les peuples à leur oeuvre pacifique, oeuvre créatrice de science et d'industrie.
>
> (Here come the leaders of the nations, powerful men in their heads, hearts, and arms, who will classify you according to your capacity, love you like fathers, fill you with social inspirations, command glory for you! See around you numerous artists grouping in chorus to partake deliciously with you, at the voice of the pontifs of the future, exciting the people to their

---

[115] Le Globe, 27 Nov. 1831, p. 1325.

[116] He also calls women to action to support the workers, saying that they too suffer the subordinate role of the proletariat; he is obviously influenced by Enfantin's ideas on sex equality.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> peaceful work, creative work in science and industry.)[117]

There is a note of patronage in this call, coupled with a childish naïvety, both qualities that occur quite frequently in the music criticism of Le Globe.

Another common trait in these reviews is guilt for enjoying music that was being enjoyed at the same time by a large audience of so called "oisifs" (idlers). The reviewer feels impelled to make some statement about the rest of the audience and also to demonstrate that he is not mindlessly enjoying the music, but at the same time is continually aware of the larger social issues. To an extent this was also one of the points being made in the review of Robert le Diable and it frequently occurs in reviews of Rossini's music. In an amusing review of Tancrède, for instance, the critic starts his review by talking of the two different worlds that exist; one of the woman leaving the Opéra wrapped in her cashmere coat, passing unnoticed a man dead from hunger, and one of a man such as he who is troubled as he leaves the Opéra. He says sententiously,

> Est-ce ma faute si, à propos de Tancrède, au souvenir de cette charmante composition toute pleine de fraîcheur, de tendresse, d'exaltation chevaleresque, d'aussi sombres pensées me reviennent? Est-ce ma faute si je trouble par les cris de ceux qui meurent de faim, qui tombent pétrifiés, raides de froid, la béatitude de ceux qui se pâment d'enthousiasme aux accents harmonieux d'une musique qui n'est pas l'expression pathétique d'aussi déplorables misères?
>
> (Is it my fault if, apropos Tancrède, with the memory of this charming composition full of freshness, tenderness, and chivalrous exaltation, such sombre thoughts come back to me? Is it my fault if I am troubled by the cries of those that die of hunger, that fall petrified, stiff with cold, the complacency of those who swoon with

---

117 "Beaux-Arts. Paganini", Le Globe, 29 April 1831, p. 482. Article is unsigned.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> enthusiasm at the harmonious accents of a music that is not the pathetic expression of such deplorable miseries?)[118]

Having shown his moral depth, the critic then launches safely into a very enthusiastic review of the opera, which he clearly immensely enjoyed. The review is not allowed to finish however without a closing homily, which starts with the critic expressing guilt at having so enjoyed the opera, especially in a world where the arts were reserved for only a few, and concludes, "[J]'ai presque honte de céder au plaisir de me laisser bercer par ces délicieux accords" ("[I] am almost ashamed to give in to the pleasure of letting myself be rocked by these delicious cadences").[119] He appeals to the public always to remember the voice of the "suffering class", even when plunged in the midst of some self-indulgent entertainment, and also to look out for occasions where the "masses" were singing. Once again this demonstration of social awareness on the part of the critic appears quite fortuitous and not linked in any real way with his review of the opera.

The focus of these reviews is hard to define. They appear to be aimed at the artists more than the general public, although "general public" is perhaps a misnomer here, since the reading audience of Le Globe at this time would presumably have largely consisted of those already interested, or involved, in Saint-Simonism.

The other focus of the articles is perhaps the demonstration of the critic's "good faith", his understanding of the important role to be assumed by the artist. It is a pity that they did not have a

---

[118] "Beaux-Arts. Théâtre Italien. Tancrède", Le Globe, 26 Sept. 1831, p. 1075. Article is unsigned.

[119] "Beaux-Arts [Tancrède]", Le Globe, 26 Sept. 1831, p. 1075.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

critic with a greater knowledge of music who might have been able to integrate the Saint-Simonian theory with the practice of criticism.

Several other journals had criticism of a Saint-Simonian bent. The major one was the Revue Encyclopédique, which from 1831 until 1835 was edited by two dissident Saint-Simonians, Hippolyte Carnot and Pierre Leroux. The criticism for the Revue Encyclopédique was not as propagandist as criticism for Le Globe. It agitated for music for the people, for renovations in church music, and for more precise demands such as a larger hall and more easily obtainable seats for the Conservatoire concerts.[120] However, the music criticism for this paper also suffered from a lack of musical expertise. It is revealing that when discussing the moral influence of music on the proletariat one of the paper's critics, Hippolyte Fortoul, uses Meyerbeer's Robert le Diable as an example:

> Cette idéaliste et intime partition de Robert le Diable, il [le prolétaire] l'a aussi vraiment comprise et aussi nettement jugée que les dilettanti. Conviez-le souvent à de semblables émotions, il rentrera chez lui plus grave, plus heureux, plus penseur, et plus moral.
>
> (This idealistic and intimate score of Robert le Diable, he [the proletarian] has also really understood and just as clearly judged as the dilettanti. Invite him often to such emotions, he will return home graver, happier, more thoughtful, and more moral.)[121]

Even if Beethoven's Fidelio had been the example used, Fortoul's remarks would be no less naïve.

Music reviews sympathetic to Saint-Simon and more generally to "music for the people" were not only characteristically patronizing,

---

[120] See Ch. Dufort, "Concerts du Conservatoire.--Concert Historique", Revue Encyclopédique, No. 54 (1832), p. 246.

[121] Hippolyte Fortoul, "Bulletin dramatique", Revue Encyclopédique, No. 58 (1833), p. 589.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

but also sentimental. Writers with a literary background were those most liable to be sentimental. The following description of one of Mainzer's singing classes for the workers, which is taken from an article in Le Monde, signed "Liszt" but actually by Marie d'Agoult, is a good example:

> Pendant que le monde élégant se presse chaque soir dans les salles resplandissantes de nos théâtres lyriques, au fond d'un faubourg, à la lueur de quelques quinquets appendus à quatre murailles nues, se rassemblent une fois la semaine, des hommes grossièrement vêtus, aux bras nerveux, à l'oeil intelligent, écoutant avec une soumission d'enfant les enseignemens d'un professeur qui se consacre avec dévouement à une noble et sainte tâche: celle de l'éducation musicale du peuple.
>
> (While the elegant world hurries each evening to the dazzling halls of our lyric theatres, in the depths of a suburb, in the glimmer of several ancient lamps hung on four naked walls, gather, once a week, men coarsely clothed, with muscular arms, with intelligent eyes, listening with a childlike submission to the teaching of a professor who devoutly dedicates himself to a noble and saintly task; that of the musical education of the people.)[122]

This style of writing about the poor was of course quite common, as in for instance Eugène Sue's Roman-feuilletons and in some of Balzac's novels.

The Saint-Simonian movement's influence is evident in the criticism of a number of people such as d'Ortigue who were not participating members, but whose search for a moral music criticism can be linked to Saint-Simonian concepts.[123] Perhaps Mainzer and Desnoyers were cognizant of the movement's ideas on art, for their criticism at times suggests that they were, as does also the criticism

---

[122] "Revue musicale de l'année 1836", Le Monde, 8 Jan. 1837, p. 2. This article is generally acknowledged to be by Marie d'Agoult.

[123] On the other hand, one must also remember Lamennais's influence on d'Ortigue.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Fétis.

The extent to which the vocabulary of the Saint-Simonian movement infiltrated contemporary music criticism has been interestingly analyzed by Dorothy Hagen.[124] Hagen talks of Heine's rebellion against the Saint-Simonian influence and his desire for a strong separation of art, politics, and religion. She also quotes a review by Blaze de Bury where, in agreement with Heine, he expostulates: "According to the extravagant theories now current, [a musical composition] has no value or meaning unless it teaches a lesson or enunciates a dogma. . . . One of these days will see Plato's dialogues set to music".[125] Théophile Gautier in his preface to Mademoiselle de Maupin satirizes the Saint-Simonian line taken by many literary critics:

> A quoi sert ce livre? Comment peut-on l'appliquer à la moralisation et au bien-être de la classe la plus nombreuse et la plus pauvre? Quoi! pas un mot des besoins de la société, rien de civilisant et de progressif! . . . La société souffre, elle est en proie à un grand déchirement intérieur (traduisez: personne ne veut s'abonner aux journaux utiles). C'est au poëte à chercher la cause de ce malaise et à le guérir. Le moyen, il le trouvera en sympathisant de coeur et d'âme avec l'humanité (des poëtes philanthropes! ce serait quelque chose de rare et de charmant).
>
> (What good is this book? In what way can it be applied to the moralization and the well-being of the most numerous and poorest class? What! Not a word of the needs of the society, nothing civilising and progressive! . . . Society suffers, it is prey to a great interior rending apart (translate: no one wants to subscribe to useful newspapers). It is up to the poet to look at the cause of this sickness and cure it. He will find the means to do so in sympathizing heart and soul with humanity (philanthropic poets!--this would be

---

124 "French Music Criticism".

125 Blaze de Bury, "Revue musicale", RDM, Series 1, 40 (1840), 603-604. Quoted (in translation) in Hagen, "French Music Criticism", p. 238.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

something rare and charming).)[126]

The influence of the Saint-Simonian movement was clearly not as negligible as might at first be thought. However, it did not inspire any great music critics; on the whole its critics lacked the necessary musical knowledge to be able to achieve a convincing interpretation of music through their theory.

iii. Press Regulations

Restoration--early years of Louis-Philippe

Music criticism was not an area much affected by press censorship. However, a brief survey of the regulations governing the press provides a context for the otherwise isolated "musical feuilletons" of political journals.

Freedoms in the press introduced by the 1830 revised Charter were more apparent than real. Many of the Restoration press laws still existed under Louis-Philippe, the major difference between the two periods being that there were no official censorship laws during the July monarchy. Both periods were marked by a dramatic event--the Restoration by the murder of the Duc de Berry (1820) and the July monarchy by the attempted assassination of the king (1835)--which had the consequence of a tightening-up of the regulations governing the press.

The Restoration press regulations alternated between relatively repressive and liberal periods. A press law of 1814 established preliminary censorship for writings of less than twenty pages and

---

126 Preface, Mademoiselle de Maupin (Paris: Bibliothèque-Charpentier, 1927), pp. 18-19.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

preliminary authorization for newspapers.[127] From 1815 to 1819 the police controlled the press. A censorship committee was established which required a daily submission of copy from all newspapers and failure to comply with the regulations led to suspension or suppression.[128] The criterion for censorship used by the committee was a law of November 1815 concerning seditious writing, which defined as "seditious" any writing that threatened an attempt on the person of the king or any member of his family; incited armed rebellion or the overthrow of the government; asked for change in the order of succession; tried to weaken the respect due to the king's authority; or spread rumours concerning restoration of national lands or feudal dues.[129] By January 1817 five newspapers had been suppressed, largely for Bonapartism, and twenty suspended, though most for a few days only.[130]

Police control was abolished in 1819, when the Government passed two new bills concerning freedoms of the press and dealing with the legal pursuit of newspapers. The first bill, passed 17 May 1819, proposed that any writer who provoked an action defined by the penal code as a felony or a misdemeanour should be punished as an accomplice. The second bill stated that these misdemeanours would be tried by Jury in assize courts.[131] A third bill was then introduced which demanded that the founder of a newspaper should deposit caution

---

[127] Irene Collins, The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1888 (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959), pp. 3-4.

[128] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 10.

[129] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 12.

[130] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 11.

[131] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 23. This bill was introduced by De Broglie.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

money at the Treasury as guarantee for the payment of fines and declare the name of someone who would be responsible for the contents of the journal.[132] With the abolition of police control, opposition papers, in particular the liberal Le Constitutionnel and ultra-royalist Drapeau Blanc, flourished. In the provinces, too, local press became more lively, commercial, and politicized.

The murder of the Duc de Berri, 13 February 1820, however provoked such an outcry against the liberal press for supposedly inciting to violence against the king that a temporary censorship bill was re-introduced. This bill demanded much the same as the November 1815 law, namely authorization from the king for journals and periodicals dealing with political matters, and the submission of copy to a censorship committee with failure to do so resulting in fines or imprisonment. Copy could also be cited before courts and suspended or suppressed.[133] The censor was severe, striking heavily at the liberal papers and semi-periodicals. Journals such as Le Constitutionnel retaliated by leaving blanks where words or phrases had been censored. The liberal press was not alone in being subject to suppression, for the ultra-royalist papers were also attacked.[134]

In 1822 there was a change in the head of government. A M. Villèle succeeded M. Richelieu, who had been head of government since 1820. During 1822 there was an unprecedented number of lawsuits brought against newspapers, many for very trivial offences.[135] In

---

[132] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 24. This Bill was introduced by Guizot. Caution money remained a feature of the press legislation up till 1881.

[133] Collins, Government and the Press, pp. 31-32.

[134] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 33.

[135] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 38.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1824 an extraordinary plan was proposed to Villèle by Sosthène de la Rochefoucauld; the scheme, "amortissement des journaux", was to buy up all the opposition newspapers published in Paris and place them under the direction of the ministry.[136] Three million francs, 450,000 of which came from Rochefoucauld's private funds, were spent on the project, which after a successful beginning collapsed when an aborted take-over of La Quotidienne ended in a disclosure of the whole plot and consequent discrediting of the ministry. Villèle tried other means of strangling the opposition press, such as increasing postal tariffs.[137] He was succeeded in government in 1828 by M. Martignac.

Martignac tried to establish more freedom in the press, for instance, he abolished the preliminary authorization for journals. In 1830 however Charles X in his Coup d'Etat suspended the freedom of the press and proclaimed that no newspaper was to appear without the king's permission.[138] The 1830 Revolution began with a protest by journalists, drawn up by Thiers in Le National office, against this legislation. The presses of three papers, Le National, Le Globe, and Le Temps, remained working throughout the night of 26 July printing the journalists' declaration.[139] To quote Collins: "Louis-Philippe became king of the French as the result of a revolution started by the newspapers, but few of them had intended to make a revolution and . . . only the National had favoured the idea of a new monarchy".[140]

Article Seven of the revised Charter of 1830 reaffirmed the right

---

[136] Collins, Government and the Press, pp. 42-43.

[137] Collins, Government and the Press, pp. 45-48.

[138] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 58.

[139] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 59.

[140] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 60.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of Frenchmen to publish their opinions and stated categorically that censorship could never be restored. As journalists knew from their experiences during the Restoration, restrictions could be applied outside a system of censorship. Despite slight reductions in stamp duty and caution money, the government still had the possibility of bringing to trial any newspaper suspected of libel. The ministers varied in the vigour of their application of regulations. Lafitte, the first minister in 1830, was benevolent towards left-wing papers and more severe towards ultra-legitimists. Casimir Périer, who succeeded Lafitte, was equally severe on both groups. A bill of 1831 made it clear that political rights were to remain the exclusive possession of the wealthy.[141] This provoked considerable movement in the press. Papers such as Le National, which at the beginning of the July monarchy had supported the king, became republican--openly so in January 1832. A spate of small republican papers, supported by republican secret societies in Paris, were founded in Paris and the provinces. Lamennais's paper L'Avenir called for universal suffrage and the separation of church and state as proposed in the Charter. The papers supportive of the Government were Le Constitutionnel, Journal des Débats, and Courrier de France.

By the end of 1834, 520 press cases had been heard in Paris, of which 332 were acquitted by lenient juries.[142] Irene Collins comments on a few surprising lapses in the control of the press at this period. She instances the period several weeks before the revolt in Lyons in 1834 when the newspapers openly incited rebellion, and the period immediately prior to the 1835 attempted assassination of the king when

---

[141] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 67.

[142] Collins, Government and the Press, pp. 77-79.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

there was an unprecedented number of articles and caricatures setting him up to ridicule. So government control of the press during this period was not applied consistently.

The attempted assassination of the king frightened not only the government but the newspapers too. For instance Carrel, a journalist for Le National, was horrified at the thought that his articles could in any way induce people to such violence.[143] The government reacted by trying to silence both the legitimist and republican newspapers. In September 1835 a law was brought in which extended the list of seditious libels so that "it became a criminal offence to introduce the name of the king either directly, indirectly, or by allusion when discussing actions of his Government, or to express the wish, hope, or threat of the overthrow of constitutional monarchy or the restoration of the former dynasty".[144] A simple majority in trial by jury was to suffice for a verdict, and in certain cases, such as provocation to attack the person of the king, the charge could be classed as treason and tried by the peers. Fines were doubled, public subscriptions for collecting fines forbidden, caution money increased, and not even drawings could be published without permission from the Minister of the Interior.

The immediate result was the collapse of small papers with insufficient capital. For instance, some thirty small republican papers in the provinces folded because of new clauses regarding caution money. Papers such as La Caricature, founded in 1830, also

---

[143] Irene Collins, "The Government and the Newspaper Press During the Reign of Louis-Philippe", English Historical Review, 69 (April 1954), 277.

[144] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 82.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

folded because of the regulations concerning drawings.[145] In 1836 an important development in the press arose with the advent of Emile de Girardin's newspaper La Presse. The three major innovations of La Presse were that it halved the subscription price from eighty to forty francs, introduced advertisements, and introduced the serial story (roman feuilleton). The content of the journal consisted of more gossip and fashion notes than serious political articles and its most successful element was the serial story, which described states of misery and poverty in the working and criminal classes. They were vividly written with a large dose of sentimentality. Eugene Sue was the genre's principal exponent and his works were enormously popular.

Girardin's appeal to business men to place advertisements in La Presse was not successful because businesses were loath to advertise in a newspaper of low circulation. Le Siècle, founded by Dutacq, was another newspaper based on the same principles as La Presse. The majority of republican and legitimist newspapers abstained from the commercial tendencies of these newpapers. They were all however obliged to lower prices, except for the cunning Journal des Débats, which retained its high price but in 1837 introduced Eugene Sue's serial story Les Mystères de Paris, probably the most popular serial of the time.[146]

Thus the two important landmarks of the press of the July monarchy were the September 1835 laws brought in after the attempt on Louis-Philippe's life and the advent of the cheap press. Though there

---

[145] Collins, Government and the Press, p. 84.

[146] Collins, Government and the Press, pp. 88-91.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was no censorship at this time, there were sufficient restrictions implemented by other means to enable one to say that freedom of the press did not vary dramatically between the two periods.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER II

Berlioz's Position as a Critic

i. Berlioz's relationship to the journals and newspapers to which he contributed

In this chapter, I trace Berlioz's entry into the field of music criticism and his reasons for becoming a critic. Berlioz's articles written during the Restoration number only fourteen and none of them are signed in full. The major journals to which he contributed during this time, Le Corsaire, Le Correspondant, and the Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung, were not principally political journals and were relatively unharassed by government press regulations. Berlioz's articles for each journal were obviously controlled to an extent by the editor's interests and desires, though in each case the style and mode of expression used in the articles remained recognizable as Berlioz's own.

Berlioz's first step into journalism was certainly not timorous. His articles for Le Corsaire are highly opinionated and flamboyant.[1] The only pointer to the author's youth--he was twenty years old--is perhaps the arrogance of some of the statements. For instance, his claim in the 1824 article to know all Gluck from memory, though undoubtedly true, has a swaggering ring, a tone absent from later reviews.

Le Corsaire (Journal de la littérature, des arts, des moeurs et des modes) ran from 1822 to 1852 and during that time underwent many transformations. At the time Berlioz was contributing to it, it was a gossipy, satirical paper which claimed to be stimulating debate with

---

[1] Le Corsaire, 12 Aug. 1823, 11 Jan. 1824, and 19 Dec. 1825.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

provocative articles on issues such as "romanticism", the vogue for Italian things, and dilettantism. Both the tone and subject matter of Berlioz's three "Polémiques" for Le Corsaire are very much in keeping with the tenor of the journal; the articles are informal, sarcastically witty, and lively.

The central concerns of the articles are on the one hand attacking the Théâtre Italien, Italian vocal technique, the monopoly of Rossini, and ignorance of the dilettante, and on the other promoting, in particular, the ill-appreciated merits of Gluck, and, in passing, Méhul, Sacchini, Salieri (Les Danaïdes), and Spontini (La Vestale). These and similar issues are discussed in Berlioz's correspondence of this time where he talks, for instance, of the "virus" of dilettantism.[2] All three Corsaire "Polémiques" take the form of letters to the editor, so presumably they were instigated by Berlioz himself. All discuss issues about which Berlioz felt very strongly. As Pierre Citron comments, apropos an amusing letter from Berlioz to Edouard Rocher in which he chastises Rocher for lying about attending Salieri's Les Danaïdes, Berlioz was so fanatical about music at this time that his friends did not dare admit not having been to hear an opera that he had recommended to them.[3] The 1825 Corsaire "Polémique" ends with a scathing condemnation of Castil-Blaze, in particular for his review of Gluck's Armide, but also in general for everything Castil-Blaze stood for both as a critic and as a composer-arranger. Obviously Castil-Blaze's column had been regularly followed by Berlioz, and in the light of his future collaboration with the Journal des Débats one could hypothesize a nascent interest in the

---

[2] CG I, 1824, 56.

[3] CG I, 1824, 67, n. 3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

position as critic held there by Castil-Blaze. On the other hand, since Castil-Blaze's column was the only semi-regular music criticism at this time, it is not surprising that Berlioz followed it with interest.

Berlioz does not appear to have written any articles over the years 1826 to 1828, except for an impressive letter he wrote in 1828 and inserted in three papers, in which he defended himself against criticism for giving a concert comprised only of his own music.[4] The years 1826 to 1828 must have been very traumatic ones for Berlioz, with the family frictions over his choice of career and his desire to prove as soon as possible that he could make a career for himself with his music--a depressingly difficult task then and, indeed, one that would remain so for most of his life.

In a letter to his friend Humbert Ferrand in June 1829 Berlioz claims he is besieged by requests for articles.[5] Although to say "besieged" is probably an exaggeration, if he were being solicited for articles it is odd that this should have taken place as late as 1829, so long after the Corsaire "Polémiques". But it is possible that the requests spanned a period of some length. In a letter to his mother in May 1829 Berlioz states as a "fait accompli" that he was the Paris correspondent for the Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung.[6] The editor of the Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung, Adolf Marx, was in Paris in 1829 and had perhaps approached Berlioz about the job. This was presumably early in the year, for his first review appears in

---

[4] Revue Musicale, 16 May, Le Figaro, 21 May, and Le Corsaire, 22 May. (See full Bibliography, Appendix A.)

[5] CG I, 1829, 254-258.

[6] CG I, 1829, 253.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

February. Why Marx approached Berlioz is not known. They might have met by chance--possible enough in Paris in music circles--or Berlioz himself might have offered his services. In the above letter to his mother Berlioz makes it clear that it is not the pay, which was extremely low, that interests him about the job, but the opportunity to become known in Prussia. Later in the same letter he claims that no-one knows he is writing for the Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung, so it is slightly puzzling how he planned to become well-known, though presumably most of the people connected with the running of the journal would have known the name of their Paris correspondent. Marx thought highly of Berlioz's music[7] and later in the year published a long analysis of the score of Huit Scènes de Faust, so perhaps this was the kind of recognition for which Berlioz was hoping.[8]

Berlioz's lively Corsaire articles had probably gained him quite a reputation and this seems the most likely reason for Marx's invitation. Berlioz's articles for the Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung are written in the same lively and witty manner as Le Corsaire articles. The subject matter had obviously been solicited, because for one thing all the reviews are of actual performances and are not articles on musical issues, and for another they are all reviews of performances of opéra-comique and opera. In his reviews of the opéra-comiques Berlioz sets his precedent of witty diversions,

---

[7] Mentioned in Berlioz, Mém. I, 167. English translation comes from David Cairns, The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz (1969; rpt, London: Panther Books, 1974), p. 147. All English translations of the Mémoires cited hereafter are by David Cairns, and I shall give only their page numbers, separated from the French Mém. page number by a slash, "/".

[8] Berlioz mentions this analysis in CG I, 1829, 288-289.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ineffectually screening his scorn for the lighter manifestations of the genre.

It was in 1829 that Berlioz also began writing for Le Correspondant. In a letter to Ferrand written towards the end of 1828 Berlioz asked him if he knew a certain M. d'Eckstein sufficiently well to write a letter of recommendation to him on Berlioz's behalf.[9] He had learnt that Eckstein was on the editorial staff of Le Correspondant and wanted to know if it would be possible to be given the job of music critic for the paper. Early in 1829 Berlioz had an interview with Carné, the journal's editor, and his first article appeared on 21 April 1829.[10] In the same letter to his mother in which he mentions the Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung articles Berlioz also talks of his collaboration with Le Correspondant, but phrases it so that it looks as if the journal approached him for the articles, rather than the other way round: "L'éditeur m'a fait prier par deux de ses rédacteurs de me charger des articles de musique, traité en grand [sic]. . . . Ces messieurs m'en ont fait beaucoup de compliments, ils m'écrivent toutes les semaines pour me demander le second article que je leur ai promis et que je fais attendre depuis longtemps. . . ." ("The editor asked me via two of his journalists to take charge of some music articles, treated in a big way. . . . These gentlemen have paid me many compliments about it, they write to me every week to ask for the second article that I have promised them and that I have made them wait for, for a long time. . .").[11] Such distortion of the truth eloquently testifies to Berlioz's

---

[9] CG I, 1828, 220.

[10] The interview is mentioned in CG I, 234.

[11] CG I, 1829, 253. Some distortion is perpetuated in the Mém. (Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

desperate attempts to justify his choice of career in his parents' eyes.

Le Correspondant began 10 March 1829 and in 1831 was replaced by the Revue Européenne. Started by Lamennais in the period between his ultramontanism and future progressiveness, Le Correspondant was the organ of the "Association for the defence of the Catholic religion" and had royalist tendencies.[12] Literary and philosophical issues not connected with religion were also discussed in the journal; as Berlioz remarked to Ferrand: "[L]es arts y occuperont une place distinguée" ("[T]he arts will fill a distinguished place there").[13] Berlioz's first article for the journal is appropriately on the subject of religious music, "Considérations sur la musique religieuse". He was probably advised to write on such a topic, but the subject was also one that genuinely interested him. Three principal issues are raised in the article: first the similarities between religious and dramatic music, second Berlioz's dislike of academic fugues in religious music, and third the lack of venues and performers for religious music. All three issues are constantly raised throughout the course of Berlioz's career as a critic.

His second article for Le Correspondant had apparently been another attack on the Théâtre Italien. In a letter to Ferrand,

---

[11] (continued)
I, ch. xxi, also, where Berlioz states that the initiative to approach Carné came from Ferrand and not himself. As David Cairns states: "This does not . . . preclude Ferrand's having previously suggested that Berlioz should try his hand at criticism" (Appendix III, Memoirs, p. 733).

[12] CG I, 1829, 233, n. 3.

[13] CG I, 1828, 221.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berlioz tells how the article was considered too harsh, and he was requested to write something on a different subject. He ironically concluded, "La Prostituée trouve donc des amants même parmi les gens religieux" ("So the Prostitute finds lovers even among religious people").[14] No doubt the royalist members of Le Correspondant staff would have included many fervent supporters of the Théâtre Italien.

Berlioz's next three articles for Le Correspondant consisted of a biographical discussion of Beethoven and his music. These articles mark the beginning of Berlioz's passion for Beethoven's music, which he had heard for the first time at the end of 1827, and he had attended every possible performance since. His correspondence of the time continually refers to the power of Beethoven's music; a letter to his sister Nanci even relates an 1829 performance of Beethoven's last quartets in a very similar fashion to its later discussion in Le Correspondant article, 6 October 1829.[15]

An interesting aspect of these Correspondant articles on Beethoven is Berlioz's emphasis on "suffering" in relation to great art; in Berlioz's opinion, Beethoven becomes really great only after he has suffered, and Berlioz is one of the few to understand the Beethoven late quartets, because he too has suffered and can therefore empathize with them. Berlioz's letters of 1829 to 1830 talk incessantly of his "souffrance", "cette faculté de souffrir qui me tue" ("this ability to suffer that kills me").[16] He clearly saw his facility for suffering as distinguishing him from ordinary men; the anguish he suffered was intimately connected with music, since music

---

[14] CG I, 1829, 257.

[15] CG I, 1829, 244.

[16] CG I, 1830, 313.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was the one means of delivering him from his very singular states of emotional agony:

> [I]l y a en moi une force d'expansion qui agit violemment, je vois tout cet horizon, ce soleil, et je souffre tant, tant, que si je ne me contenais, je pousserais des cris, je me roulerais par terre. Je n'ai trouvé qu'un moyen de satisfaire complètement cette avidité immense d'émotion, c'est la musique.
>
> ([T]here is in me an expansionary force that acts violently, I see all this horizon, this sun, and I suffer so much, so much, that if I did not contain myself, I would cry out, I would roll on the ground. I have only found one means of completely satisfying this immense avidity of emotion, that is music.)[17]

Although Berlioz was conscious of "souffrance" throughout his life, during this particular period he seems to have been particularly susceptible to such extreme emotional states as described above.

Berlioz's single article for Le Correspondant in 1830, his first article under the new monarch, continues the romantic slant of his 1829 Beethoven articles. This article, "Aperçu sur la musique classique et romantique", is the only article in which Berlioz talks enthusiastically of "romanticism".[18] Appropriately for 1830, he defines a romantic as a renegade, a "rule-breaker"; romanticism is free inspiration, where classicism is the adherence to strict scholastic rules; a classicist is forbidden to research effects that have not been already anticipated by the rules. In his previous articles Berlioz had already gleefully noted instances where he felt that Beethoven had courageously broken rules, and in the 1830 article Gluck is portrayed as the great "romantic" in the same way that E. T. A. Hoffmann portrayed Don Giovanni as one of the great "romantic"

---

[17] CG I, 1830, 311.

[18] Le Correspondant, 22 Oct. 1830, pp. 110-112.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

operas. Berlioz states that Gluck's mode of composition was dictated by passion and changed only according to the dramatic demands of the text, and he clearly felt that the path taken by Gluck and Beethoven was the one to follow. Thus, in this article he is implicitly describing himself as a romantic--a romantic however in the sense of someone governed by the rules of "passion" rather than pre-ordained scholastic rules. Since Berlioz rarely discusses romanticism, especially in opposition to classicism, it is significant that 1830, the year of Hugo's Hernani, Stendhal's Le Rouge et le noir, and Berlioz's own Symphonie fantastique, is the date for his brief exposé on romanticism.[19]

In conclusion these early articles give few signs of the author's youth or inexperience. The Corsaire articles in particular are slightly immature, perhaps, in their humour and tendency to unqualified condemnation and in Berlioz's not very subtle attack on Castil-Blaze. The pervasive mood of the articles is also one of youthful enthusiasm and vigour; Berlioz as "young romantic" or Jeune France. However, as already noted, many of the issues that were to become central to Berlioz's criticism throughout his life are formulated here in these early reviews. He was a confident and assured writer from the very beginning of his career.

Berlioz finally gained the Prix de Rome in 1830 and spent the following year largely in Italy. The articles he wrote on his return to Paris are, not surprisingly, concerned with his time in Italy and the Concours for the Prix de Rome. In 1832 he wrote an article entitled "Lettre d'un enthousiaste sur l'état de la musique en Italie"

---

[19] The letter on classicism and romanticism, quoted in the Revue Musicale, 5A, No. 21 (Nov. 1905), 531, is almost definitely a fake.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for the Revue Européenne. His article condemns virtually point by point every possible aspect of musical activity in Italy.[20]

During the first half of the nineteenth century many writers wrote and often published accounts of their travels abroad, particularly in Italy, in the form of letters to a friend. Berlioz also found this form convenient, and many of his travels are described through letters such as the lengthy series of letters from Germany and Russia that form a portion of his Mémoires. The letters are informative and chatty, and written in a narrative style that Berlioz used with great skill. He never retracted his opinions on the low standard of music in Italy, even though he was criticized for them. His article for the Revue Européenne was the first of many on the subject; the second was published the following year for the journal L'Europe Littéraire: journal de la littérature nationale et étrangère. L'Europe Littéraire was a spectacular journal with luxurious presentation and had numerous well-known literary figures such as Hugo, Heine, Balzac, and de Vigny working for it. Unfortunately, though not suprisingly, given the generous payments it made to contributors (Berlioz for instance was paid fifty centimes the line), it collapsed for financial reasons after only a few months.[21]

The journal was founded by Victor Bohain (1805-1856) and Alphonse

---

[20] The article had perhaps been requested; as Berlioz remarked in a letter to his mother: "Je reçois à l'instant une aimable lettre de De Carné, l'un des fondateurs du Correspondant et pour les talents duquel mon père profesee beaucoup d'admiration; il m'écrit pour me demander quelque griffonage sur l'état actuel de la musique en Italie" ("I have just received a friendly letter from De Carné, one of the founders of Le Correspondant and for whose talents my father has a great deal of admiration; he has written to me asking for some scribblings on the current state of music in Italy") (CG I, 1831, 501).

[21] Mentioned in CG III, 1843, 120.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Royer (1803-1875). Berlioz knew Bohain, who directed the Théâtre des Nouveautés when Berlioz had a brief singing job there during the late 1820s.[22] "Journal d'un enthousiaste", his article on Italy for the journal, is again a fast-moving, entertaining narrative, in which Berlioz conveys, rather self-consciously, his melancholy at the cultural desolation of Rome. The concept of "souffrance" is brought up once again; this time Berlioz expounds on how he must necessarily suffer more than the average man because of his unusually high degree of "sensitivity" (which seems to have been a fairly common complaint amongst artists at this period).

Berlioz's other two articles for the L'Europe Littéraire are fairly bitter expositions on the Concours for the Prix de Rome and recount his personal humiliations from the previous years and the farcical nature of the whole examination. All three articles for L'Europe Littéraire are written in a very fluid and vivid narrative style. Berlioz presumably thought highly of them himself since they are all reproduced almost word for word in the Mémoires.

In 1833 Berlioz began writing for Le Rénovateur. Although he wrote only five articles that year, over the next two years, 1834 and 1835, he regularly wrote an article a week, contributing seventy-nine articles by the time Le Rénovateur closed down in December 1835 in order to fuse with the ultra-legitimist La Quotidienne in 1836. In 1834 Berlioz started his permanent position with the Gazette Musicale, a position he kept for twenty-six years until 1859, and in 1835 he started writing for the Journal des Débats, a position he kept for

---

[22] At one stage in 1828 Berlioz was interested in writing a ballet on Faust based on a scenario by Bohain (CG I, 1828, 217).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

twenty-eight years until six years before his death in 1869.[23] So, though his contributions to Le Rénovateur began at an earlier date, 1834 is the year that marks the beginning of Berlioz's full-time activity as a critic.

To each of these papers Berlioz had a different relationship and it is best to proceed by examining each in turn.

Le Rénovateur, founded in 1832, was a legitimist daily which was quite frequently censored for its views on the monarchy. In May 1833 it amalgamated with the Courrier de l'Europe and changed its name to Le Rénovateur, Courrier de l'Europe. Berlioz's friends Ferrand and d'Ortigue also worked sporadically for the paper. For Le Rénovateur Berlioz mainly reviewed performances, though he occasionally wrote more general articles and book reviews.[24] He reviewed all the Conservatoire concerts, the premières of new works (though sometimes it is difficult to tell whether he was at the first performance or not), including new operas and opéra-comiques, ballets, a vast assortment of minor concerts by visiting artists and local artists, singers' débuts (often at the Théâtre Italien), Musard's concerts, music performed in churches, and works performed at the Théâtre Ventadour.[25] In 1835 he reviewed twelve opéra-comiques, more than in any other year. The overall number of opéra-comiques reviewed by Berlioz during this whole period is astounding, given his basic lack of enthusiasm for the genre. Examined as a whole, however, his

---

[23] His very first article for the JD, "Rubini à Calais", 10 Oct. 1834, p. 1, was only a reprint of an article from the GM, 5 Oct. 1834, pp. 317-319.

[24] Books reviewed were for instance Traité de composition de Beethoven (27 Jan. 1834, p. 1) and Cours de contrepoint et fugue by Cherubini (21 Sept. 1835, pp. 1-2).

[25] The Théâtre Ventadour was also known as the Théâtre Nautique.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

criticism for Le Rénovateur covers basically all the major areas of musical activity in Paris at the time, and the works he reviewed catered for the interests of a large range of people. Presumably the readership of a paper like Le Rénovateur would have been very varied, and Berlioz was no doubt requested to cover as many areas as possible.

Berlioz claims in a letter to Ferrand that it is in Le Rénovateur that he least conceals his "true opinions": "Je conserve toujours le Rénovateur, où je ne contrains qu'à demi ma mauvaise humeur sur toutes ces gentillesses" ("I always keep Le Rénovateur where I only half restrain my bad humour over all these little niceties").[26] Certainly his reviews of opéra-comique for Le Rénovateur are fairly caustic. Berlioz does nothing to disguise, and if anything exaggerates, his boredom with such music. It is in Le Rénovateur, too, that Berlioz complains the most bitterly about the musical taste of Parisians, singers who ornamented their parts, and the poor standard of choirs and orchestras. While in 1834 he blamed the public for the low standard of music in Paris, by 1835 he had begun rather to blame the directors of theatres for presenting poor music to a public which was perhaps capable of appreciating better things. Throughout the course of his Le Rénovateur articles Berlioz also posits the existence of a small group, to which he felt he belonged, an elite, an "aristocratie musicale", which in contrast to the general public had an elevated understanding of music.

The lively and witty tone that distinguishes Berlioz's Le Corsaire articles is continued in a large number of Le Rénovateur articles, particularly in his reviews of works or events that he felt to be unimportant. There are even occasional reviews in which Berlioz

---

[26] CG II, 1835, 229.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

writes on nothing except the lack of performances worthy of review or the frustration he feels at writing a feuilleton when he could be composing instead.[27] However, he takes his reviews of chamber music and orchestral concerts, in particular the Conservatoire concerts, very seriously, although as befits music criticism for a political newspaper he offers little analysis of works.

The Gazette Musicale was founded in 1834 by the expatriate German music publisher, Maurice Schlesinger. Schlesinger's aim in founding the magazine was two-fold: first he wanted a venue through which he could promote his own editions, and second he wanted to form a music journal that, with more literary articles on music and less musical analysis, appealed to a wider audience than Fétis's Revue Musicale. Schlesinger gathered around him an impressive editorial team composed of literary and musical figures. For instance, in January 1835 the editorial committee included, amongst others, Adam, Berlioz, Castil-Blaze, Fétis, Dumas, Halévy, Janin, Mainzer, Liszt, d'Ortigue, and Marx. In November 1835 Fétis's son, Edouard (who had been running his father's magazine since 1833 when Fétis moved to Belgium), decided he was no longer interested in continuing the Revue Musicale. Rather than close down altogether, Fétis senior reluctantly agreed to a merger with Schlesinger's Gazette Musicale, which though still commonly known as the Gazette Musicale then became the Revue et Gazette Musicale.

Fétis contributed various articles himself to the Revue et Gazette Musicale over the next few years, but gradually withdrew his collaboration altogether.

The Revue et Gazette Musicale provided a good coverage of actual

---

[27] For instance his article of 5 Oct. 1834, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

events alongside serious articles on music, snippets on overseas musical events (mainly in England, Germany, and Italy), and literary fiction with a musical theme.[28] Jules Janin, for instance, specialized in Contes fantastiques in the style of E. T. A. Hoffmann. One of the most well-known and successful literary-musical ventures to appear was Balzac's short nouvelle, Gambara.[29] Berlioz himself contributed various musical nouvelle in the style of Balzac's Gambara, for instance, "Le Suicide par enthousiasme" (1834) and "Un Bénéficiaire et Rubini à Calais" (1834).[30] As a musical magazine the Revue et Gazette Musicale was naturally geared to a more specialized audience than was a political newspaper, and articles could be analytical without fear of not being understood. Such articles did not comprise the majority; Schlesinger's aim was that the music-lover without a scholarly musical education should still be able to find things to interest him in the Revue et Gazette Musicale.

In a decision that doubtless appealed to Berlioz, the Revue et Gazette Musicale consciously disengaged itself from the enthusiasm at the time for the Théâtre Italien and works of Rossini. Indeed a number of Revue et Gazette Musicale articles express very similar opinions to those of Berlioz, for instance, a distaste for the vocal ornamentation in Italian music and attacks on the poor standard of the chorus and orchestra of the Opéra-Comique. The critic Henri Blanchard

---

[28] Henceforth, wherever reference is made to the Revue et Gazette Musicale in a general statement such as this one, it is assumed that reference is also being made to the Gazette Musicale, since the journal changed its name only in November 1835, and not its approach or contents.

[29] RGM, 23 July to 20 Aug. 1837.

[30] "Le Suicide", GM, 20 July, 27 July, and 3 and 10 Aug. 1834. "Un Bénéficiaire", GM, 5 Oct. 1834.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wrote articles that were even more antagonistic towards Rossini and the Théâtre Italien than those of Berlioz.[31] Berlioz took the opportunity of having a "musical audience" to write serious, extended articles on one particular work or composer. For instance, in 1834 he wrote an article in two parts on Gluck, three on Guillaume Tell,[32] and four on Iphigénie en Tauride. By January 1835 Berlioz had written seven articles exclusively on Gluck, none of which was a review of a performance. The major reviews of performances were of the Conservatoire concerts.

Berlioz was not required to review only the premières of operas. For instance, an 1835 article in the Gazette Musicale on Robert le Diable is not a review of the performance, but a study of one specific quality of the opera, namely its instrumentation.[33] It would have been unlikely for such an article to appear in any political newspaper other than the Journal des Débats unless it had immediately followed a review of a performance. In 1836 the Revue et Gazette Musicale published three articles Berlioz had written in an exchange on the Concours d'Institut with a M. Germanicus Pic. Once again, a political paper would have been unlikely to encourage such a lengthy debate. However, Berlioz still wrote some articles to order for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, such as a series of biographies of Italian

---

31 Henri Blanchard (1791-1858), French violinist, dramatist, composer, and critic. From 1818 to 1829 he was conductor of the Théâtre des Variétés orchestra. He was a contributory editor of the RGM from 1836 until his death. (NG) He sometimes wrote under the alias of J. J. J. Diaz.

32 Guillaume Tell and Le Barbier de Seville, in particular the latter, were the two Rossini operas that Berlioz did appreciate.

33 The première of Robert le Diable took place in 1831 when Berlioz was still in Rome.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

musicians in 1836.[34]

Between the period 1834 to 1837 Berlioz also wrote a series of unsigned articles for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, largely on topics which he had already covered in the Journal des Débats and Le Rénovateur (see Appendix B). Presumably Schlesinger knew that the articles were by Berlioz and agreed, or even perhaps suggested in the first place, that they remain anonymous. Berlioz mentions that the Revue et Gazette Musicale paid him badly,[35] yet the number of articles he wrote during this period suggests that he enjoyed writing for the journal. It must have been liberating to write on subjects that really impassioned him, such as the music of Gluck. Schlesinger's high regard for Berlioz is shown by the fact that he entrusted the paper's editorship to Berlioz in 1837.[36]

No striking alteration to the Revue et Gazette Musicale is apparent under Berlioz's editorship in 1837; the paper continued much the same as before. During the year 1837, however, Berlioz wrote a total of thirty-seven articles for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, which was more than he had any previous year and more than he would in any one of the following years. The articles cover a very broad range; Berlioz wrote on the Conservatoire concerts, operas, several opéras-comiques; he wrote a nécrologie on Le Sueur, nouvelle on

---

[34] A letter of 1836 to Bottée de Toulmon, the Conservatoire librarian, requests information on this subject: "On m'a fait promettre pour un journal des biographies de Musiciens Italiens" ("Someone has made me promise some biographies of Italian musicians for a journal") (CG II, 1836, 313).

[35] CG II, 1835, 232.

[36] Berlioz had also been entrusted with the editorship of the paper in August of 1836 when Schlesinger went on a cure (CG II, 308). Schlesinger retook control at various stages in 1837, though Berlioz remained the chief editor for most of the year.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Benvenuto Cellini, some general articles such as "De la musique en général", and a fairly daring open letter to Schumann. The letter is daring in that it largely consists of an open defence and explanation of Berlioz's own music. It is doubtful that he would have tried to print this letter under the editorship of Schlesinger. Yet on the whole Berlioz had no real interest in changing the content of the journal, as he had enough to cope with in his music.

Schlesinger's choice of Berlioz as his temporary successor says something of his standing as a critic by 1837. The days of the "free-lance" articles were behind him; he was now an established and respected critic and, even at this early date, one of the best music critics in Paris.

Berlioz's music criticism for the Journal des Débats was unquestionably the most significant collaboration he undertook. The Journal des Débats was founded in 1791 by Louis Bertin senior,[37] and along with many other papers and individuals had changed political allegiances several times during the course of the early nineteenth century. For example, it had supported Napoleon, though when Charles X came to power it claimed that Napoleon's police had forced their support.[38] During the Restoration the paper's greatest asset was the journalism of Chateaubriand, who had followers and admirers amongst both the émigrés and the bourgeois royalists. When Chateaubriand's political career ended, the Journal des Débats withdrew its support of

---

[37] Louis-François Bertin, called "Bertin l'aîné" (1766-1841), took acquisition of the JD in 1800, and ran the paper in conjunction with his brother, Louis-François Bertin de Veaux (1771-1842), and son Armand (1801-1854), who took over on his father's death in 1841. Another son, François-Edouard (1797-1871), took over on the death of Armand in 1854--very much a family-run affair. (GDEL)

[38] Collins, The Government and the Press, p. 13.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Charles X's ministries and in 1830 switched its allegiances from Charles X to Louis-Philippe. Chateaubriand however remained loyal to Charles X and consequently broke his ties with the paper.

The Journal des Débats did not suffer badly from its changes of heart and was popular all through the first half of the nineteenth century. The Bertins, two brothers and a son, Armand, not only supported Louis-Philippe, but they, and Armand in particular, were also very friendly with the important statesmen of the day. Naturally the Journal des Débats' support of the monarchy meant that the paper complied with the press regulations and escaped the fines that were crippling other newspapers. Although the Journal des Débats did indeed follow a party line, the quality of its journalism was such that it was followed by many people who were not of the same political persuasion, but valued the high standard of factual reportage the paper presented.

In 1834 Bertin senior published one of Berlioz's articles, "Rubini à Calais", which had previously appeared in the Gazette Musicale.[39] Berlioz went to visit Bertin, ostensibly to thank him for printing the article, but also perhaps with the idea that Bertin might offer him a job, which, as it happened, he did. Berlioz was offered the reviews of Concerts and Variétés musicales, while Jules Janin still reviewed the Opéra and Ballet and Delécluze the Théâtre Italien.[40] In February 1837 Berlioz gained the coverage of the Opéra

---

[39] See footnote 23, p. 82.

[40] See Mém. II, ch. xxlvii, 18/287.
Etienne Jean Delécluze (1781-1863). Delécluze was still in charge of the Théâtre Italien in 1851 when Berlioz wrote in a letter, "[C]'est M. Delécluze qui depuis un temps immémorial est chargé d'en enregistrer . . . [ses] heureuses ou malheureuses péripéties" (" [I]t is M. Delécluze who since time immemorial is in charge of recording . . . [its] happy or unhappy vicissitudes") (CG IV, 1851, 48).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and Opéra-Comique (Théâtres lyriques), though Janin still retained the ballet.[41]

In a letter to his sister Adèle in 1835 Berlioz stated that the Journal des Débats paid him a hundred francs an article regardless of the length.[42] A later letter to his sister Nanci in 1843 states that an article of four columns was paid fifty francs and only an article of eight to twelve columns was worth a hundred francs.[43] Perhaps the situation had changed over the years, but it seems more likely that the latter statement was the correct one, especially as the majority of Berlioz's articles are of eight to twelve columns. But in either case the pay was still extremely generous.

Music critic for the Journal des Débats was an important position to have, not only because of the paper's prestige, but also because, with its reputation for "good" criticism, people had grown accustomed to looking to it for serious music criticism. Berlioz was very much aware of the paper's importance. As he remarked to Ferrand: "C'est une affaire importante pour moi; l'effet qu'ils produisent dans le monde musical est vraiment singulier; c'est presque un événement pour les artistes de Paris" ("It is a very important affair for me; the effect they have on the musical world is quite striking; it is almost an event for the artists of Paris").[44] At times he even comments ironically on the public's high regard for the paper; an article entitled "Tribulations d'un critique musical" describes an eager article-seeker who exclaims to Berlioz,

---

[41] CG II, 1837, 333.

[42] CG II, 1835, 232.

[43] CG III, 1843, 120-121.

[44] CG II, 1835, 229.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> [E]t quel article tu vas me faire là-dessus dans le Journal des Débats! C'est une bonne fortune pour toi; ne va pas gaspiller un pareil sujet dans la Gazette musicale: non, un grand journal, dix-huit mille abonnés, voilà ton affaire.
>
> ([A]nd what an article you are going to write for me in the Journal des Débats! It is very good luck for you; don't waste such a subject in the Gazette Musicale; no, am important journal, eighteen thousand subscribers, there's your opportunity.)[45]

The jealousy of Berlioz's fellow critics, Mainzer for instance, is also evidence of the paper's importance.

Jules Janin's exaggerated eulogy on Bertin (aîné) in his book Les Symphonies de l'hiver no doubt had some truth behind it. Talking of Bertin, Janin says,

> Il nous avait choisis, il nous avait divinés, il nous avait encouragés, il nous avait adoptés, il nous avait fait libres, riches, honorés, indépendants de toutes les variations de la politique, et de tous les changements de la fortune.
>
> (He chose us; he found us; he encouraged us; he adopted us; he made us free, rich, honoured, independent of all political vagaries and changes of fortune.)[46]

Bertin probably rendered many services to Berlioz that are unknown,[47] but two at least are. First, Bertin tried to use his influence to get Benvenuto Cellini performed at the opera, as Berlioz says in his Mémoires:

---

[45] VM II, 414. When Berlioz resigned from the JD in 1864, he commented in a letter, "Rien de plus comique que le désappointement et la colère des gens qui, depuis trois mois, me faisaient la cour" ("Nothing is more comical than the disappointment and anger of those people who have been courting me for the past three months") (Corr. Inéd., p. 306).

[46] Les Symphonies de l'hiver (Paris: Morizot, 1858), p. 265.

[47] His son Armand Bertin was Berlioz's chief friend and champion.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Duponchel . . . me regardait comme une espèce de fou dont la musique n'était et ne pouvait être qu'un tissu d'extravagances. Néanmoins, pour être agréable au Journal des Débats, il consentit à entendre la lecture du livret de Benvenuto. . . .
>
> (Duponchel regarded me as a kind of lunatic whose music was a conglomeration of absurdities, beyond human redemption; but in order to keep in with the Journal des Débats he consented to listen to a reading of the libretto of Benvenuto . . .).[48]

Second, Bertin successfully arranged for the payment of the last two months of Berlioz's pension for the Prix de Rome,[49] and at various stages lent Berlioz money. Berlioz comments in his Mémoires on an occasion in 1846 when Armand Bertin advanced him 1,000 francs.[50] Berlioz's respect and admiration for Bertin and all his family is well documented in the Correspondance générale.

Berlioz's articles for the Journal des Débats over the period 1835 to 1837 are more often reviews of performances than articles on general musical topics, and fulfil the traditional role of the feuilleton in the political newspaper. In 1835 Berlioz reviewed almost exclusively instrumental and orchestral works, which largely consisted of the Conservatoire concerts but also of isolated performances of vocal religious music and solo concerts. He also wrote, yet again, several articles on Gluck and his infamous trenchant article on Zampa, an opéra-comique by Hérold. The subject matter of Berlioz's Journal des Débats articles in 1836 remained largely the same as 1835. In 1837, however, on taking over the responsibility of

---

[48] Mém. II, ch. xlviii, 25/293.

[49] Mentioned in Henry Barraud, Hector Berlioz (Paris: Fayard, 1979), pp. 75-76.

[50] Mém. II, ch. liv, 250/514.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Théâtres lyriques, Berlioz's Journal des Débats reviews began to concentrate more on the Opéra and Opéra-Comique. It was not only the premières of operas that he reviewed but bénéfices (benefit concerts) and débuts as well. Obviously he was obliged to review these works; his job now entailed coverage of specific areas.

Berlioz's articles for the Journal des Débats are serious in tone, perhaps not as analytical as some of the Revue et Gazette Musicale articles, nor as casual as Le Rénovateur articles. He obviously felt a responsibility to Bertin to perform well, and only very occasionally does he revert to the flippant, ironical tone of many Le Rénovateur articles. This tone is not very prominent in the Revue et Gazette Musicale articles either, except in some of the unsigned articles, notably the 1836 articles signed "Un Vieillard stupide . . . " (see Appendix B).

Perhaps the protection of Bertin did give Berlioz the confidence more freely to express what he felt about certain works. A case in point is Zampa, which he reviewed mildly for the Gazette Musicale, leaving all his aggressive comments for the Journal des Débats articles. Bertin obviously had enough confidence in Berlioz's opinion to take a risk, if indeed it was a risk, in publishing the article.[51] On the other hand, Berlioz's respect for Bertin may have meant in some instances that he restrained his comments so as not to upset his editors.

---

[51] At a later date Armand Bertin, not believing that music criticism could be considered worthy of censor, inadvertently published an article of Berlioz's which strongly attacked the Opéra. Berlioz commented, "Tout l'opéra est en émoi à cause de mon dernier feuilleton que Bertin a fait passer malgré la censure (par mégarde!!!!)" ("All Paris is in an uproar because of my last feuilleton that Bertin passed despite the censor (inadvertently!!!!)") (CG IV, 1852, 114).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Journal des Débats was the paper with which Berlioz remained the longest. Many reasons must have influenced his stay--Bertin's importance in political circles, the wide audience reached by the Journal des Débats, and, probably above all, the generous remuneration. The Journal des Débats was also one of the longest-running papers.

During 1837 Berlioz also contributed some music reviews to the Chronique de Paris, a political and literary Sunday newspaper.[52] His articles number only six, but as they review the month's activities, each is two to three pages in length, which was unusually long. The articles are sophisticated versions of the weekly or monthly Chroniques often found in the political papers at the time. Whereas such columns usually made fairly superficial comments on the week's or month's entertainment, Berlioz would pick one or two of the major events and discuss them as thoroughly as the medium would allow. He would often include polemical discussions of musical issues in his article. Berlioz's last article for the Chronique de Paris was written several months before the paper's closure in December 1837.

ii. Motivation of Berlioz's criticism

Berlioz showed an awareness of the importance of the press from his first years in Paris. Before the performance of his Mass at St. Roch on 10 July 1825, he and Humbert Ferrand had mounted a "gig" and delivered invitations to all the press.[53] He was despondent at not

---

[52] Chronique de Paris ran from 3 Aug. 1834 to 24 Dec. 1837.

[53] CG I, 1825, 98. The work was a Messe Solennelle; only one of its nine movements, the Et Resurrexit, still survives.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

having the time to do the same for his concert at the Conservatoire in 1828.[54] He felt that the Théâtre Italien was the only venue and musical genre that did not need to solicit reviews since the fact that it was fashionable ensured regular newspaper coverage.[55] Although he sought reviews, Berlioz did not have a very high opinion of the quality of the criticism. For instance, concerning the reviews of the performance of his Mass on 22 November 1827 he remarked,

> Le Corsaire et la Pandore m'ont donné des éloges, mais sans détails: de ces choses banales, comme on en dit, pour tout le monde. J'attends le jugement de Castil-Blaze, qui m'avait promis d'y assister, de Fétis et de l'Observateur; voilà les seuls journaux que j'avais invités, les autres étant trop occupés de politique.
>
> (Le Corsaire and La Pandore gave me eulogies, but without details: those banal things, that one says for everyone. I await Castil-Blaze's judgement, who promised me he would attend, of Fétis and L'Observateur; these are the only journals that I invited, the others being too concerned with politics.)[56]

The scarcity of music critics at the time is highlighted by the fact that Berlioz awaits a review by Castil-Blaze, a man for whom, as the 1825 Corsaire article shows, he had little respect. By 1828 Berlioz no longer sought Castil-Blaze's reviews, and he comments apropos the reviews of his concert at the Salle des Menus Plaisirs in 1828,

> Castil-Blaze, ne se trouvant pas à Paris, n'a pas pu assister à mon concert; je l'ai vu depuis; il m'a cependant promis d'en parler. Il ne se presse guère; heureusement, je puis m'en passer, et largement.
>
> (Castil-Blaze, not being in Paris, could not attend my

---

[54] CG I, 1828, 192.

[55] CG I, 1829, 284.

[56] CG I, 1827, 160.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> concert; I have seen him since; he has however promised me that he will write on it. He is in no hurry to do so; luckily, I can do without him, easily.)[57]

Berlioz is not satisfied with Castil-Blaze's review of a later concert on 1 December 1829: "Castil-Blaze n'entre dans aucun détail; ces animaux ne savent parler que quand il n'y a rien à dire" ("Castil-Blaze does not go into any detail; these animals only know how to talk when there is nothing to say").[58] However, had Castil-Blaze read the 1825 Corsaire article, his lack of interest in Berlioz would hardly be surprising.

In his Mémoires Berlioz describes the anger he felt in his early years in Paris at the ignorant statements made in the press by Rossinists about the music of Gluck and Spontini. He claims that this anger provoked him into attempting a written reply to the statements: "En lisant les divagations d'un de ces fous je fus pris un jour de la tentation d'y répondre" ("I was reading the ramblings of one of these lunatics when I was seized by the desire to answer them").[59] Berlioz's first reviews were thus aesthetically motivated; his desire was to defend "great art" against ignorant misrepresentations. His awareness of the power of the press and of the paucity of music criticism at the time, coupled with both a desire to become known and a more spontaneous need to defend his ideals, were possibly the reasons for his entering the field of criticism. Although not initially motivated by financial gain this fairly soon came to be an important consideration.

---

[57] CG I, 1828, 197. Salle des Menus Plaisirs was the former name for the Conservatoire hall, built in 1806.

[58] CG I, 1829, 284.

[59] Mém. I, ch. xxi, 142/125.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Anyone writing about Berlioz's music criticism is forced to try to work out what appear to be several puzzling contradictions. For instance, Berlioz complained bitterly about writing criticism, yet he continued to do so even when in his later years making a living was not such a problem for him. He spoke of the burden and toil of writing: "La composition musicale est pour moi une fonction naturelle, un bonheur; écrire de la prose est un travail" ("Musical composition is a natural activity for me and a pleasure, prose-writing a burden").[60] Yet his articles flow easily with an energy and liveliness that suggest enjoyment in his task. French musicologists Edmond Hippeau and Adolphe Jullien, writing at the turn of the century, both came to the conclusion that Berlioz had distorted his "true" attitude to criticism. Hippeau surmised that even if the career of critic was not always easy, writing was an easy if not agreeable task for Berlioz.[61] Jullien claimed that the motivation behind Berlioz's criticism was the desire to communicate his hatreds and enthusiasms. He also claimed that Berlioz's position in French musical circles was due entirely to his work as a journalist and to his friendship with powerful journalists.[62] However, later in the century Jacques Barzun repudiated such disbelief in Berlioz's complaints. Barzun believes that the job of critic was indeed a drudgery for Berlioz: "It would obviously have been much pleasanter for him [Berlioz] to keep his

---

[60] Mém. I, ch. xxi, 143/126.

[61] "[T]out n'est pas roses dans le métier de critique . . . [mais] on doit avouer qu'écrire de la prose était pour lui un travail facile, sinon agréable" ("[T]he career of a critic is not all roses . . . [but] one must acknowledge that writing prose was an easy, if not agreeable, task for him") (Berlioz et son temps (Paris: Ollendorff, 1890), p. 293).

[62] Adolphe Jullien, Hector Berlioz, sa vie et ses oeuvres (Paris: Allison and Co., 1888), p. 335.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

witticisms and stories for friends at his fireside . . .".[63] Barzun is devastated at the thought of what music Berlioz might have left behind had all the time he spent on criticism been spent on composition.

Without wishing to suggest too great a compromise, I would say that the reasons for Berlioz's entry into criticism became both financial and personal--the need to defend his ideals and sustain a public image. Although he does write very easily and with obvious enjoyment, there were occasions when it clearly was drudgery, such as when doing the opéra-comique reviews for Le Rénovateur.

In fact, in his correspondence and Mémoires, Berlioz has discussed his mixed feelings about becoming a critic. I shall briefly turn to the instances where he talks of the personal and emotional gratification he found in criticism.

As early as 1829 Berlioz wrote to his mother of his need for the money brought to him by his reviews: "J'aurai bon besoin que cela me rapporte quelque argent, car je perds presque tout mon temps à copier des parties pour quelque chose que je prépare. . . . " ("I will really need that to bring me some money, since I waste nearly all my time in copying parts for something I am preparing . . ").[64] In chapter twenty-one of the Mémoires, describing his first feelings about becoming a critic, Berlioz expresses his dual motivations clearly:

> L'idée d'une arme pareille mise entre mes mains pour défendre le beau, et pour attaquer ce que je trouvais le contraire du beau, commença aussitôt à me sourire, et la considération d'un léger accroissement de mes ressources pécuniaires toujours si bornées, acheva de me décider.
>
> (I began to see the attractions of the idea. What a

---

[63] Barzun, Berlioz and the Romantic Century II, 259.

[64] CG I, 1829, 254.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> weapon I would have for defending the beautiful and attacking whatever seemed to me opposed to it! There was also the consideration that it would add a little to my income, which was still very meagre.)[65]

On the other hand, Berlioz at times spoke of his criticism as being essential to his well-being regardless of the money it brought him. In these instances he tends to use military similes, talking of criticism as a shield, or as armour, a sword, or weapon with which to fight the world:

> Cette tâche toujours renaissante empoisonne ma vie. Et cependant, indépendamment des ressources pécuniaires qu'elle me donne et dont je ne puis me passer, je me vois presque dans l'impossibilité de l'abandonner, sous peine de rester désarmé en présence des haines furieuses et presque innombrables qu'elle m'a suscitées. . . . La seule compensation même que m'offre la presse pour tant de tourments, c'est la portée qu'elle donne à mes élans de coeur vers le grand, le vrai et le beau. . . .
>
> (This self-perpetuating task poisons my life. And yet, quite apart from the income I get from it, which I cannot do without, I see no prospect of being able to give it up. To do so would leave me without weapons, exposed to all the rancour and hatred that I have incurred by it. . . . Indeed, a sole compensation that journalism offers me for all its torments is the scope it gives to my passion for the true, the great, the beautiful. . . .)[66]

Berlioz was aware of the advantages of becoming a public figure and of being associated with powerful papers. In 1837, commenting on the many papers seeking his services, he remarks that he has accepted the request to work for the Chronique de Paris and Encyclopédie du XIXe

---

[65] Mém. I, ch. xxi, 141/124.

[66] Mém. II, ch. xlvii, 18-19/288. In his correspondence Berlioz, in discussing the amount of time that his criticism took up, said, "Mais il faut arriver à l'Opéra, et c'est ma machine de guerre pour battre la porte de cet immense théâtre" ("But I must succeed at the Opéra, and this is my war machine for battering the door of this immense theatre") (CG II, 1837, 336).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

siècle "à cause de la puissance que ses feuilles me donneront pour aider encore à l'influence si énergique des Débats" ("because of the power that these newspapers will give me to contribute even more to the energetic influence of the Débats").[67]

Gérard Condé postulates that Berlioz's borrowing of choirs and halls for performances of his music was made possible only by his notoriety as a critic.[68] As already mentioned, in his later years Berlioz did not really need the money he gained from his reviews for the Journal des Débats in order to survive. Yet he continued to write, and continued to complain. Once again, Berlioz himself sums up the situation perfectly in a letter (14 February 1861) to his son Louis:

> [I]l faut pourtant m'obstiner à écrire pour gagner mes misérables cent francs, et garder ma position armée contre tant de drôles qui m'anéantiraient s'ils n'avaient tant de peur. Et j'ai la tête pleine de projets, de travaux, que je ne puis exécuter à cause de cet esclavage!
>
> (I have however to persist in writing to earn my miserable hundred francs, and keep my position armed against so many odd-bods who would kill me if they weren't too frightened to do so. And I have a head full

---

[67] CG II, 1837, 336.

[68] Gerard Condé, Introd., Hector Berlioz, p. 18. This view was held at the time also. An article in Le Corsaire of 1840 argues that Berlioz was only tolerated as a composer because of his position as a critic: "Mais au moyen de l'escopette que l'on nomme le Journal des Débats, M. Hector Berlioz parvient à faire jouer ses opéras acrobatiques et ses symphonies orichalciennes. Avec le Journal des Débats, M. Hector s'impose aux cérémonies officielles, s'impose aux directeurs, aux ministres, au directeur des beaux-arts. . . ." ("But by the means of a blunderbuss that one calls the Journal des Débats, M. Hector Berlioz is able to have his acrobatic operas and metallic symphonies performed; M. Hector imposes himself at official ceremonies, imposes himself on directors, on ministers, on the director of the Beaux-arts . . .") (unsigned article, "M. Berlioz le critique, se vengeant des échecs de M. Berlioz le compositeur", Le Corsaire, 22 Aug. 1840, p. 1).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> of projects, of works that I cannot undertake because of this slavery!)[69]

Perhaps Berlioz sincerely believed that he did still need this money. John Klein, in an interesting article on Berlioz's personality, has commented on Berlioz's fear of not having enough money in these later years.[70] Still, the important point is that the need to defend himself was as strong as the financial need. Right to the end of his life Berlioz was reluctant to relinquish his powerful position on the Débats staff. Even a year later, in 1862, when obviously quite exhausted by the task of writing, Berlioz had to pretend to himself, as much as to his correspondent, that since it was fate that decreed his continued collaboration it was beyond his control:

> J'ai l'ambition de ne plus être domestique, de ne plus monter derrière la calèche des sots et des idiots, et de pouvoir au contraire leur jeter des pierres, si cela me plaît. Mais les sorcières de Macbeth ne m'ont rien prédit . . . [J]e louerai encore longtemps les hommes et les choses que je méprise le plus. Dieu le veut!
>
> (I have the ambition no longer to be a domestic, no longer to climb on the back of the wagon of fools and idiots, but to be able on the contrary to throw stones at them if I please. But the witches of Macbeth have not predicted anything for me . . . [F]or a long time yet I shall praise men and things that I hate the most. God wills it!)[71]

In 1862 Berlioz wrote to the Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein announcing his retirement from criticism and composition: "Je voulais n'avoir plus rien à faire, rien, absolument rien. J'y suis parvenu;

---

[69] Corr. inéd., p. 274.

[70] "Berlioz's Personality", Music and Letters, 50 (Jan. 1969), p. 21.

[71] Letter to the Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein, 21 Sept. 1862, SW, p. 127.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

et je puis à toute heure dire à la mort, cette abominable camarde: Quand tu voudras!" ("I wanted to have nothing more to do, nothing, absolutely nothing, and I have succeeded. At any time I can say to death, that abominable release: when you wish").[72]

This letter gives the disturbing impression of a man who wants his life to end, and yet it was another five miserable years before Berlioz died. However much it burdened him, and despite the undeniable drudgery and boredom of so much of it, criticism was an important, perhaps essential, part of Berlioz's life.

The question whether he would have composed more music had he not been a critic is a difficult one to answer. It is not just a question of Berlioz's having more time for his music, since other factors also come into play, such as a receptive intellectual environment. The Mémoires finish with the pathetic vision of Berlioz beginning to doubt his own "genius",[73] and at various earlier stages during his life he wrote with desperation about his lack of time to compose, for instance: "Il est dur d'être obligé d'avouer que je n'ai pas le temps de travailler et que je ne fais presque rien de ce dont je suis le plus capable!" ("It is hard to be obliged to admit that I do not have the time to work and that I am doing practically nothing of what I am the most capable of doing!")[74] In 1859 the Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein was encouraging him to write another opera based on Antony and Cleopatra, yet Berlioz again claimed that he did not have the time.[75]

---

[72] SW, 1862, p. 127.

[73] David Cairns comments very movingly on this in his editor's epilogue to the Memoirs, pp. 637-639.

[74] CG III, 1844, 167.

[75] SW, pp. 107-108 and 110.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Whether indeed he would have written Les Troyens without the intensive and intelligent encouragement of the Princess is also a difficult question. It was not only the burden of criticism that was hindering Berlioz's composition but a variety of other factors contributed, such as the lack of professional support. As David Cairns remarks in his introduction to the Memoirs: "It is heartbreaking to think of all that he might have written with a little more encouragement from the musical authorities of the day . . .".[76] Gérard Condé suggests that Berlioz could never have made his living from his music, since it appealed to such a small audience:

> [S]on métier de critique a évité à Berlioz de devoir composer pour vivre. N'ayant pas la facilité d'un Auber ni l'opportunisme d'un Meyerbeer, il en aurait été d'ailleurs incapable: malgré ses illusions romantiques sur une éventuelle consécration populaire, il avait dû se rendre compte assez tôt que l'originalité de sa musique la réservait à une élite restreinte de connaisseurs ou d'esprits sensibles.
>
> ([H]is job as a critic spared Berlioz the necessity of composing to live. Not having the facility of an Auber or the opportunism of a Meyerbeer, he would however have been incapable of it. Despite his romantic illusions about a possible popular consecration, he must have realized quite early that the originality of his music restricted it to a limited elite of connoisseurs or sensitive spirits.)[77]

Berlioz himself commented in a letter to his sister in 1854 that he could not, at times, see the point of writing music:

> On ne dit plus 'Que sais-je?' comme Montaigne, mais 'A quoi bon?' Je suis obsédé par des plans d'ouvrages, vastes et hardis que je me crois sûr de réaliser; je vais commencer et je m'arrête: Pour quoi entreprendre une pareille oeuvre, me dis-je, m'éprendre pour elle d'une effrayante ardeur? . . . Pour la voir livrée aux enfants ou aux brutes, ou enterrée vive.

---

[76] Cairns, Introd., Memoirs, p. 11.

[77] Gérard Condé, Introd., Hector Berlioz, p. 19.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> (One no longer says, 'What do I know', like Montaigne, but, 'What's the good?' I am obsessed by plans of vast and bold works that I think I am sure to realize; I begin and I stop myself: Why take on such a work, I say to myself, why become enamoured with such frightening ardour? . . . To see it either delivered to children or brutes, or buried alive.)[78]

If, however, Berlioz had not been obliged to write criticism to live, and had also been born into a more encouraging environment, he would almost undoubtedly have written more music.

In placing Berlioz's music criticism in its context, it is interesting to note that his criticism was relatively mild. For instance, Berlioz's review of Zampa, which so horrified both his contemporaries and later writers, is quite mild in comparison to some of the statements made by his fellow critics on, for instance, the libretti of Scribe. Another interesting aspect of seeing Berlioz's criticism in context is realizing that the ethical and pedagogical aspect of Berlioz's criticism was not unique, but shared by several of his colleagues, and indeed that it formed part of a general trend that showed at times the influence of the Saint-Simonian movement.

Berlioz's early criticism does have a fairly strong prejudice against the Théâtre Italien. This attenuated with time, as Berlioz became reconciled to more of the music of Rossini and Bellini. However, in general Berlioz appreciated less, and wrote much less about the Théâtre Italien, than the majority of his contemporary music critics. Conversely, he wrote more, and in greater detail, on instrumental music and, in particular, on the music of Beethoven.

No other French music critic at the time wrote as well or as much as Berlioz. This fact is indisputable, yet it should not be taken to

---

[78] CG IV, 1854, 569.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mean that none of his contemporaries wrote worthwhile music criticism. As outlined in Chapter I, much interesting music criticism was written by other writers, and it is important to see Berlioz's work as part of a critical community, not as an isolated phenomenon. Berlioz's enthusiasm for the Conservatoire concerts and music of Beethoven, for instance, was shared by a large number of fellow writers. Where Berlioz differed was in the amount of space he devoted to such issues and also, in many cases, in the standard of his criticism in these areas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER III

Critical Practices of the Day

i. What constituted a good review

In order to say what constituted a good review in Parisian music criticism of the 1830s, various parameters need to be fixed. First, I shall examine what was "good" in terms of the criticism of the period and not in any broader historical context. Second, by "good" I mean "well-written", "well-organized", and "musically informed". The musical magazines had expectations about the extent of musical knowledge required from the critic that differed from those of the newspapers and literary journals. Little technical knowledge of music was required of the average writer of feuilletons for the political newspapers, though such knowledge was desirable in articles written for the music magazines such as the Revue et Gazette Musicale.

Much of the music criticism at the time still consisted of reviews of opera and opéra-comique. This was the traditional area for review and as such entailed certain expectations and certain established practices. The major commitment in these reviews was to the detailed retelling of the libretto. This was presumably desired by the public, who wished to know the story of the work before attending. However, the libretto was apparently sometimes available at the performance. In a letter to Deschamps (apropos his review of the opera Stradella) Berlioz comments,

> Je pense à ce que je vous ai demandé relativement à l'analyse de la pièce; je crois à présent que c'est inutile, le livret imprimé suffira; j'avais oublié, quand je vous ai parlé de m'en donner le contenu, qu'on pourrait se le procurer à la première représentation.
>
> (I am thinking of what I asked you relative to the analysis of the piece; I think at the moment that it is not of much use, the printed libretto will be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> sufficient; I had forgotten when I asked you to give me its contents that one could get hold of it at the first performance.)[1]

Thus the need for retelling the libretto was not purely a practical consideration but also an integral part of the critic's artistic undertaking; he had to relate the story before he could pass any critical judgements on the music. With Berlioz, for instance, judgement of the music was frequently based on whether the libretto had lent itself to musical development or not. If Berlioz had several articles about the one work, he often devoted one entire article to the libretto; if he had just the one article, he spent approximately half the review on the libretto, and often less. This seems to have been about the average amount of time to spend on the libretto, and any more time indicated that the critic was either unable to discuss the music or was deliberately avoiding doing so (see Chapter IV).

After describing the libretto the critic usually proceeded to some comments about the music. The extent of the musical coverage depended on whether the critic had access to the score, and was interested enough to want to see it. Critics who did not have access to the score usually discussed the work in general terms, commented on the merit or lack of merit in various of its scenes, and drew some general conclusions on the value of the music. Critics who did have

---

[1] CG II, 1837, 335. In another, earlier review Berlioz commented, "Il faut que je vous raconte le livret de M. Scribe que vous pourriez acheter" ("I must recount you M. Scribe's libretto which you could buy") (Le Rén., 1 March 1835, p. 1). Elizabeth Bartlett remarks in her article, "Archival Sources for the Opéra-Comique and its Registres at the Bibliothèque de l'Opéra", that in the early nineteenth-century "printed libretti were not issued for the Paris première (and indeed sometimes never appeared)" (19th-Century Music, 7 (Fall 1983), 121). Perhaps the custom of issuing libretti at premières was just beginning in the 1830s--which would explain Berlioz's forgetfulness in his letter to Deschamps.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

access to the score on the whole presented a more detailed examination of the music and attempted to explain why the music did or did not succeed. Berlioz condemned the review that stated only that the music was successful, without making any attempts to explain why or in what way: " [I]l ne suffit pas de les [les véritables beautés] énumérer, il faut les démontrer, si toutefois le beau se démontre . . . . [C]omment prouvez-vous qu'elle [l'ouverture] soit belle, vous le dites et c'est tout" ("[I]t is not enough to enumerate them [the real beauties], they have to be demonstrated . . . . [H]ow do you prove that it [the overture] is beautiful; you say it, and that is all").[2]

Berlioz usually told his reader when he had not had access to the score, though it is in any case clear from the review itself. Frequently, of course, the critic just did not have the time to consult the score even if he wanted to, since the newspaper editors demanded that the reviews appear immediately after the première of a work. Berlioz felt that in these situations it was difficult to distinguish even the most striking points of a score:

> [U]ne première audition [est], je l'ai déjà dit, complètement insuffisante pour distinguer même les points saillans d'une partition. La nécessité de parler des ouvrages nouveaux immédiatement après leur apparition, nécessité imposée tant par les habitudes de la presse que par l'intérêt des théâtres, est fâcheuse pour les artistes comme pour les critiques.
>
> ([A] first hearing [is], as I have already said, completely insufficient to distinguish even the most salient points of the score. The necessity of speaking of new works immediately after their first appearance, a necessity imposed as much by the practices of the press as by the interest of the theatres, is as annoying for the artists as it is for the critics.)[3]

---

[2] RGM, 7 Feb. 1836, p. 44.

[3] JD, 2 Nov. 1837, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Occasionally Berlioz remarked on insights that the knowledge of the score gave to his aural perception. For instance in a review of Les Huguenots he pinpointed a section in the second act where a study of the score gave partial justification for an abrupt harmonic progression--the justification was only partial because Berlioz felt that the preparatory chord he found marked in the score could not be noticed aurally unless one were aquainted with the score.[4] Conversely, in another instance, this time in reference to works of Monpou, Berlioz remarked that deliberately displaced rhythms in the score were effectively displaced only for the eye, since singers were obliged, despite themselves, to put the rhythm where it fell naturally:

> Ainsi, plusieurs morceaux des ouvrages que je viens de citer sont dessinés avec toute la symétrie et la carrure scholastique, le temps fort de chaque mesure y étant seulement déplacé. Mais ce déplacement n'est que pour l'oeil; on l'aperçoit en lisant la partition ou en regardant les mouvemens du chef d'orchestre; à l'audition il n'existe pas, la force du sentiment musical obligeant à leur insu les exécutans de remettre l'accent rhythmique à la place que la forme de la mélodie lui assigne naturellement.
>
> (Thus, several bits of the works that I have just cited are drawn with total symmetry and scholastic square-cutness, the strong beat of each bar only being displaced there. But this displacement is for the eye alone. One recognizes it in reading the score or in watching the movements of the conductor; in the listening it doesn't exist, the force of the musical feeling obliges the performers unconsciously to put the rhythmic accent back in the place that the form of the melody naturally assigns it.)[5]

The critic's discussion of music was usually followed by

---

[4] JD, 10 Nov. 1836. The example refers to the sermon scene, "Devant vous nous jurons éternelle amitié".

[5] JD, 2 Nov. 1837, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

commentary on the mise-en-scène. Since Berlioz rarely commented at any length on the mise-en-scène, which he saw as accessory rather than fundamental, it is possible, given the importance of the mise-en-scène at this time, that his reviews of opera disappointed many of his readers. However, they had only to turn to one of the other papers for a more detailed coverage of it.

The opera review would usually finish with an assessment of the standard of performance of the principal singers in particular, and, though of lesser importance, the orchestra and chorus. Berlioz often used this section as the place to give advice to singers on ways in which they could improve their performance.

In summary, then, a "good" review of an opera at this time entailed a quite standard way of looking at the libretto and--though not necessarily in this order--music, mise-en-scène, and standard of performance or interpretation. The amount of musical commentary--to call it analysis would be an exaggeration--depended on the critic's knowledge of the score and the readership, which may have been the general public or a specialized audience, to which the review was directed. This separation between the general public and specialized audience is not strict, however, for Berlioz wrote almost as many technical articles for the Journal des Débats as for the Revue et Gazette Musicale. For the most part Berlioz's reviews of opera followed the pattern outlined above.[6] Although, as mentioned earlier, some of his public may have seen his minimal commentary on the mise-en-scène as a limitation, this was compensated for by the extent of his commentary on the music.

No such patterns can be discerned in the reviews of music other

---

[6] See Chapter IV.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

than opera. In the large mixture of "other subjects" covered in the musical press, the concerts most consistently covered were the conservatoire concerts. To give a brief idea of what else was reviewed, Berlioz's reviews during the 1830s also covered chamber music concerts, religious music performed in churches, and concerts given by virtuosi.

The majority of other reviews can be grouped loosely together, as all in some way approached the concept of music as an "independent expressive medium". The extent of the critic's musical knowledge was more critical here, since he could not pad out his review with a description of the libretto. With no recourse to the "words" of a composition, the critic had no choice but to turn to the music.[7] This was obviously fairly daunting for many critics, who substituted another kind of narrative description consisting of a descriptive recounting of the music in terms of the poetic associations it aroused in them. Blaze de Bury's criticism has already been mentioned in this regard. This resulted once again in the music review that described the effects of the music upon the listener-critic, but stopped short of examining what it was that caused them. Berlioz also at times engaged in poetic reverie, though he differed in that, instead of using the music as a trigger for associations only loosely connected with the music itself, his reveries were closely based on the music and changed as the music changed.

In the case of the Conservatoire concerts and concerts put on by virtuosi, critics also seemed to feel themselves behoven to discuss the concerts as a social phenomenon. These concerts were after all a

---

[7] Katherine Kolb Reeve's dissertation, "The Poetics of the Orchestra", gives an excellent account of the critic's response to music as an "independent medium".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

new occurrence, which obliged the critic in some way to situate himself in relation to their novelty.

Judging from what can be gleaned from comments made in the journals and books of the day, the general feeling about critics was one of antagonism towards the sort of "pedantry" and too excessive "scholasticism" of which Fétis was seen, in my opinion often unfairly, as the major offender. A livelier writing style was preferred.

Berlioz's combination of a spirited literary style and an informed knowledge of music was unique amongst the contemporary Parisian critics. His literary gifts were in a way a bonus since his criticism is valuable in itself for its interest in the primary texts, the musical scores.

ii. Malpractices

Music and theatre critics are lamentably susceptible to bribery. The twentieth century is no exception to this, as Guy Hocquenghem states in his Minigraphie de la presse parisienne: "Le Service [service-rendu] est le vrai ciment de la Presse" ("Favours are the true cement of the press").[8] The corruption of the Parisian press of the first half of the nineteenth century was notorious, even in its day. Balzac's Illusions Perdues provides a clear picture of the journalistic ethics of the day. The picture Balzac draws, though coloured by his personal bitter experience with the press, is nevertheless reasonably accurate and modelled on real people. Balzac wrote a Monographie de la presse parisienne which analyzes various

---

[8] Guy Hocquenghem, "Minigraphie de la presse parisienne", Pref., Monographie de la presse parisienne by Honoré de Balzac (1842; Paris: J.-E. Hallier/ Albin Michel, 1981), p. 14.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

different types of journalist under the generic title of Gendelettre ("comme gendarme", Balzac comments). He talks, amongst others, of Le Jeune Critique blond, with sub-genres such as Le Farceur, Le Négateur, Le Critique de la vieille roche, and Le Feuilletoniste. Honesty is the least valued commodity in the profession. Balzac remarks apropos Le Feuilletoniste: "Entre l'argent à empocher et le gouvernement de la plus belle partie de l'intelligence, la presse n'a pas hésité: elle a pris l'argent et a résigné le sceptre de l'article de fond" ("Between money in the pocket and the rule of the most beautiful part of the intelligence, the press didn't hesitate: it took the money and renounced the sceptre of the in-depth article").[9]

Although Berlioz was not party to accepting bribes to write good reviews, it appears that he himself occasionally did pay money to ensure favourable reviews. It was something he deplored doing, as he wrote in a letter to Liszt in 1853:

> Je profiterai de tes avis pour Francfort, si je me décide à y aller; je me doutais déjà de l'existence de ces critiques de grands chemins, et de la nécessité où l'on est de jeter un sou dans leur chapeau quand on passe devant leur Escopette.
>
> (I will take your advice for Frankfurt if I decide to go there; I already suspected the existence of these highway critics, and of the necessity of throwing a sou in their hat when one passes in front of their Blunderbuss.)[10]

It is unlikely that critics such as Mainzer, Desnoyers, or d'Ortigue accepted bribes either, but other critics were not so scrupulous and succumbed to the attraction of money easily gained. Emile de Girardin described a journal of the day as one

---

[9] Balzac, Monographie, p. 147.

[10] CG IV, 351.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> dont la spéculation financière est fondée sur la rançon qu'il tire sans pitié de quelque acteur ou actrice qui paient pour qu'il ne soit pas dit d'eux dans le feuilleton du lendemain qu'ils sont gauches, laids ou détestables.
>
> (whose financial speculation is founded on the ransom that they pitilessly extract from some actor or actress who pays so that it will not be said of them in the following day's feuilleton that they are awkward, ugly, or detestable.)[11]

Louis Gouin (Meyerbeer's secretary) commented in a letter to his master in 1833,

> [H]ier j'ai entendu [Ch. Maurice] dire--parlant à Caraffa, au foyer de L'opéra, que la musique d'Ali Baba était encore au dessous de qu'on l'avait jugée, et ce matin, celui qui hier soir lui disait cela, a probablem[en]t été achété (car on là a bon marché) Mr. Charles Maurice a fait un article à l'opposé des paroles que j'ai entendu sortir de sa bouche. Il n'y a que le Moniteur qui ait osé dire qu'on avait sifflé, le fait est vrai et c'est un ouvrage passablement ennuyeux. . . .
>
> ([Y]esterday I heard [Ch. Maurice] say--speaking to Caraffa in the foyer of the Opéra, that the music of Ali Baba was still beneath what it had been judged to be. And this morning the person that yesterday evening said this to him had probably been bought (because he can be got cheaply). M. Charles Maurice wrote an article the total opposite of the words that I heard come from his mouth. Only Le Moniteur dared say that it was booed; the fact is true and it is quite a boring work. . . .)[12]

The fact that only one newspaper mentioned that the work was whistled at shows how little credence could be given to the reviewer's report of a work's reception.

The most outrageously corrupt critic of the day was Charles

---

[11] Quoted by Antoine Adam in his Introduction to Balzac's Illusions Perdues, p. xxviii.

[12] Giacomo Meyerbeer, Briefwechsel und Tagebücher, II (Berlin: Gruyter, 1970), 321. I have reproduced the bad French of the original.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Maurice.[13] He edited a journal called the Courrier des Théâtres which provided a daily listing of all current performances at the major theatres of the day from the Variétés to the Opéra. Maurice ran what could be best termed a protection racket, whereby artists, playwrights, actors, singers, dancers, and composers paid him for a good review, and if they neglected to pay were given a poor review or simply not mentioned at all. Maurice's articles were little more than the stringing together of a few banal phrases and hardly deserved the title of "Critique musicale".

The importance artists attached to Maurice's column is surprising and presumably lay in the large audience reached by the Courrier. In a sense, the journal filled a similar role to that of the present-day Pariscope. Anyone wanting to know what was being performed in Paris at the time would have looked for a Courrier des Théâtres. Although other newspapers also listed performances of the day, none were as detailed or comprehensive as the Courrier.

In 1856 Maurice published a book of the letters written to him during his editorship of the Courrier. The book contains an astonishing number of fawning, unctuous letters from famous artists.[14] A large number of the letters talk quite specifically of "protection". Donizetti for instance writes that he is putting "mon Marino Faliero . . . sous la protection de votre talent. . . ." ("my Marino Faliero . . . under the protection of your talent . . . ").[15] The Elssler sisters,

---

[13] Maurice's full name was Jean Charles François Maurice Descombes (1782-1869), but he was commonly known as Charles Maurice.

[14] Charles Maurice, Histoire anecdotique du théâtre, de la littérature et de diverses impressions contemporaines, 2 vols. (Paris: H. Plon, 1856).

[15] Maurice, letter of 10 March 1835, II, 120.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

too, request his protection: "Veuillez, nous vous prions, monsieur, nous protéger comme vous l'avez fait jusqu'à présent" ("Please would you, we beg you Monsieur, continue to protect us as you have done up until now"),[16] as does Louisa Puget: "[V]ouloir bien prendre sous votre protection mon début de compositeur dans la carrière dramatique" ("[P]lease take my début as a dramatic composer under your protection").[17] Other letters consist only of exaggerated praise; Arrago writes, "Je n'ai trouvé qu'un journaliste qui fît de la haute critique théâtrale; et ce journaliste c'est vous" ("I have found only one journalist who writes high-class theatre criticism; and that journalist is you").[18] In discussing his collection of letters in the preface to his book, Maurice claims, "A chaque fait mémorable, comme à chaque bruit de sonorité piquante, je me suis imposé le devoir de les annoter et de jeter ces provisions de l'avenir dans un Coffre qui ne m'a jamais quitté" ("At each memorable happening, as for each piquant sonorous noise, I imposed upon myself the task of annotating them and of throwing these provisions for the future in a Chest which has never left me").[19] By using words such as "coffre" and "provisions de l'avenir", Maurice himself hints at the financial nature of his correspondence. Although never mentioned, it is highly probable that money accompanied these letters.

Maurice was not the only music critic at the time to exact money for favourable reviews. It is reputed that Jules Janin at times

---

[16] Maurice, letter of 11 August 1835, II, 124. The Elssler sisters, Fanny and Thérèse, were two Austrian ballet dancers. Fanny became one of the most famous ballerinas of the time.

[17] Maurice, letter of 1836, II, 154.

[18] Maurice, letter of 18 Feb. 1837, II, 156.

[19] Maurice, Introd., I, vi.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

operated in a similar fashion,[20] and Fiorentino was renowned for his accepting bribes,[21] but no other critic was as blatant or as unsubtle in his manoeuvres as Charles Maurice and his infamous cry of "la bourse ou la vie!" ("your money or your life!")[22]

In his introduction to the Garnier edition of Illusions Perdues, Antoine Adam remarks, "Balzac avait compris que le caractère essentiel de son temps, c'était la toute-puissance de l'argent. La librairie, le théâtre, le journalisme, les belles-lettres étaient dominés par cette nouvelle et abjecte tyrannie" ("Balzac understood that the essential character of his time was the all-powerfulness of money. Bookshops, theatre, journalism, and belles-lettres were dominated by this new and abject tyranny").[23] Money certainly had the power to open doors that earlier in the century would have remained sealed;

---

[20] Mentioned in Auguste Ehrhard, "L'Opéra sous la direction Véron (1831-1835)", Extrait de La Revue Musicale de Lyon, 1907, p. 40. Antoine Adam commented, "Si l'on veut apprécier la vertu de Janin, qu'on lise, dans le journal du comte Apponyi, ces étonnantes confidences du journaliste: 'Je suis comme une femme entretenue, je suis à la mode, il faut que j'exploite la folie; dans un an, je serai peut-être à cent sous'. Pour le moment--1834--il 'était' à mille francs l'article de louange" ("If one wants to appreciate the virtue of Janin, one should read Count Apponyi's journal for these astonishing confidences of the journalist: 'I am like a kept woman, I am fashionable, I must exploit this madness; in a year, I will perhaps be worth only a hundred sous'. For the moment--1834--he was 'worth' a thousand francs the article of praise") (Introd., Illusions Perdues, p. xxvii, n. 3).

[21] Pier Angelo Fiorentino (1806-1864), Italian music critic working in Paris from 1849, writing music criticism for Le Corsaire, Le Constitutionnel, Le Moniteur Universel (under the pseudonym of A. de Rovray), and La France (CG III, 779). Charles Soullier in L'Union Musicale (20 June 1864) called him "un grand critique musical très versé dans les mystères du son...de l'or" ("a great music critic very familiar with the mysteries of the sound...of money") (quoted in Marie-Hélène Coudroy's dissertation, "La Critique parisienne face aux créations du Prophète et de l'Africaine de Meyerbeer", Diss. Université de Paris IV 1982, p. 194).

[22] Quoted in Ehrhard, p. 41.

[23] Introd., Illusions perdues, p. xxvii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

even the doors of the Opéra-Comique could be swung by money. Berlioz talks with a mixture of bitterness and pity of a certain rich M. Fontmichel from Provence who, because of his wealth and his desperation to have a work performed in Paris, had been cajoled into paying for having his work performed at the Opéra-Comique. M. Fontmichel was nevertheless being badly treated by the management who were demanding unreasonable sums of money for services that were by rights automatic.[24]

Meyerbeer is the name that is, and has always been, most frequently associated with favours obtained by financial influence. The suggestion that he bribed all his critics has been questioned by Heinz Becker, at greatest length in his book Der Fall Heine-Meyerbeer,[25] but also in other writings such as the New Grove entry on Meyerbeer. In Der Fall Heine-Meyerbeer it is Heine that Becker portrays as the corrupt one, as the insidious critic who, an adept at moral blackmail, extorted money from Meyerbeer for not writing bad criticism. Becker provides convincing documentary evidence that corroborates his argument.

Heine's criticism of Meyerbeer is curious. The early criticism written before he turned so vehemently against Meyerbeer already has several ambiguous undercurrents.[26] Heine describes Meyerbeer as a

---

[24] Berlioz discussed Court de Fontmichel (1789-1862) in his unsigned article for the RGM, 17 July 1836. The name of Fontmichel's opéra-comique was Le Chevalier de Canolle. On another occasion Berlioz spoke of a M. Cohen who had paid money in order to have his work, Le Moine, rehearsed: " M. Cohen a donné mille francs à la Société comme indemnité pour les répétitions. Vous concevrez qu'on ne pouvait résister à cet argument" ("M. Cohen gave a thousand francs to the society, as indemnity for the rehearsals. You can imagine that one could not resist that argument") (CG IV, 1851, 53).

[25] Der Fall Heine-Meyerbeer (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1958).

[26] Heine turned against Meyerbeer after a financial
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

timorous, anxious man, who is desperate for public approval, paranoid about failure, and continually alters his works in rehearsal and in the manuscript.[27] This image is then contrasted with an idolatrous portrayal of Meyerbeer as a "colossus", the builder of Gothic cathedrals in music, and a leader of men.[28] The two images sit oddly together. Heine raises the question of the fickle populace, which could turn against the composer, and asks rhetorically whether wreaths of flowers thrown at the head might hurt, and whether flowers thrown by dirty hands could dirty the composer also.[29] Was Heine hinting here that the people who were doing this had been paid to do it?

Heine takes up the subject of floral wreaths again in his later witty, explosive attack on Meyerbeer in Lutèce.[30] Here he ridicules Meyerbeer, saying that the weight of his floral wreaths must be now so

---

[26](continued)
misunderstanding explained in Becker, Der Fall Heine-Meyerbeer.

[27] See Henri [Heinrich] Heine, De tout un peu (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1890). In a series of confidential letters addressed to A. Lewald, director of the Revue théâtrale de Stuttgart (reprinted in the above), Heine describes Meyerbeer as timorous etc. See, in particular, p. 278.

[28] Heine, De tout un peu, pp. 279-280. Peter Conrad remarks about the image of the cathedral in the nineteenth century that it was "an image of art in the service of faith . . . [proclaiming] the notion of an art which was dogmatic and epic, not romantically self-divided and self-communing, it was naturally the object of artistic assaults in a later period: Debussy sinks his cathedral under the sea, Monet makes his molten in a dazzling light . . ." (Peter Conrad, Romantic Opera and Literary Form (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), p. 15). This is an interesting observation, to which I would like to add the point that Heine's comparison of Meyerbeer's work with a Gothic cathredral also reflects the influence of Saint-Simonism, where the Gothic cathedral represented the ultimate art-form.

[29] Heine, De tout un peu, p. 272.

[30] Lutèce. Lettres sur la vie politique, artistique et sociale de la France, 5th ed. (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1859), pp. 196-197. This work is a collection of letters originally written for the Gazette d'Augsbourg, 1840-1843.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

heavy as to require the help of a little donkey to trot along beside him and share the load. This article probably did a great deal to spread and reinforce the belief that Meyerbeer controlled the Press. Heine very adroitly uses the orchestra as a metaphor for the press, talking of Meyerbeer's skill at "instrumentation" which he later defines as "l'art d'employer toute sorte d'hommes comme instruments" ("the art of employing all sorts of men as instruments").[31] Becker also claims that impecunious music critics such as Fiorentino and Scudo persistently asked Meyerbeer for loans, the implication being that, once again, the instigators of "money transfers" between Meyerbeer and certain critics were the critics themselves.

Even if this is the case, however, there is no doubt that Meyerbeer did most assiduously court the press. He was neurotically obsessed with the success of his works and concerned with every detail that could contribute to that success. He was not in Paris during the performances of Robert le Diable, but his secretary wrote him a letter after every performance in which he gave details of the takings, standard of performance, and the public response. Meyerbeer kept up regular correspondence with innumerable journalists and subscribed to a very large number of papers. The splendid banquets he gave the press before the premières of his works were not insignificant affairs. Becker, who equates them simply with the modern press reception with refreshments, is clearly understating the case.[32]

Money was not the only means by which Meyerbeer courted his following. In his article on Meyerbeer and Fétis, Peter A. Bloom, though admitting that money did pass between the two, suggests that

---

[31] Heine, Lutèce, p. 196.

[32] Becker, New Grove article on Meyerbeer.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

their friendship was more than just mutually opportunist.[33] Meyerbeer was a very powerful friend to have and was always prepared to do favours for his friends. He was canny in the ways in which he stimulated allegiance. The tenor Duprez recounts in his Mémoires that when Meyerbeer asked him to sing in Les Huguenots he bet him that the work would not reach its eightieth performance. The wager was Meyerbeer's author's rights for twenty performances. The eightieth performance was attained and Duprez was duly paid. Duprez notes this as one of the subtle means used by Meyerbeer to stimulate the zeal of his performers.[34] Though money played an important role in the artistic world of the time, it was not always manipulated in the unsubtle manner of Charles Maurice.

Factors other than money also had undue influence over the critical fraternity. Political allegiances, for example, played a significant part in the critics' response to Louisa Bertin's opera Esmeralda.[35] Although it was not often that political influence infringed upon the artistic world, it is interesting to look at this particular instance, as it illustrates the malleability of the critics.

Louisa Bertin, daughter of Louis Bertin, was undoubtedly helped enormously in her career by the importance of her family. As a woman

---

[33] "Friends and Admirers: Meyerbeer and Fétis", Revue Belge de Musicologie, 32-33 (1978-1979), p. 185.

[34] Gilbert Duprez, Souvenirs d'un chanteur (Paris: C. Lévy, n. d.), pp. 149-150.

[35] Louisa Bertin (1805-1877), French composer, daughter of Louis Bertin (of the Journal des Débats dynasty) and sister of Armand Bertin. She wrote several operas: Guy Mannering (1825), Le Loup-garou (1827), Fausto (1831), and Esmeralda (1836). After the failure of Esmeralda she wrote no more operas, her music thereafter consisting mainly of a series of cantatas that were performed only in private. She also published two volumes of poetry. (NG)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

she stood very little chance of having a work performed that had the pretensions of being a serious opera. Her chances of success would have been stronger had she, like her contemporary Louisa Puget, contented herself with writing chiefly romances.[36] Several critics even remarked in their reviews on the unsuitability of the opera genre for a female. Blaze de Bury commented,

> D'ailleurs est-ce bien l'oeuvre d'une femme de soulever les tempêtes de l'orchestre et de faire mouvoir les choeurs? . . . Trouver la voix des larmes et du coeur, c'est là une assez belle tâche pour occuper les loisirs d'une femme.
>
> (Besides, is it really the work of a woman to raise the tempests of the orchestra and to move the chorus? . . . To find the voice of tears and of the heart is a beautiful enough task to occupy the leisure time of a woman.)[37]

Although her sex would have counted against her, it was also extremely difficult for anyone without the right connections to have a work performed at the Opéra--witness the extraordinary problems Berlioz had throughout his life. Berlioz commented on the acceptance of Esmeralda by the Opéra administration: "C'est la puissance seule du Journal des Débats qui fait accepter cet ouvrage par l'administration de l'Opéra" ("It is the power of the Journal des Débats alone that has had this work accepted by the Opéra administration").[38]

The reviews of Esmeralda were almost entirely governed by the relationship of the various newspapers and journals to the Journal des Débats. As one critic was driven to expostulate: "[O]n ne va pas à

---

[36] Puget also wrote some light-weight opéra-comiques.

[37] Hans Werner (pseud. Blaze de Bury), "De la musique des femmes", RDM, 8, 4th series (1836), 625.

[38] CG II, 1836, 285.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

l'Opéra pour y compter les amis et les ennemis du Journal des Débats. . . ." ("[O]ne doesn't go to the opera to count the friends and enemies of the Journal des Débats . . ."). [39] Jules Janin wrote a series of sycophantic review articles for the Journal des Débats that were full of unreserved and eulogistic praise. [40] This was of course to be expected, though a more objective critical response to the work would have been more astute. To look at a few of the newspapers that attacked Esmeralda, an article in La Mode (a Royalist journal) maliciously suggests that Louis Bertin (aîné) had bribed the director of the Opéra in order to have his daughter's opera performed. [41] Frédéric Soulié of La Presse wrote twice on the opera, once before its première and once after. The first article was very satirical, mocking Victor Hugo for coming to the assistance of a poor woman who had only the Journal des Débats to help her which had "ouvert les portes, forcé les comités de lecture, marqué la mesure aux chanteurs et à l'orchestre. . . ." ("opened doors, pressured the reading committees, marked the beat to the singers and orchestra . . ."). [42] In his second article Soulié is obviously at a loss over how to attack the work. He finally takes as his point of departure the question of "sacrilege", claiming that the opera is sacrilegious. Soulié's comments on this question give no evidence of his having

---

[39] It is significant that this critic was a woman, Delphine Gay, who wrote for La Presse under the name of Vicomte Charles de Launay. See her article "Courrier de Paris", 24 Nov. 1836, pp. 1-2. See footnote 27, p. 27.

[40] Janin's articles were 17 Nov. (8 1/2 col.), 21 Nov. (5 col.), and 19 Dec. (2 1/2 cols.).

[41] "Despotisme du Journal des Débats", La Mode, No. 8 (1836), pp. 215-216. Article is unsigned.

[42] Frédéric Soulié, "Théâtres. Opéra [Esmeralda]", La Presse, 14 Nov. 1836, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

actually attended the opera. His review, used purely as a means of attacking the Bertins, attacks Louisa Bertin:

> Pour la gloire d'un duo vous avez insulté à l'église; pour l'honneur d'un récitatif vous avez sali le prêtre. . . . [L]es vers de M. Hugo pouvaient alarmer la réligion, mais on les a fait chanter en choeur parce qu'ils étaient utiles à la dynastie des Bertin. Il résulte de tout ceci que . . . les Débats sont plus fort que Dieu.
>
> (For the glory of a duo you have insulted the church; for the honour of a recitative you have dirtied the priest. . . . [T]he verses of M. Hugo could alarm religion, but they have been made to be sung in chorus because they were useful to the Bertin dynasty. The result of all this is that . . . the Débats is stronger than God.)[43]

The work was a resounding failure; the second performance even had to be stopped because of cries of "A bas les Bertin! à bas le Journal des Débats!" ("Down with the Bertins! Down with the Journal des Débats!")[44] Berlioz said in a letter that Esmeralda was beaten by a systematic opposition, in which politics played a large part.[45] Berlioz wrote two articles on the opera for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, while Janin covered the work for the Journal des Débats.[46] Berlioz's first article, written before the première, is unsigned (see Appendix B) and merely argues for an objective reception of the work. He accurately forsaw the type of response the work would produce. After the première it was suggested by many people that Berlioz, who had to some extent supervised the final composition of the opera and

---

[43] Soulié, "Théâtres. Opéra [La Esmeralda]", La Presse, 21 Nov. 1836, pp. 1-2.

[44] CG II, 1836, 319.

[45] CG II, 1836, 318.

[46] The first article was 28 Aug. 1836, p. 305, and the second 20 Nov. 1836, pp. 409-411.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

all the rehearsals, had himself composed the better parts of the score, namely the Air of Quasimodo in the fourth act. Berlioz's second article on Esmeralda was thus very difficult. Naturally he wanted to write a good review and seemed sincerely to appreciate the work. He wrote to a fellow critic, Théophile de Ferrières, "Il y a vraiment dans cette partition des choses bien remarquables, et les gens impartiaux seront fort surpris" ("There are really some remarkable things in this score, and people who are impartial will be very surprised").[47] On the other hand he did not want to write the type of sycophantic eulogy written by Janin, but wanted to be seen as distinct from the Bertin family. His article, which is one of the few to look closely at the opera as a musical composition rather than a political manoeuvre, achieves an impression of objectivity. Berlioz remarks on several faults in the work, which he put down largely to the author's inexperience. He also praises many qualities and individual sections, and the overall view is one of tempered praise. In a footnote Berlioz firmly denies the rumours that he helped in any way with the composition of the Air of Quasimodo.[48] The article would have pleased the Bertins without making Berlioz appear a pawn of the Bertin family.

It is clear that for the Parisian music critic the interest of a work was often quite extrinsic to the work itself. In 1852 Berlioz's opera Benvenuto Cellini suffered an ignominious failure at Covent Garden because a caball organized by a group of Italian Opera

---

[47] CG II, 1836, 306.

[48] In a letter to his sister (CG II, 1836, 319) Berlioz reaffirms that this air really was by Louisa Bertin, saying, "ma collaboration s'est bornée à indiquer à l'auteur une péroraison plus digne de l'exorde" ("my collaboration was limited to indicating to the author an end more worthy of the beginning").

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

supporters disrupted the performance with whistling and shouting. Berlioz wrote to Armand Bertin, explaining what had happened and asking for his aid:

> Je crois donc que le mieux, si vous voulez dire quelque chose dans le Journal des Débats, serait d'annoncer seulement que la première représentation a eu lieu samedi dernier, sous ma direction, en présence de la Reine, qui est restée jusqu'à la dernière note du dernier choeur; que plusieurs morceaux ont été redemandés et que l'exécution et la mise en scène ont été fort remarquables. Obligez-moi de mettre ces quelques lignes.
>
> (I think, then, that the best, if you want to say something in the Journal des Débats, would be to announce simply that the first performance was last Saturday, under my direction, in the presence of the Queen, who stayed until the last note of the last chorus; that several pieces were asked for again and that the execution and the mise-en-scène were quite remarkable. Do me a favour by putting in these few lines.)[49]

Berlioz is in fact outlining a review in which, though all the information contained would be correct, the overwhelming fact of chaotic failure is omitted. Berlioz's letter to Gemmy Brandus, editor of the Revue et Gazette Musicale, is almost identical.[50] The ploy of deception by omission was widely used, often in instances where the critic wished to disguise his true feelings.[51] Other ploys were also employed to the same end. Balzac, in Monographie de la presse parisienne, comments on the literary critic who, out of consideration for a journal or a powerful friend, has to review a book he does not

---

[49] CG IV, 1852, 330-331.

[50] CG IV, 1852, 331-333. Gemmy Brandus became the editor of the RGM in 1846.

[51] In a letter to Janin on the failure of Benvenuto Cellini in Paris, Berlioz wrote, "L'orchestre a massacré l'ouverture qu'il n'avait pas répétée, mais, il ne faut pas le dire" ("The orchestra massacred the overture which they had not rehearsed, but you must not say so") (CG II, 1839, 518).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

like and writes an article on, rather than about, the book.[52] This could perhaps involve a simple retelling of the plot--a tactic many music critics employed in their reviews of opera and opéra-comique. Berlioz's use of the technique will be discussed in the following chapter.

In his book De l'Opéra en France Castil-Blaze describes a method for reviewing mediocre works. He introduces his method by talking of "those occasions" when the critic is obliged to praise a mediocre work. It is obviously a fairly mundane occurrence and Castil-Blaze remarks that it would be indiscreet to want to know who it is that engages the critic to perform the task. As Castil-Blaze remarks on his own method:

> Il faudrait au moins s'en acquitter avec adresse, en passant légèrement sur les endroits faibles, garder un silence absolu lorsqu'il s'agit des défauts et signaler avec éclat les beautés, les traits remarquables, les passages que l'on peut, sans crainte, montrer en première ligne.
>
> (One must at least acquit oneself with address, in passing lightly over the weak spots, keeping absolutely silent when it is a matter of faults, and pointing out the beauties, the remarkable characteristics and the passages that one could without fear show to be of first quality.)[53]

The literary music critic, observes Castil-Blaze, is incapable of writing one of these subtle reviews because, not having any musical knowledge, he is unable to select which sections to praise.

Berlioz frequently had to review works that he didn't like,[54] and

---

[52] Balzac, Monographie, p. 128.

[53] De l'Opéra en France (Paris: Janet et Cotelle, 1820), II, 198.

[54] For instance, in a letter to a Russian friend in 1852, Berlioz said, "[V]ous ne pouvez savoir comment ces affaires de feuilletons s'arrangent et de combien de niaiseries nous sommes forcés de parler

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

when doing so he seems to have employed tactics similar to those of Castil-Blaze, but differed only in that unlike Castil-Blaze he usually included a few mild remarks on the major faults of a work. It is often difficult to discern what Berlioz's feelings were about some works. Luckily, however, there are several instances where he states in his correspondence that he does not like a work he is reviewing, and a study of the reviews of works to which he refers in the correspondence helps gauge the sincerity of some of his other reviews. It should be stressed here that there is never any question of not knowing when Berlioz really likes a work. In such reviews his appreciation could even be termed glaringly obvious. The reviews under consideration here are those of the middle ground, and the task is one of distinguishing reviews of works that Berlioz likes, but with reservations, from those reviews of disguised dislike.

One of the works that Berlioz disliked, but had to judge otherwise in his reviews, was the opera Stradella by Niedermeyer.[55]

---

[54](continued)
avant de pouvoir étudier les choses importantes" ("[Y]ou cannot imagine how these feuilleton affairs work themselves out and how many stupidities we are forced to speak of before being able to study the important things") (CG IV, 103).

[55] I have given only one example here, though numerous others could be given. To mention a few of them, Berlioz disliked most of Gounod's operas, but supported them. As he said in a letter to his son Louis (20 Feb. 1862): "Gounod écrit des bêtises...et espère avoir du succès: pourquoi pas! Je devrai hélas l'entendre et en écrire du bien!!!" ("Gounod writes stupidities...and hopes to be successful: why not! Unfortunately I must listen to them and write something good about them!!!") This letter was kindly shown to me by Thérèse Husson. For further remarks on Gounod see Berlioz's Corr. inéd., p. 286. Of an opera performed in 1857 by a M. Billeta, Berlioz commented in a letter to his friend Auguste Morel, "Ne croyez pas un mot des quelques éloges que contient sur cette musique mon feuilleton de ce matin, et croyez, au contraire, que je me suis tenu à quatre pour en faire aussi tranquillement la critique" ("Do not believe a word of the eulogies that my feuilleton of this morning has on the music, and believe, on the contrary, that I have had to control myself strongly to write criticism as tranquilly as I do") (Corr.
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In a letter to his sister Nanci of 1837 Berlioz talks bitterly of the objectionable concessions he had to make in his reviews for the Journal des Débats of opera and opéra-comique:

> [C]'est une position bien difficile à conserver sans de vilaines concessions. Ainsi dans quelques jours je vais avoir à dire passablement des bêtises indulgentes pour une énorme niaiserie musicale appelée Stradella, dont j'ai vu la répétition hier soir à l'Opéra. . . . Mais je te préviens de ne rien croire de ce que je dirai de la musique car depuis 15 ans que j'en entends, je n'ai encore rien rencontré d'aussi tranquillement plat.
>
> ([I]t is a very difficult position to keep without terrible concessions. Thus in a few days I am going to have to say indulgent stupidities in a tolerable manner for an enormous musical foolishness called Stradella, whose dress rehearsal I saw last night at the Opéra. . . . But I warn you not to believe anything of what I am going to say about the music, for in fifteen years I have encountered nothing so tranquilly insipid.)[56]

He reviewed the work twice, once for the Journal des Débats and a second time in an unsigned article for the Revue et Gazette Musicale. Over half the Revue et Gazette Musicale article and three-quarters of the Journal des Débats article consists of a retelling of the libretto; both detail qualities and sections appreciated by Berlioz alongside sections that he liked less. He makes numerous double-edged, if not blatantly ironical, remarks:

> M. Niedermeyer dans cet ouvrage a fait preuve de beaucoup de talent; mais ce talent, à en juger d'après une première impression, se fût exercé probablement avec plus d'avantages sur un sujet moins vaste et plus en harmonie avec sa nature tranquille et ses douces habitudes.
>
> (In this work M. Niedermeyer has given us proof of a lot of talent, but which, to judge it on a first impression,

---

[55](continued)
inéd, p. 249).

[56] CG II, 333.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> would have probably been exercised to more advantage on a subject that was less vast and more in harmony with his tranquil nature and his quiet habits.)[57]

He further remarks,

> Il s'est borné à exprimer ce qu'il sentait, sans ambitionner dans l'art de nouvelles conquêtes, ni chercher un mieux qu'on dit ennemi du bien.
>
> (He limited himself to expressing what he felt, without having any ambitions in the art of new conquests, nor searching a better that is called the enemy of the good.)[58]

Though the tone of the articles here is flat and unenthusiastic, the overall impression is certainly not one of disapprobation. Berlioz has successfully masked his dislike of the work.[59]

Other critics did not seem to feel the same necessity as Berlioz to make concessions to Niedermeyer. For instance, Blaze de Bury, writing in the Revue des Deux Mondes, talked of Niedermeyer's "timidité désespérante",[60] and the critic for the Revue de Paris remarked that "la musique . . . manque fréquemment de force, toujours de caractère; mais souvent elle a du charme, de la vivacité. . . ." ("the music . . . frequently lacks force, always character; but it is sometimes

---

[57] RGM, 5 March 1837, p. 80.

[58] JD, 5 March 1837, p. 2.

[59] Some time later in a letter (25 Nov. 1856) Berlioz expresses concern at his fellow critic Adolphe Samuel whom he felt was taking criticism too seriously: "Je ne vois pas sans inquiétude tous les chagrins que vous vous préparez par le sérieux de votre critique. Voyez tout ce qui est résulté pour moi de mes rares boutades de franchise. . . ." ("I can only view with some disquiet all the pain that you are preparing for yourself by the seriousness of your criticism. Just look at what has resulted from my rare fits of frankness . . .") (quoted in Condé, Hector Berlioz, p. 34).

[60] "H. W" (pseud. Blaze de Bury), "Revue Musicale", RDM, 9 (March 1837), p. 767.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

charming and vivacious . . . ").[61] In the letter on Stradella to his sister Berlioz stressed that apart from putting him in an awkward position with the journal there were a thousand reasons for not slating the work of someone who stood in the same position regarding the Opéra as he did himself. But in his Mémoires he comments that "chaque mot mensonger, écrit en faveur d'un ami sans talent, me cause des douleurs navrantes" ("every untrue word on behalf of an untalented friend causes me acute distress").[62] There appears to be no question of obliterating that distress by telling the truth and Berlioz accepts these reviews almost as unfortunate necessities. He did however believe that in some cases the truth was transparent. As he said:

> La violence que je me fais pour louer certains ouvrages, est telle, que la vérité suinte à travers mes lignes, comme, dans les efforts extraordinaires de la presse hydraulique, l'eau suinte à travers le fer de l'instrument.
>
> (It costs me such violent efforts to bring myself to praise certain works that the truth comes out between the lines, as in the action of a hydraulic press the water seeps through the pores of the metal.)[63]

This is certainly the case in his reviews of Stradella.

It is rather surprising, then, that in a later discussion of Stradella--in his "Chronique musicale" for the Chronique de Paris--Berlioz allows himself to be quite openly dismissive of the work's lack of originality. He applauds his colleagues' reception of Stradella, pointing to an amelioration in the musical morals of the

---

[61] RDM, "Bulletin", Revue de Paris, 39, NS (1837), 77.

[62] Mém., II, 19/288.

[63] Mém., II, 20/289.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

day.[64] By the time this review was written Stradella was on its way to becoming a failure. Apparently Berlioz felt obliged to support it contre-coeur at its première, but when it was generally accepted as a failure he was free to give his true opinion. It could also be suggested that Berlioz felt less obliged to the editor of the Chronique de Paris than to the editors of the Journal des Débats and Revue et Gazette Musicale, and correspondingly freer to express his true opinions.

To an extent, then, Berlioz made the decision to disguise his true feelings himself, as for instance when he could not bring himself to attack the vulnerable young composer on his première. But in other instances it must have been the constraints of the editor and journal for which he was writing. There are several cases where Berlioz refused to review a work. He did not for instance want to review the premières of either La Juive or I Puritani for the Journal des Débats, and in a letter to Humbert Ferrand dated 1835 Berlioz states, "Je n'ai pas voulu, malgré l'invitation de M. Bertin, rendre compte des Puritani, ni de cette misérable Juive; j'avais trop de mal à en dire; on aurait crié à la jalousie" ("In spite of M. Bertin's invitation, I did not want to review Les Puritani or La Juive; I had too many bad things to say about them; I would have been accused of jealousy.")[65] However, he reviewed both for Le Rénovateur, a week after their premières.[66] In both reviews he barely conceals his dislike. His

---

[64] Chronique de Paris, 19 March 1837, pp. 191-193.

[65] CG II, 1835, 229. At a later date Berlioz also refused to review the Paris première of Tannhäuser.

[66] His review of La Juive was on 1 March 1835 after its première on 23 Feb.; similarly he reviewed I Puritani 1 Feb. 1835 after its première on 25 Jan.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

review of La Juive says very little about the music, but says that the opera itself disappeared under the weight of the choreography. Many other critics, such as Castil-Blaze and Buloz, felt the same about La Juive, though someone like Gautier could not praise the work enough. Gautier felt the work put Halévy "au plus haut rang des compositeurs modernes. . . ." ("in the first rank of modern composers . . .").[67]

Berlioz's review of Bellini's I Puritani examines only the first two acts. He excuses himself saying that he was very tired after three hours and felt that to judge the third act conscientiously he would have to do so on another occasion--which needless to say he does not do. The review is very much in the mould of Castil-Blaze's method. Berlioz details little sections he likes and several pieces he doesn't like (which include the two most popular pieces). He makes numerous flippant statements such as: "A part les choristes qui se tenaient presque constamment à une distance respectueuse du temps frappé par l'orchestre, l'exécution a été magnifique" ("Apart from the

---

[67] Théophile Gautier, Histoire de l'art dramatique, I (Leipzig: Hetzel, 1858), 21.

Berlioz's opinion of Halévy did change over the years. Already in 1838 in his review of Guido et Ginevra for the RGM, 11 March 1838, he was less censorious. The review is hardly enthusiastic however; he gives no real analysis of the music--a task he leaves to another collaborator--and details sections that were appreciated by the audience rather than by himself. If Berlioz had thought the music worthy of detailed analysis, he would no doubt have done it himself rather than leave it to another critic. Berlioz's reviews of Halévy's Val d'Andorre and La Reine de Chypre are different, however. Of the Val d'Andorre (1861) Berlioz comments in a letter, "C'est vraiment bien. . . . J'ai dit ce que je pensais dans mon feuilleton" ("It really is good. . . . I said what I think in my feuilleton") (CG III, 1848, 594). And in his review of La Reine de Chypre in 1861 (JD, 26 Dec. 1861) one senses a real appreciation of the work. He comments that Halévy's music needs time and attentive study. Perhaps he had decided that his former judgements of Halévy had been rash, for he does use an example from La Juive in his Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration (Paris, Bruxelles: Henry Lemoine and Co., n. d.).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

chorus who constantly kept a respectful distance from the time beaten by the orchestra, the execution was magnificent"), and: "Bellini connaît son monde, et s'il a par fois eu le courage de rebaisser son style et de parler à son auditoire une langue plus à sa portée, il ne l'a fait sans doute que pour faire passer les belles choses" ("Bellini knows his public, and if he sometimes had the courage to lower his style and to speak a language more within the grasp of his audience, he no doubt only did it in order to get across some beautiful things").[68] Such statements even a reader unaccustomed to Berlioz's irony would have been able to appreciate.

In a letter to Schlesinger in 1835 Berlioz begs to be relieved of the review of an opera, Un Caprice de Femme by Paer, saying by way of excuse that "un article contre ne vous irait pas" ("an article counter it would not suit you").[69] In fact he eventually did review the work for Le Rénovateur, and in a manner more favourable than not. In 1837, while Berlioz was acting editor of the Revue et Gazette Musicale, Schumann sent him a large collection of piano music for review. Berlioz clearly felt unequal to this chore and not prepared to compromise himself, for he promptly asked Liszt to undertake the review, saying, "[T]u es le seul, ce me semble, qui puisses le faire d'une manière complète ("[I]t seems to me that you are the only one who could do it thoroughly").[70] The editors of the papers undoubtedly influenced the scope of the critic quite extensively. Berlioz clearly felt he could put reviews in Le Rénovateur that were not serious

---

[68] Le Rén., 1 Feb. 1835.

[69] CG II, 191. A footnote to this letter erroneously gives Berlioz's review of the opera as appearing in the Journal des Débats instead of Le Rénovateur (27 July).

[70] CG II, 348.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

enough to be put in the Revue et Gazette Musicale or Journal des Débats, and it is unfortunate that there are not more letters of transaction between Berlioz and his editors.

The general level of corruption in the press of the day was high, and Berlioz's veracity was affected, too, in a variety of ways; another way, as yet not considered, was the manner in which his role as a composer impinged on his critical objectivity.

iii. Effect of Berlioz's role as a composer

As a critic who also composed, Berlioz was possibly even more susceptible than other critics to the editor's control. His awareness of the power of the press and his desire for publicity and a good coverage for himself would have led him to see the advantages of being on good terms with editors. Berlioz frequently asked fellow critics, as well as newspaper editors, to insert small preview notices of his concerts in their criticism.[71] He reciprocated in a similar manner; for instance, when Liszt asked him to mention the Conservatoire at Geneva in one of his reviews, Berlioz devoted an entire article to it in the Revue et Gazette Musicale and a portion of another article in the Journal des Débats.[72] On another occasion, in a review that was

---

[71] When he wanted good publicity for one of his books or works, Berlioz wrote to his colleagues. For instance, apropos of the publication of his Traité d'instrumentation Berlioz wrote in his correspondence, "J'ai donc recours à tous ceux de nos confrères qui ont montré et qui montrent journellement de la bienveillance pour moi, afin de donner à cette oeuvre toute la publicité possible" ("I have therefore recourse to all my colleagues who have shown and who daily show benevolence towards me, so as to give this work all the publicity possible") (CG III, 162).

[72] RGM, 10 April 1836 (unsigned), pp. 116-117, and JD, 26 Aug. 1836, pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

supposed to be of the Concerts de la société philotechnique, Berlioz mainly discusses the merits of some poetry by his friend Ernest Legouvé that had been read as part of the concert.[73] Berlioz does mention in his Mémoires the exasperation he felt at the devious ways in which many artists sought to win a good notice:

> N'oublions pas le mal que vous font au coeur, quand on a comme moi le malheur d'être artiste et critique à la fois, l'obligation de s'occuper d'une façon quelconque de mille niaiseries lilliputiennes, et surtout les flagorneries, les lâchetés, les rampements, des gens qui ont ou auront besoin de vous.
>
> (When you have the misfortune, as I have, to be both critic and creative artist, you have to suffer an endless succession of Lilliputian trivia of one sort or another, the most nauseating of all being the cringing flattery of those who have or are going to have need of you.)[74]

This exasperation can at times be felt in the notice itself, for instance in a notice on a concert by Henri Herz (written in response to a sycophantic request from Herz) Berlioz comments,

> Je n'ai pas pu assister au concert de Henri Herz, mais j'ai su que, malgré le great excitement causé par une soirée antimusicale . . . la salle de Herz n'a pu contenir tous les auditeurs que l'affiche de son concert avait attirés. J'ai su que le nouveau concerto de piano de Herz avait obtenu un brillant succès. Tout se sait, malgré les efforts de certains artistes à dérober leurs triomphes à la connaissance du public.
>
> (I was not able to attend the Henri Herz concert, but I knew that, in spite of the great excitement caused by an antimusical evening . . . Herz's hall could not hold all the listeners that the poster had attracted. I knew that the new Herz piano concerto had obtained a brilliant success. Everything becomes known, in spite of the efforts of certain artists to hide their triumphs from the public's knowledge.)[75]

---

[73] RGM, 18 Dec. 1836, p. 446.

[74] Mém., II, 19/289.

[75] "Concerts", JD, 7 April 1861, p. 1. Herz's letter to Berlioz
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Herz would not have missed Berlioz's irony, having himself supplied the information.

Yet at times Berlioz was willing to perjure himself if a good friend demanded a favour. In a letter to the English music critic James William Davison, obviously in response to a reproach from Davison, Berlioz, apologizing for harshly reviewing a singer whom Davison supported, says, "Qu'importe d'ailleurs un mensonge de plus ou de moins? Veux-tu que je dise, à la prochaine occasion, qu'elle a du style. . . . Parole d'honneur, je le dirai" ("Anyway, what does it matter, one lie more or one lie less? Do you want me to say on the next occasion that she has style. . . . On my word of honour, I will say it").[76] Davison replied that he did not want Berlioz to lie. It was not Berlioz's criticism to which he objected, but his ironical tone, and all he asked was that Berlioz stay at home the next time the singer sang!

In a letter to A. F. Marmontel, Berlioz comments with despair about the problems involved in being a composer-critic.[77] Marmontel had recommended the work of a young composer and friend to Berlioz for review. Berlioz warns Marmontel that he cannot examine the work in depth and that he has strong prejudices against certain types of music, prejudices which might well be misguided. In short, Berlioz is worried about the possibility of not liking the music and consequently

---

[75](continued)
was written on the 17 March 1861 and was kindly shown to me by Thérèse Husson, secretary of the Berlioz Association.

[76] CG IV, 1854, 653.

[77] Letter of 28 March 1863, published in the Revue de Musicologie, No. 66-72 (1938-1939), pp. 140-141, and translated in Barzun, Berlioz and the Romantic Century, II, 262.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of upsetting his friend, though most probably some sort of compromise review could have been written.

As has already been mentioned, Berlioz was also aware of the advantages of being a composer-critic, in particular that of being able to propagate his personal ideals about music with the possible result of forming a public more receptive to his own compositions. On numerous occasions in his reviews Berlioz also wrote at length about the trials besetting the composer in Paris. At other times his personal interest as a composer in some issue led him to devote a disproportionate amount of space to it. The Gymnase Musical is a case in point. He was personally interested in the Gymnase for two reasons. It was a venue for concerts--he held two concerts there on the fourth and twenty-fifth of June 1835--and Berlioz had hopes of becoming its musical director. This interest led him to write the best part of seven articles for Le Rénovateur alone and an unsigned article in the Gazette Musicale (31 May 1835) on the opening of the Gymnase.[78] The interaction between Berlioz's dual roles as critic and composer is indeed a subject in itself, and I shall restrict myself here to studying one example where Berlioz's objectivity as a critic seems to have been affected by his position as a composer.

Duponchel became director of the Opéra in August 1835. Six months before his appointment, in a conference with Bertin, Meyerbeer, and Berlioz, Duponchel had promised that if he were elected to office

---

[78] Berlioz's chances of becoming director of the Gymnase Musical were dashed in 1836 when Thiers refused the theatre permission to perform vocal music. According to Berlioz, the only way the theatre could survive was to be granted permission to perform vocal as well as instrumental music--thus when this was refused the theatre had no choice but to close, which it did in Jan. 1836. See CG II, 278 and 281. Berlioz's major articles that deal with the Gymnase Musical are Le Rén., 17 May, 28 May, 7 June, 14 June, 29 June, 12 Oct., and 27 Oct. 1835, JD, 23 June 1835, and GM, 31 May 1835.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he would commission an opera from Berlioz. Berlioz did not believe Duponchel to be any more musical than Véron and said so in a letter to Humbert Ferrand: "Véron n'est plus à l'Opéra. Le nouveau directeur, Duponchel, n'est guère plus musical que lui. . . ." ("Véron is no longer at the Opéra. The new director, Duponchel, is scarcely more musical than he . . ."). [79] Another letter to his sister shows that Berlioz was also wary about Duponchel keeping his word: "[J]e sais si bien ce que c'est que ces animaux de directeurs, que je donnerais pour cent écus la parole de Duponchel" ("I know so well what these animals of directors are like that I would give [the significant sum of] a hundred écus for Duponchel's word"). [80] Yet his first review on Duponchel's coming to office is full of praise and suggests that "l'art musical va reprendre le rang d'où il n'aurait jamais dû descendre à l'Opéra" ("musical art is going to regain the rank at the Opéra from which it should never have descended"), [81] and an article for the Journal des Débats written some months later comments for some paragraphs on Duponchel's first administrative moves being the happy augur of a reaction in favour of music. [82]

Favourable comments about Duponchel in Berlioz's criticism are made all the more striking by the converse reactions of his fellow critics in, for instance, Le National (Louis Desnoyers), Revue des Deux Mondes (Blaze de Bury), La Presse, and Revue de Paris. The general feeling expressed by most critics towards Duponchel and the Opéra during this period was one of censure, mainly for the large

---

[79] CG II, 248.

[80] CG II, 246.

[81] Le Rén., 31 Aug. 1835, p. 2.

[82] JD, 15 Nov. 1835, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

number of nights with no performances (relâches), for the predominance of ballets, and for the trivial nature of many of the operas performed. As Blaze de Bury (signing Hans Werner) stated in the Revue des Deux Mondes:

> Or, à moins que Stradella ne révèle subitement un homme de génie dans M. Niedermeyer, que M. Halevy ne soit tout à coup inspiré du ciel, et que M. Auber ne retrouve sa verve du Philtre et de la Muette, toutes choses au moins fort révocables, nous pouvons prendre patience, et faire nos provisions pour les temps de disette musicale qui vont s'ouvrir.
>
> (Now, unless Stradella suddenly reveals a man of genius in M. Niedermeyer, unless M. Halévy is suddenly inspired by heaven, or M. Auber rediscovers the verve of Le Philtre or La Muette, all things which are at least revocable, we must be patient, and build up our supplies for these times of musical paucity that are about to begin.)[83]

Berlioz's failure to stress any of these shortcomings is perhaps a measure of his desire to have a work performed at the Opéra. Nor, presumably, did he want to criticize a friend of Meyerbeer since Meyerbeer had been instrumental in Duponchel's appointment to the Opéra. In a letter to his sister in 1836 Berlioz talks quite openly of the need to be conciliatory towards Duponchel. Bemoaning the obligation to provide free tickets to all the contemporary journals, Berlioz concludes,

> Je ne fais pas grand cas d'ordinaire de ces ignobles petites vengeances, mais les directeurs de théâtres tremblent devant la moindre ligne imprimée, et ma position avec Duponchel, qui n'est pas des plus hardis à cet égard, m'a fait baisser la tête et payer l'impôt.
>
> (I normally do not take much notice of these ignoble little revenges, but the theatre directors tremble before the least printed line, and my position with Duponchel, which is not one of the strongest in this

---

[83] "Revue Musicale", RDM, 9, 4th Series (Jan. 1837), 117.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

regard, has made me lower my head and pay the tax.)[84]

Obviously the journalists could not be trusted to give equitable reviews if denied their free tickets.

Despite Berlioz's direct support of Duponchel, he did make many indirect criticisms of the Opéra in his reviews of the period 1836 to 1837, of precisely the same issues criticized by his fellow critics.[85] This instance of Berlioz's role as a composer impinging upon his critical role is thus not very serious--indeed Berlioz's praises for what Duponchel was going to achieve at the Opéra could be interpreted as merely wishful thinking.[86]

---

[84] CG II, 1836, 317.

[85] This is demonstrated in the following two quotations from an article for the Journal des Débats:

"L'exécution vocale et instrumentale a fait sans doute des progrès à l'Opéra . . . mais il faut avouer qu'il reste beaucoup à faire sous plusieurs rapports. . . ." ("Vocal and instrumental execution has no doubt made some progress at the Opéra . . . but one must admit that there still remains a lot to be done in various regards . . .") (JD, 31 Jan. 1837, p. 1).

"Nous n'ignorons pas l'importance des travaux nécessités par des partitions comme les deux dernières qui ont paru sur notre grande scène lyrique; pourtant . . . il n'eût pas été tout-à-fait impossible de remonter au moins un de ces anciens chefs-d'oeuvre, déjà connus d'une partie des chanteurs . . . ." ("We do not deny the importance of the work necessitated by scores such as the last two that have appeared on our great lyric stage; however . . . it would not have been absolutely impossible to put on again at least one of the old masterpieces, already known by a large number of the singers . . .") (JD, 31 Jan. 1837, p. 1).

[86] Berlioz was not always concerned with keeping on good terms with the director of the Opéra. Indeed in 1846 he was on very bad terms with the then Opéra director, Pillet, and aware that his animosity would count against the possibility of a performance of the Damnation de Faust: "J'aurai quelques difficultés pour l'exécution, très probablement, à cause de la guerre sans merci ni trève que j'ai déclarée dans mes feuilletons à l'Opéra et surtout à la direction de ce grand imbécile de théâtre" ("I will have some difficulties in getting it performed, very probably, because of the war, with neither mercy nor truce, that I have declared in my feuilletons on the Opéra and especially on the management of this great idiot of a theatre") (CG III, 349).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Adolphe Boschot in Un Romantique sous Louis-Philippe raises some doubts about Berlioz's integrity in his reviews of Duponchel and Meyerbeer.[87] Boschot's patronizing tone and lack of documentation are irritating, and it is easy to understand how he provoked the ire of Jacques Barzun. Nevertheless some of the points made by Boschot are valid and should not be too quickly passed over. For instance Boschot questions the integrity of Berlioz's 1834 reviews of the Théâtre Ventadour.[88] He feels these reviews mirror Berlioz's personal relationship to the theatre, that Berlioz's review for Le Rénovateur (13 June) of the theatre's opening is not favourable because the theatre had rejected a project proposed by Berlioz for a performance featuring his wife Harriet Smithson.[89] Harriet was engaged soon after this article, and Berlioz's next article on the Théâtre overflows with enthusiasm for the exciting possibilities of this new venue. I would tend to agree with Boschot. Although Berlioz may well have genuinely found the theatre opening poor, but later felt that the prospects were better, his concern over Harriet's involvement with the theatre could have also affected his criticism.[90]

Berlioz always referred to himself as an "honest critic", which

---

87 Un Romantique sous Louis-Philippe (Paris: Plon, 1908). See Chapter V, "Vers L'Opéra".

88 Boschot said, "Dans Le Rénovateur, le compte rendu de la soirée d'ouverture, ce fut un coup de caveçon. Peu de jours après, Harriet était engagée" ("In Le Rénovateur, the review of the opening evening was a serious set-down. A few days later, Harriet was engaged") (Une Vie romantique (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1919), p. 148).

89 See CG II, 173. Berlioz here discusses the project with the conductor Girard.

90 Berlioz ended up losing money over the Théâtre Ventadour, since the director was declared bankrupt and unable to pay his debts. Berlioz brought a law suit against him, but to no avail because the director of the Théâtre went into hiding. See CG II, 276.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

indeed he was by the standards of the day.[91] As he said in his Mémoires, in his reviews of works he disliked, the truth is almost always discernible, certainly to someone familiar with his style and beliefs, though perhaps not to the occasional reader. Those reviews where it is hard to tell exactly what Berlioz is thinking are almost without exception reviews of fairly insignificant works.

It is impossible for a composer-critic not to be influenced by his personal needs and interests. Berlioz even acquits himself well in this regard, since so often his digressions on the problems of the composer are attempts to achieve better conditions for all composers. But just as it is wrong to assume that Berlioz's "shady" reviews are symptomatic of a dishonest approach to criticism, so the attempt to whitewash Berlioz's involvement in any of the malpractices of the day needs to be corrected.

---

[91] A typical statement for instance is, "[M]a position de critique honnête m'a fait à Paris une foule d'ennemis" ("[M]y position as honest critic has made me a host of enemies in Paris") (CG IV, 1852, 121).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PART TWO

BERLIOZ'S CRITICISM OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter IV

Vocal Music: Opéra-Comique

During his early years as a critic Berlioz reviewed a large number of opéras-comiques--the majority of which he disliked--for Le Rénovateur (1834 and 1835), the Journal des Débats (1835 to 1837), and the Revue et Gazette Musicale (1836 and 1837).

He wrote most of the reviews in the years 1834 and 1835 and virtually none in 1836. In 1836 Jules Janin covered the opéra-comique for the Journal des Débats and J. J. J. Diaz, alias Henri Blanchard, wrote the majority of reviews for the Revue et Gazette Musicale. Interestingly, that was also the year that Berlioz's three unsigned articles on the opéra-comique appeared. These articles, while humorous, are much more acerbic than his signed Revue et Gazette Musicale articles on the genre. The following year, 1837, Berlioz began to review opéras-comiques again, and would often review the same work for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, Journal des Débats, and Chronique de Paris. His reviews in 1837, particularly his articles for the Journal des Débats, are slightly more overt in their criticism than in the earlier years.

A study of these opéra-comique reviews forms an interesting critical exercise because of the many different ways Berlioz avoids expressing his true feelings. His typical review of an opéra-comique is devious and ironical. Yet, with the aid of remarks made in his correspondence and in several straightforward articles, a more or less clear picture of his "true" impressions can be drawn from the web of rhetorical devices.

The opéra-comique of this period, the 1830s, comprised the works of Adam, Auber, Paer, Hérold, and others. It was to these works

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

specifically that Berlioz objected, and not to the genre of opéra-comique itself. Indeed he talked with melancholy nostalgia of the opéra-comique of Monsigny, Méhul, and in particular Grétry. Though not of the same stature as Gluck or Beethoven, these composers nevertheless represented for Berlioz a type of perfection within the limitations of their medium. His respect for them was perhaps further enhanced by the comparison with the opéra-comique of the 1830s. As he commented in an article for the Revue et Gazette Musicale of 1837:

> [O]n peut, ce me semble, s'affliger de voir le complet abandon où languissent de véritables chefs-d'oeuvre, pendant qu'on accorde toute attention et tout hommage à ces myriades de niaises platitudes que nous voyons éclore chaque jour, pour gaspiller les richesses de l'art, bourdonner un instant et mourir.
>
> ([O]ne could, it seems to me, grieve to see the complete abandonment in which real masterpieces languish, while great attention and homage are paid to these myriads of inane platitudes that come to light each day, squander the riches of art, buzz for an instant and then die.)[1]

Nor was Berlioz's antipathy unusual. The average opéra-comique of the 1830s was seen by numerous people as a distasteful element of the Parisian music scene. The following three quotations, from Deschamps, Berlioz, and Gautier respectively, show a striking similarity of opinion on the subject:

> L'Opéra-Comique [est un] genre éminemment national, mais essentiellement bâtard . . . [où] le mélange du dialogue parlé et de la musique n'en est pas moins mortel pour l'art.
>
> (The opéra-comique, [is an] eminently national, but essentially bastard genre . . . [where] the mixture of spoken dialogue and music is no less fatal for art.)[2]

---

[1] RGM, 5 Feb. 1837, pp. 45-46.

[2] Emile Deschamps, "Lettres sur la musique françaises (1835)", in Oeuvres complètes, Prose IV (Paris: A. Lemerre, 1873), p. 24.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> [L'opéra-comique est] un genre bâtard qui fatigue les amateurs de vaudevilles par son exubérance musicale autant qu'elle irrite les partisans de la musique par les défauts opposés.
>
> ([The opéra-comique is] a bastard genre that tires the lovers of vaudeville by its musical exuberance as much as it irritates music lovers for its opposite faults.)[3]
>
> Nous n'avons, pour notre part, aucune tendresse à l'endroit de l'opéra-comique, genre bâtard et mesquin, mélange de deux moyens d'expressions incompatibles, où les acteurs jouent mal sous prétexte qu'ils sont chanteurs, et chantent faux sous prétexte qu'ils sont comédiens.
>
> (For our part, we do not have any tenderness where the opéra-comique is concerned, a bastard and paltry genre, a mixture of two incompatible means of expression, where actors act badly under the pretext that they are singers, and sing out of tune under the pretext that they are actors.)[4]

The Parisian opéra-comique was well known outside France and scorned by many outsiders. Mendelssohn, for example, self-righteously wrote to his father in 1831,

> None of the new libretti here would, in my opinion, be attended with any success if brought out for the first time on a German stage. One of the distinctive characteristics of all of them is precisely of a nature that I should resolutely oppose, although the taste of the present day may demand it, and I truly admit that it may, in general, be more prudent to go with the current than to struggle against it. I allude to that of immorality.[5]

And in a letter to Karl Klingemann he wrote,

---

[3] Berlioz, RGM, 18 Sept. 1836, p. 323.

[4] Théophile Gautier, Histoire de l'art dramatique en France, II, p. 142. Even Jules Janin spoke of the opéra-comique as "cette drogue si précieuse et si ridicule, qu'on appelle un opéra-comique" ("that so precious and ridiculous drug one calls an opéra-comique") (JD, 8 Aug. 1836).

[5] Felix Mendelssohn, Letters, ed. and trans. G. Selden-Goth (1945; rpt. New York: Vienna House, 1973), p. 180.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> These ways and doings seem to me to smack of the devil; if a man does not pull himself together, he may as well hand over his soul (I mean his musical soul!) to that gentleman in comfort and pleasure. The superficialities are so tempting, people enjoy honours and money and decorations and cheers and orchestras, and lack absolutely nothing--if only they were not such execrably bad musicians![6]

In England the opéra-comique was frequently described as relatively harmless in comparison with the gross depravity of the Opéra, about which the English music critic George Hogarth said that "the modern French public appear now to have a morbid appetite for horrid and revolting theatrical exhibitions".[7] During her visit to Paris in 1835 Frances Trollope recounted dutifully in her diary that the vaudeville and the opéra-comique were not nearly as morally depraved as she had been led to believe:

> It is certain, indeed, that, spite of all we say, and say in some respects so justly, respecting the corrupted taste of France at the present era, there never was a time when her stage could boast a greater affluence of delightful little pieces than at present. . . . Another proof that it is not necessary to be vicious in order to be in vogue at Paris, and that purity is no impediment to success, is the popularity of Madame Tastu's poetry.[8]

Berlioz's reviews of the opéra-comique are a kaleidoscope of shifting tones and shades of meaning. He employs differing tactics in his approach to a work. Patterns emerge in these tactics however, which can be described as "quasi-methods", though there is no reason to suppose that Berlioz was conscious of them.

---

[6] Mendelssohn, Letters, p. 182.

[7] George Hogarth, Memoirs of the Opera (London: 1851; rpt. New York: Da Capo, 1972), II, 268-269.

[8] Paris and the Parisians in 1835, I, 180-181.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Two major patterns emerge in Berlioz's reviews of the opéra-comiques that he disliked, and they shall be discussed separately. There were some opéra-comiques that he did like--small respite from the oppressive majority--and these shall be discussed too. It is immediately evident when Berlioz liked a work, and there is no need to decipher verbal games.

The first pattern emerging in Berlioz's reviews of the opéra-comiques that he disliked is that of devoting almost the entire review to recounting the libretto, with little or no commentary on the music. This pattern occurs chiefly in the 1834 articles for Le Rénovateur. Berlioz's retelling of the libretto is witty and entertaining and constantly mocks the nonsensical nature of the narrative. His ensuing comments on the music consist usually of a few standardized and ambiguous phrases, for instance: "[C]ette partition est un trésor pour le public auquel elle a été destinée" ("[T]his score is a treasure for the public for whom it was destined"),[9] and again: "La musique dont M. Adam a brodé ce vaudeville ne manque ni de grace ni de vivacité. Elle sera bientôt sur tous les pianos" ("The music with which M. Adam has embroidered this vaudeville lacks neither grace nor vivacity. It will soon be on pianos everywhere.")[10] These platitudes carry a double meaning; their implication is obviously scorn for the music, which is not worthy of separate scrutiny.[11]

In various places Berlioz expressed his dislike of recounting the

---

[9] Review of Lestocq by Auber, Le Rén., 1 June 1834, p. 1.

[10] Review of La Marquise by Adam, Le Rén., 5 March 1835, p. 1.

[11] For other reviews that follow this pattern in Le Rénovateur of 1834, see the reviews of Adam's Une Bonne Fortune (2 Feb.), Auber's Lestocq (1 June), Labarre's L'Aspirant de marine (15 June), Paer's Un Caprice de femme (27 July), Feltre's Le Fils du prince (31 Aug.), Adam's Le Chalet (28 Sept.), and Rifault's Sentinelle perdue (5 Dec.).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

libretti of opéra-comiques and operas. This dislike became more openly expressed in his writings of 1835, and his review of La Juive for Le Rénovateur demonstrates this with some force.[12] The review opens with a condemnatory remark: "Encore un rude cauchemar! Il faut que je vous raconte le livret de M. Scribe que vous pourriez acheter pour la modique somme de 20 sous" ("Another rude nightmare! I must recount you M. Scribe's libretto which you could buy for the modest sum of 20 sous.")[13] Interestingly, Jules Janin's review of La Juive for the Journal des Débats starts in much the same way: "Malheureusement avant de parler de la musique de tout opéra de ce mode, il faut parler du poème, et malheureusement encore le poème est de toute nécessité un poème de M. Scribe" ("Unfortunately, before discussing the music of operas of this nature, it is necessary to speak of the libretto, and, again unfortunately, the libretto has to be a libretto of M. Scribe").[14] Franz Stoepel in his review of La Juive in the Gazette Musicale starts: "Commençons par le poëme; l'usage le veut ainsi en France" ("Let us start with the libretto, as it is the custom in France").[15] "P" writes for Le Moniteur Universel, "L'examen d'un opéra soulève toujours pour nous une première question. Le poëme est-il bon? Ce qui ne veut pas dire, surtout en parlant des vers de M. Scribe: est-il bien écrit?" ("The examination of an opera

---

[12] Le Rén., 1 March 1835.

[13] Le Rén., 1 March 1835, p. 1.

[14] Jules Janin (signed "J. J."), "Première représentation de la Juive, opéra en cinq actes, paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. Halévy, décorations de MM. Filastre, Cambon, Séchan, Diéterle, Despléchin et Feuchères", JD, 25 Feb. 1835, p. 1. I am translating both "poème" and "livret" as libretto, since they refer to the same thing here.

[15] "Académie Royale de Musique. La Juive", GM, 1 March 1835, p. 72. The article is unsigned but listed as by Franz Stoepel in the index.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

always raises for us an initial question. Is the libretto any good? This does not mean, especially when talking of M. Scribe, is it well written?")[16] These comments support the suggestion that the recounting of the libretto was a convention considered necessary at the time and perhaps demanded of the critic by journal editors. Berlioz certainly implies in his reviews that he is under constant pressure to recount the libretto. His review of La Juive in Le Rénovateur continues:

> Aussi beaucoup de mes confrères ne mettent-ils guère plus de soin à l'analyse des paroles d'un opéra qu'ils n'en mettraient à celles d'un discours académique, et les lecteurs, à l'aspect de tout ce griffonage, s'empressent-ils de sauter à la dernière colonne pour voir si, comme à l'ordinaire, le musicien a fait preuve de beaucoup de talent. Car c'est une chose tout-à-fait digne de remarque que l'inégalité avec laquelle la critique traite le poète et le musicien. Si la pièce est tombée, les paroles seules en sont cause; si elle a obtenu du succès, c'est au musicien qu'il faut en faire honneur. . . . Mais tout cela n'a point trait à la Juive, je vous prie de le croire; ma tirade n'a été motivée que par la mauvaise humeur que me cause toujours l'obligation d'écrire une espèce de scenario ou si vous aimez mieux un mauvais extrait de la pièce nouvelle, qu'on ne lira point. Aussi espérai-je m'en tirer cette fois à peu de frais. Je serai bref.
>
> (Thus many of my colleagues take little more trouble in analyzing the words of an opera than they would if it were a discourse of the Academy; and the readers, on seeing all this scribble, hasten to jump to the last column to see if, as usual, the musician has shown great talent. For the inequality with which the critic treats the poet and the musician is thoroughly worth noting. If the play is a flop, then the words are to blame; if successful, it is the musician who is to be praised . . . . But all this has nothing to do with La Juive, please believe me. My tirade was motivated only by the bad mood engendered by the obligation to write some sort of scenario, or if you prefer a bad extract from the new piece, that no-one will read. So, on this occasion I

---

[16] "Spectacles. Académie Royale de Musique. La Juive, opéra en cinq actes, paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. Halévy", Le Moniteur Universel, 28 Feb. 1835, p. 458.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

hope to honour it at little cost. I shall be brief.)[17]

The intention of being brief is of course not carried out and Berlioz launches once again into a detailed narration of the libretto.

In maligning reviews that always ended with some fatuous reference to the great talent displayed by the composer or musician, Berlioz was giving the lie to his own reviews that followed the same pattern. Having made clear his contempt for this technique, his own use of it demonstrated his lack of respect for the works on which he used it. Obviously it was necessary for him to be diplomatic about works he disliked,[18] and his ironizing in this way was a convenient means for him to intimate his true feelings. At the same time he was able to mock his fellow journalists who worked to such a cliché. Of course, not all his fellow journalists wrote like this. In fact some of them, for instance Henri Blanchard, held views very similar to Berlioz on the subject:

> Et ne croyez pas que ce soit la partition que préoccupe ces messieurs quand il s'agit d'un ouvrage lyrique: non, non! ils dirigent sept ou huit colonnes d'indignation ou d'ironie contre l'auteur des paroles ou du poème, comme ils appellent cela, et consacreront à l'auteur de la musique un petit paragraphe en dix ou douze lignes, dans lequel ils disent tous, et d'une manière à peu près identique: Cette musique vive et légère est digne du spirituel compositeur. . . .
>
> (And do not believe that it is the score that occupies

---

[17] Le Rén., 1 March 1835, p. 1. English translation up until the ellipsis marks is based on Robert Cohen's translation given in his dissertation on Berlioz's music criticism, p. 33. I shall acknowledge all further use of Cohen's translations by the words "Cohen, trans." followed by the page number of his dissertation.

[18] As he said in a letter to his sister (1854): "Et puis mon maudit feuilleton, qui m'oblige à m'occuper de tant de plates vilenies et souvent même à en parler avec une sorte de déférence!" ("And then my damned feuilleton that obliges me to spend my time on so many insipid villanies and often even to speak of them with a sort of deference!") (CG IV, 569).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> these gentlemen when it is a lyrical work: no, no! They aim seven or eight columns of indignation or irony at the author of the words, or the poème, as they call it, and devote to the author of the music a little paragraph of ten or twelve lines, in which they all say, in a more or less identical fashion, "This lively and light music is worthy of the spirited composer. . . .)[19]

In a review in Le Rénovateur of 1834 Berlioz bemoans the tribulations of a critic and comments on the opéra-comique, Le Chalet:

> Je vous ai déjà dit que la musique du Châlet était fort jolie, que voulez-vous de plus? Faut-il énumérer les modulations de chaque morceau, vous dire comment M. Adam passe de re en mi bémol ou de sol en si? Voulez-vous la liste de ses effets d'instruments à vent, de ses chants gracieux?
>
> (I have already said that the music of Le Chalet was very pretty, what more do you want? Is it necessary to enumerate the modulations of each section, tell you how M. Adam goes from D to E flat or from G to B? Do you want a list of his woodwind instrumental effects, of his gracious songs?)[20]

Thus he publicly admits to the paucity of his remarks on the music, hinting at the same time that an analysis of such music would be ridiculous. It must have been a tedious task recounting libretti. Occasionally Berlioz expresses relief when a libretto is too well known to demand detailed retelling: "Le sujet du libretto est trop connu pour que je ne puisse, cette fois, en esquiver l'analyse" ("The subject of the libretto is so well known that this time I can disregard the analysis").[21] However, the vivacity with which he

---

[19] Henri Blanchard (signed J. J. J. Diaz), "Théâtre de l'Opéra-Comique. Les Chaperons Blancs, opéra-comique en trois actes. musique de M. Auber, libretto de M. Scribe", RGM, 17 April 1836, p. 124.

[20] Le Chalet, opéra-comique by Adam. Le Rén., 9 Oct. 1834, p. 1. Le Rénovateur writes Chalet with a circumflex.

[21] Le Rén., 29 March 1835, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

recounts many of the libretti also seems to suggest he took some enjoyment in his task. Since reviewing opéras-comiques was an unavoidable task for the music critic of Le Rénovateur, Berlioz appears to have decided to make it as enjoyable as possible by turning his review into exercises in wit. These reviews are indeed extremely funny. As the critic Paul Smith commented: "[P]lus un critique tel que Berlioz est ennuyé, moins il ennuie; plus il a de verve et de chaleur, plus il formule ses piquantes observations" ("[T]he more a critic such as Berlioz is bored, the less he bores; the more vivacious and ardent he is, the more he formulates his stinging observations").[22] Underlying the humour, nevertheless, Berlioz's conviction of the basic triviality of the music is continually present.

The principal author of the majority of these opéra-comique libretti was Scribe, who, writing the libretti for ninety-five opéras-comiques, played an important role in the opéra-comique as well as in the opera of the 1830s.[23] Though Berlioz appears to have appreciated some of Scribe's libretti, in particular Les Huguenots, some of Berlioz's comments on Scribe's opéra-comique libretti are unmistakably ironical. To give an example where the irony is most pronounced, I shall quote briefly from Berlioz's unsigned review of Auber's Actéon in the Revue et Gazette Musicale. In this review Berlioz pretends to be under the impression that Auber has written the libretto and Scribe the music:

> A la rigeur, ceci n'est point mal pour un musicien. Je sais bien que si M. Scribe eût écrit les paroles au lieu

---

22 Paul Smith (pseud. of Edouard Monnais), "Littérature musicale. A Travers Chants, par Hector Berlioz", RGM, 21 Sept. 1862, p. 308.

23 Karin Pendle, in her dissertation "Eugène Scribe and the French Opera of the Nineteenth Century", Illinois 1970, analyzes and systematizes Scribe's entire opus.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> de la musique, il ne se serait certes pas contenté d'une intrigue aussi pauvre, il n'eût pas employé d'aussi vieux moyens; il n'aurait assurément pas fait du prince Aldobrandi un personnage aussi volontairement ridicule sans être amusant. . . . Mais en somme, comme je viens de le dire, ce n'est pas mal pour un musicien.
>
> (Strictly speaking this is not bad for a musician. I well know that if M. Scribe had written the words instead of the music, he would certainly not have been happy with such a poor intrigue, nor employed such old-fashioned means; he would assuredly not have made Prince Aldobrandi so absolutely ridiculous without being amusing. . . . But, on the whole, as I have just said, it is not bad for a musician.)[24]

However, Berlioz's ironical comments on Scribe's opéra-comique libretti were just small darts to throw at someone who had attained the status of an institution, or had become, in Frances Trollope's words, "a national museum of invention".[25]

The second method emerging in these reviews is more difficult to elaborate. It could be said that many of Berlioz's reviews of opéra-comique are written in "bad faith"; that is, there are a number of reviews that give the appearance of being serious, objective articles, but which are in reality a tissue of semi-truths.

In these reviews Berlioz starts, as required, with a summary of the libretto, but he then proceeds to comment on the music. Following basically the method of Castil-Blaze outlined in Chapter III, Berlioz takes small sections of the score, elaborating on passages he likes and other passages he dislikes. This is such a common procedure that it is easy to read the article without digesting what it is that Berlioz likes. Closer examination shows that often the sections liked by Berlioz are very small compared with the sections he dislikes. To

---

[24] RGM, 31 Jan. 1836, p. 37. The article is signed "Un vieillard stupide qui n'a presque plus de dents".

[25] Frances Trollope, I, 180.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

quote an example from his review of the Cheval Bronze by Auber:

> Plusieurs autres morceaux, parmi lesquels nous signalerons un duo et l'ouverture, ont également été fort goûtés. Mais la verve du compositeur ne l'a pas aussi bien servi au dernier acte. La roulade sans mélodie y domine. . . .
>
> (Several other pieces, amongst which we point out a duo and the overture, were also very much enjoyed. But the composer's verve did not serve him as well in the last act. Here the unmelodious roulade dominates. . . .)[26]

Here, it is small passages such as a duo and overture which he likes while he dislikes the entire third act of the work. To quote another example, this time in a review of Godefroid's La Diadesté in the Revue et Gazette Musicale of 1836:

> L'ouverture est à mon avis le meilleur morceau de la pièce, je n'aime pas il est vrai le petit thème sautillant du milieu, et le reste est assez terne; mais tout y est clairement disposé et la coupe en est fort régulière.
>
> (In my opinion the overture is the best section of the piece. It is true I do not like the little skipping theme in the middle, and the rest is rather dull; but it is all clearly arranged, and the beat is extremely regular.)[27]

To quote a similar example from his review of Louisa Puget's Le Mauvais Oeil:

> Son ouverture n'est pas ce qu'il y a de mieux; la plupart des phrases qui la composent sont bien communes, il faut le dire; mais la coda a réellement de la verve, assez même pour faire pardonner à l'auteur son affreuse grosse caisse, instrument ignoble dont une jeune femme n'aurait pas dû se servir.
>
> (Her overture is not the best. It must be said that most of the phrases that comprise it are quite common; but

---

[26] Le Rén., 29 March 1835, p. 2.

[27] RGM, 11 Sept. 1836, p. 320. The article is unsigned. See Appendix B on the unsigned articles.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> the coda really has verve, enough, even, to excuse the author for her frightful bass-drum, an ignoble instrument that a young woman should never have used.)28

This is not the only way he shows his derision. In other instances the sections he purportedly likes are qualified in such a way as to demonstrate quite clearly his scorn for them. To quote, again, from his review of Auber's Cheval Bronze:

> M. Auber a été bien inspiré pendant les deux premiers actes; de tous côtés surgissent les plus droles [sic] de petites mélodies, qui feront la fortune de nos marchands de contre-danses.
>
> (M. Auber was very inspired during the first two acts; from all sides rise the most droll little melodies. They will make the fortunes of our contre-danse merchants.)[29]

Berlioz's irony and condescension are here unmistakable. His use of the word "joli" is often equally as condescending. Commenting on Auber's Domino Noir, he says,

> M. Auber a écrit sur cette pièce tant soit peu risquée et invraisemblable, mais vive et amusante, une de ses plus jolies partitions.
>
> (In this unadventurous and unlikely, but lively and amusing piece, M. Auber has written one of his prettiest scores.)[30]

While not as damning as some of the other comments, "jolie partition" is not very flattering; "joli" was not an adjective used by Berlioz to describe works he admired.[31]

---

[28] RGM, 9 Oct. 1836, p. 359.

[29] Le Rén., 29 March 1835, p. 2.

[30] RGM, 10 Dec. 1837, p. 542.

[31] Adolphe Adam was obviously unaware of Berlioz's condescension in his use of "joli", for in a letter to Berlioz in 1854 (CG, IV, 692) he thanks Berlioz for a review in which Berlioz had called his opera

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

There are two words which immediately signal an article in "bad faith". These are the verbs "broder", "to embroider", and "brillanter", "to load with florid ornament" or "to tart up". If Berlioz starts an article by the words "La musique dont M. x a brodé ce livret", one knows that, whatever the number of small compliments that follow, Berlioz does not like the work. His review of the Cheval Bronze, for instance, starts: "La musique dont M. Auber a brillanté ce livret fantastique est d'une piquante physionomie" ("The music with which M. Auber has ornamented this fantastique libretto is of a piquant character"),[32] and in his review of Louisa Puget's Le Mauvais Oeil he writes, "Mademoiselle Puget a brodé ce petit poëme" ("Mademoiselle Puget has embroidered this little libretto").[33] Berlioz could never really respect music that he saw as only a decorative adjunct, and not as a dramatic expression of a text.

As already said, Berlioz unfortunately does not often talk about his criticism in his correspondence. However, on the rare occasions when he does discuss his criticism, proof is given of these conjectural remarks about his articles in "bad faith". The most striking occasion is the series of letters on Niedermeyer's opera Stradella mentioned in Chapter III. Another instance occurs in a letter in 1842, where, reviewing a work by Auber, Berlioz says, "[J]e dirai que c'est assez agréable, sans ajouter pour les modistes" ("I

---

[31](continued)
Muletier de Tolède "une de ses plus jolies partitions" (CG IV, 649, n. 2).

[32] Le Rén., 29 March 1835, p. 1.

[33] RGM, 9 Oct. 1836, p. 359.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

will say that it is quite agreeable, without adding for dressmakers").[34] In 1839 Berlioz wrote with considerable bitterness of his critical role:

> Le métier de critique m'est odieux, il faut que je ménage un tas de platitudes qui me font mal au coeur. On me circonvient à propos de la plus mince débutante, chanteuse ou pianiste, pour le plus misérable opéra-comique qui ne vaut pas un vieux bout de cigare, pour toutes les plaies honteuses de l'art musical, de manière à me donner une idée effrayante de la puissance du Journal des Débats. . . . On va me haïr à la mort, si je dis seulement la moitié de ma pensée. Peut-être la dirai-je tout entière. Quel métier!
>
> (The career of critic is odious to me, I have to manufacture a whole heap of platitudes that make me sick at heart. They pull me in apropos the most minor debutante, singer or pianist, for the most miserable opéra-comique that is not even worth an old cigar butt, for all the shameful sores of musical art, in such a way as to give me a frightful impression of the importance of the Journal des Débats. . . . I would be hated to death if I said only half of what I thought. Perhaps I will say it all. What a career!)[35]

I have elaborated a little on two of the ways in which Berlioz avoids expressing his true feelings. There are more, for his ingenuity is boundless. To give just one more example of a different approach, I shall very briefly discuss Berlioz's criticism of Ambroise Thomas' first opéra-comique.[36]

Ambroise Thomas' La Double Echelle, performed first in August 1837, presented Berlioz with a critical dilemma. In all his writings one of the issues he most deplored was the fact that the winner of the Prix de Rome was never given the promised opportunity of having a work performed on his return to Paris. Ambroise Thomas, as a recently

---

[34] CG II, 1842, 714.

[35] CG II, 1839, 552 and 554.

[36] Ambroise Thomas (1811-1896), French composer.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

returned young Prix de Rome winner (1832), had already had a section from his "Italian" opera performed at a public concert at the Académie des Beaux-Arts.37

La Double Echelle was his first opéra-comique. Berlioz's sympathies were naturally inclined towards the young composer, and also he wished to encourage and applaud the authorities for performing the work of a "new" composer. However, the overall impression one gains from a study of his three reviews of La Double Echelle is that he did not like the work.38

His review in the Chronique de Paris is brief and outwardly favourable, but closer inspection reveals its ambiguities. We see this when he writes for instance, "La Double échelle, petite comédie fort amusante, où la musique n'a que tout juste la place qu'on ne pouvait lui refuser, . . . servira peut-être mieux les intérêts de l'avenir de M. Thomas, que ne l'eût faut un ouvrage moins gai. . . ." ("La Double Echelle, a very amusing little comedy, where the music fits only too well the position where it could not be refused, . . . will perhaps better serve the interests of M. Thomas' future than a less gay work would have done. . ."). 39 The majority of the review is taken up with a reiteration of the problems of the Prix de Rome.

The article, in the Revue et Gazette Musicale, is more comprehensive; Berlioz has obviously studied the work in close detail and he compliments Thomas on "une certaine finesse d'intentions dramatiques peu commune, et beaucoup de tact dans l'emploi des masses

---

37 This is mentioned by Berlioz in an article in the JD, 27 Aug. 1837.

38 RGM, 27 Aug. 1837, JD, 27 Aug. 1837, and Chronique de Paris, 10 Sept. 1837.

39 Chronique de Paris, 10 Sept. 1837, p. 166.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

instrumentales" ("a certain uncommon finesse in his dramatic intention, and a great deal of tact in his use of instrumental masses").[40] Berlioz finishes, however, by advising Thomas to find a more individual style.

The review, for the Journal des Débats, published the same day as the article for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, more openly expresses Berlioz's lack of respect for the work. He comments, "Cette farce, ce vaudeville, ou, si l'on veut, cet opéra-comique, a obtenu un succès de fou rire. . . ." ("This farce, this vaudeville, or if you want, this opéra-comique, has been a wild success . . .").[41] The scorn here is unmistakable. Berlioz continues by complimenting Thomas for not choosing a heavy libretto which might have crushed his light score; but though Berlioz proceeds conscientiously to list the passages he liked, he has already shown his lack of appreciation. He suggests that further experience and reflection might develop a more individual style in Thomas, rather than the present vacillation between Italian and German modes of composition.

These reviews are interesting because they show Berlioz struggling not to show his true feelings in order to promote a cause, but finally not being able to resist hitting out. Perhaps there is also an oblique criticism of Thomas for writing music to appeal to the opéra-comique public. Théophile Gautier on the other hand praises Thomas for this same reason: "[C]'est une preuve de tact et d'esprit dont il faut lui savoir gré. Les gens assez maîtres d'eux pour se faire, au besoin, plus petits qu'ils ne sont, sont rares, et, en faisant ainsi, M. Thomas a prouvé qu'il comprenait son poëme, son

---

[40] RGM, 27 Aug. 1837, p. 390.

[41] JD, 27 Aug. 1837, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

théâtre et son public" ("[I]t is a proof of spirit and tact for which one must be grateful to him. People sufficiently confident enough of themselves to become, if needs be, smaller than they are, are rare; and in doing this M. Thomas has proved that he understood his libretto, his theatre, and his public.")[42] Berlioz would not have agreed with this statement, even though he seemed to be facing the bitter realization that it was maybe the only way a new composer could succeed.

Occasionally, in order to express a little of what he really thinks, Berlioz does not put his own name to an article, as in the articles in 1836 signed "un viellard stupide . . . ".[43] In a review of Adam's Micheline in 1835, Berlioz pretends not to have been able to attend the work himself and to have taken the review from a friend. His friend is harsh in his judgements: "Encore de gentilles petites phrases musicales incolores! Encore une partition vide de pensées! Encore un petit acte de M. Ad. Adam!" ("Again these nice little colourless musical phrases! Again a score empty of thought! Again a little one-acter of M. Ad. Adam!")[44]

Because of the continual suppression and dissimulation of his feelings, when Berlioz does express his real views it comes as an explosion of vitriol. This really happens only once, and it is in his review for the Journal des Débats of Zampa by Hérold.[45] Curiously, in his review of Zampa for the Gazette Musicale Berlioz is only mildly critical. The reason for this may have been that the protection of

---

[42] Histoire de l'art dramatique, I, 28.

[43] See Appendix B on the unsigned articles.

[44] Le Rén., 12 July 1835, p. 1.

[45] JD, 27 Sept. 1835, pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bertin on the Journal des Débats gave Berlioz more confidence.

The review for the Journal des Débats is very long. It is not an unthinking condemnation for Berlioz carefully and conscientiously pulls the work to pieces. Often it seems as though his criticisms of Zampa are in fact the quintessence of his criticism of all opéras-comiques of this type:

> Hérold, sans avoir un style à lui, n'est cependant ni Italien, ni Français, ni Allemand. Sa musique ressemble fort à ces produits industriels confectionnés à Paris d'après des procédés inventés ailleurs et légèrement modifiés; c'est de la musique parisienne. . . . [N]ous disons en finissant que cette partition remplit cependant toutes les conditions qu'on exige aujourd'hui à Paris d'un véritable opéra-comique. . . .
>
> (Hérold, without having a style of his own, is nevertheless neither Italian, French, nor German. His music very strongly resembles those industrial products manufactured in Paris, according to procedures invented elsewhere and slightly modified; it is Parisian music. . . . [W]e shall say in conclusion that this score fulfils however all the conditions demanded of an opéra-comique in Paris today. . . .)[46]

Zampa is thus attacked both on its own terms and for all that it represents. Fortunately, though, Berlioz did like a few opéras-comiques.[47] For instance he also liked the opéras-comiques of Gomis, a Spanish composer living in France, and, to a lesser extent, of the French composer Monpou.[48]

---

[46] JD, 27 Sept. 1835, pp. 1-2.

[47] He always retained an affection for Auber's La Muette de Portici, even if he deplored the Italian influence Auber underwent in his later works. Though this is a Grand Opera, not an opéra-comique, it is important to mention it here, so as to show that Berlioz did not dislike all of Auber's works. Berlioz reviewed it in JD, 27 Sept 1837, RGM, 1 Oct 1837, and Chronique de Paris, 8 Oct. 1837.

[48] José Melchor Gomis (1791-1836), Spanish composer, who was a political exile in Paris from 1823, where he remained for almost all the rest of his life; he wrote chiefly opéra-comiques. (NG)
Hippolyte Monpou (1804-1841), French composer. He was a pupil of
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berlioz wrote at length on the music of Gomis. It is interesting to study these reviews in some depth, to see what it was that attracted Berlioz to Gomis's music, and what qualities he respected in an opéra-comique composer. Berlioz reviewed Gomis's opéra-comiques, Le Revenant[49] and Le Portefaix,[50] and also wrote Gomis's obituary notice for the Revue et Gazette Musicale in 1836.[51] In his criticism Berlioz would frequently put himself in the place of the composer and express what he felt the composer must have himself been wanting to express. This was an effective technique in that the reader feels immediately involved in the review, yet obviously it can also lead to misinterpretation of the composer's aims and intentions.

Berlioz depicts Gomis as a brave fighter for higher values trying valiantly to lead the tastes of the opéra-comique public on to worthier paths; and as someone who, having failed in this attempt, has succumbed to the worthless desires of his audience and descended to their level. But from the little reading material available on Gomis--mostly other reviews of the time--one does not get the impression that he saw himself as the "revolutionary" of the Opéra-Comique as portrayed by Berlioz.

Berlioz's review of Le Revenant stands out strikingly from all his other reviews of opéra-comique for Le Rénovateur, as it takes the work seriously from beginning to end. His own identification with Gomis is evident throughout the article:

---

[48](continued)
Choron, and composed principally songs and opéra-comiques. (NG)

[49] Le Rén., 5 Jan. 1834, pp. 1-2.

[50] Le Rén., 20 June 1835, pp. 1-2.

[51] RGM, 7 Aug. 1836, pp. 275-277.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> M. Gomis est un savant musicien, . . . il déteste la routine, les vieilles traditions; il croit autant à son propre jugement qu'à celui des inconnus qui veulent lui imposer leurs doctrines. En conséquence, ce qu'il produit est oeuvre d'art et doit être traité avec respect et considération.
>
> (M. Gomis is a learned musician, . . . he detests routine and oldfashioned traditions; he believes as much in his own judgement as in that of nobodies who want to impose their doctrines on him. Consequently what he produces is a work of art and must be treated with respect and consideration.)[52]

Gomis's work is thus immediately raised on to a different level; it is not a vaudeville annotated by music but a work of art. Having made this declaration, Berlioz proceeds with a careful and detailed analysis of the work, praising originality in rhythm, orchestration, and melody. The review is not entirely laudatory, however. Berlioz balances his praise with several minor criticisms, such as a lack of unity in the general plan and misuse of the ubiquitous trombones and bass-drum. However, he continually speaks as though he were Gomis, a fighter in the struggle for "true art". Berlioz often imputes a moral design or motive to some of the techniques used by Gomis. For instance, instead of simply saying that he does not employ square phrases and monotonous rhythms, Berlioz says,

> Il a declaré la guerre aux phrases carrées dont la désinence se prévoit dès la première mesure; au lieu de ce rhythme, monotone comme celui d'un pendule, les phrases de sa musique sont disposées dans un ordre nouveau.
>
> (He declared war on square-cut phrases whose termination could be anticipated from the very first beat; instead of the monotonous rhythm like that of a pendulum, the

---

[52] Le Rén., 5 Jan. 1834, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

phrases of his music are arranged in a new order.)[53]

Berlioz was not the only critic to praise Gomis. Naumann, for example, wrote two articles on Le Revenant in the Gazette Musicale (1834), describing the score as one of the most remarkable works of the time;[54] and an unsigned review in Le Moniteur Universel stated that Le Revenant "assigne à M. Gomis un rang distingué parmi nos plus habiles compositeurs" ("assigns M. Gomis a distinguished rank amongst our most talented composers"), and further remarked, "L'ouvrage, . . . par ses formes, nous semblerait devoir appartenir davantage à la scène de l'Académie Royale de Musique qu'à celle de l'Opéra-Comique" ("The work, . . . by its forms, would seem to us to belong more to the stage of the Académie Royale de Musique than to that of the Opéra-Comique").[55]

Berlioz's reviews of this work by Gomis give the impression that despite general praise by critics it was not popular. However, a survey of Maurice's Courrier des Théâtres shows that Le Revenant was performed frequently during 1834, which would suggest that in fact it was popular. Maurice mentions it frequently during the month of January and each time with growing enthusiasm: for instance, on 2 January he states, "Le Revenant a été parfaitment joué" (Le Revenant was perfectly played)", on 3 January, "La seconde représentation du Revenant a causé, hier, le plus heureux effet et autorisé de douces

---

[53] Le Rén., 5 Jan. 1834, p. 1.

[54] Naumann, "Théâtre Royale de l'Opéra-Comique. Le Revenant, opéra-fantastique en deux actes et en cinq tableaux; paroles de M. Calvimont, musique de M. Gomis", Parts 1 and 2, GM, 12 Jan., pp. 14-16, and 19 Jan., pp. 24-25.

[55] "Spectacles: Opéra-Comique", Le Moniteur Universel, 13 Jan. 1834, p. 90. Unsigned.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

espérances") ("The second performance of Le Revenant caused the most happy effect yesterday and raised sweet hopes"), on 5 January, "Nouvelle affluence, hier au Revenant" ("Another large audience yesterday for Le Revenant"), on 6 January, "Le succès musical du Revenant grandit d'une représentation à l'autre" ("The musical success of Le Revenant grows from one performance to the next"), and on 10 January, "La soirée a été complète" ("The house was full").[56] In his obituary of Gomis, Berlioz gives the impression that the type of audience that would have appreciated Le Revenant was not that which frequented the Opéra-Comique and vice-versa; however this would not appear to be entirely true.

Gomis's next opéra-comique, Le Portefaix, was a disappointment for Berlioz. In his review of this work for the Revue et Gazette Musicale he begins by pointing out that Gomis had his first two opéras-comiques--the first was Diable à Seville (1831)--performed only because of connections with theatre directors. According to Fétis's Biographie, Gomis obtained a pension at the end of his life because of his friendship with Cavé.[57] In his reviews of Le Portefaix and in his obituary article Berlioz continues to identify with Gomis, outlining the image of a tormented man who is so depressed by the lack of appreciation of his music that in desperation he tries to write something in the popular style. Berlioz sympathizes with but chastises Gomis, and, adopting a somewhat pedagogical tone, writes a

---

[56] Charles Maurice's column (p. 4) in the Courrier des Théâtres, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 Jan. 1834.

[57] Cavé was the Commissaire-Secrétaire de la Commission de l'Académie Royale de Musique. John Dowling in his book José Melchor Gomis: Compositor Romantico (Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1973) elaborates on Gomis's friendship with Cavé, who called him the "Rossini espagnol" (p. 45).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

review which is more or less a personal address to Gomis telling him not to abandon his ideals.

In both this article and in the obituary Berlioz elaborates a theory about composition, the essence of which is that it is almost impossible for a man of scholarly artistic talent like Gomis to be successful in the type of music demanded for a popular opéra-comique. Berlioz details passages in Le Portefaix where Gomis does succeed, but these are the passages where he uses an unusual rhythm or harmony. Where he fails most miserably is in his attempts to be frivolous. Skill in composition, according to Berlioz, does not mean that one will write a better contre-danse than the average opéra-comique composer; it means that one will write a worse one because it will be forced and lack the freshness and spontaneity that are the redeeming characteristics of such music:

> On fait de l'art populaire . . . parce qu'on ne peut faire autrement. . . . Jamais . . . un homme de style ne parviendra à écrire des choses communes avec cette aisance, cet abandon. . . .
>
> (One creates popular art . . . because one cannot do otherwise. . . . Never . . . will a man of style manage to write common things with that ease, that abandon. . . .)[58]

Berlioz's whole perception of Gomis is permeated by a romantic image of him as a convention breaker: "Gomis était un de ces hommes qui semblent nés pour souffrir et lutter pendant toute la durée de leur courte existence" ("Gomis was one of those men who seem to be born to suffer and struggle throughout their short existence").[59] In the obituary Berlioz also talks of a new work by Gomis, Comte Julien,

---

[58] RGM, 7 Aug. 1836, pp. 276-277.

[59] RGM, 7 Aug. 1836, p. 275.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

written for the Académie Royale de Musique. The article suggests this was a work written in accordance with Gomis's artistic ideals, not with the demands of the public. Berlioz gives no indication of having seen a copy of the score, and according to Fétis the authorities at the Académie Royale de Musique deemed the work not worthy of performance.[60] It is interesting that Berlioz makes no mention of another opéra-comique by Gomis, Rock le barbu (1836), which judging by comments made in a review by J. J. J. Diaz (alias Henri Blanchard), seems to have been composed more in the style of Le Portefaix than of Le Revenant.[61] Jules Janin's ironical review of Rock le barbu in the Journal des Débats adds proof to Berlioz's claim that Gomis was disliked by some people for his scholarly approach:

> Donc à propos de cet opéra bouffon, M. Gomis a écrit de la musique sérieuse. Pendant que M. Duport, son collaborateur, lui faisait de la gaîté, M. Gomis changeait cette gaîté en tristesse. . . . M. Gomis et M. Paul Duport avaient pu s'entendre pour pleurer ensemble ou pour rire ensemble, et ensuite, si M. Gomis ne tenait pas tant à être toujours et à tout propos, et sans trop savoir pourquoi, et sans trop s'inquiéter comment, un homme de génie. Avoir du génie, c'est bien beau, mais c'est bien pénible. Avoir du génie toujours, c'est une grande fatigue pour tout le monde; que diable! il est plus facile et plus agréable d'être tout simplement et tout bonnement un homme de talent. Et puis quelle idée d'avoir du génie en opéra-comique? M. Gomis aurait dû se souvenir qu'il ne faut pas prendre un pavé pour écraser une mouche.
>
> (Thus, for this bouffon opera M. Gomis has written serious music. While M. Duport, his collaborator, provided him with gaiety, M. Gomis changed this gaiety into sadness. . . . M. Gomis and M. Paul Duport should have been able to come to an understanding, to cry

---

[60] This is according to Fétis' Biographie universelle des musiciens. The NG article on Gomis states that Comte Julien was performed at a later date with great success. However, John Dowling suggests that the work was never performed (Gomis, p. 77).

[61] Henri Blanchard, "Théâtre de l'Opéra-comique. Rock le barbu, libretto en un acte, paroles de MM. Paul Duport et Deforges, musique de M. Gomis", RGM, 22 May 1836, pp. 174-175.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> together or laugh together, then, if M. Gomis did not count so much on being, at all times, and without knowing too much why, a man of genius. To have genius is all very well, but it's also hard going. To have genius always is very tiring for everyone; what the devil! It is easier and more agreeable to be quite simply a man of talent. And then, what an idea to have genius in an opéra-comique! M. Gomis should have remembered that one does not need to take a paving stone to crush a fly.)62

Also, Berlioz's personal identification with Gomis resulted in a slightly distorted picture of his importance. Having begun by portraying him as a rebel, Berlioz then had to try to justify all of Gomis's compositions in the light of this original image.

Certainly Berlioz exaggerated Gomis's worth as a composer, particularly in his review of Le Revenant. Given the enormous quantity of similarly boring works Berlioz was required to review, one can see how easily he might overestimate the quality of a work that stood out from the rest just because it broke the monotony.

Berlioz liked other individual opéras-comiques--if not wholly, at least in part--such as Onslow's Guise (1836),63 but no one else received the same eulogies as Gomis. Still, Berlioz's first review of the composer Monpou is highly commendatory. Monpou was well known at the time as a writer of romances, which were based particularly on the poetry of Hugo and Musset. He was self-consciously "romantic", to the point of heading some of his works "Je suis romantique". For Le Rénovateur in 1835 Berlioz reviewed a scene from Monpou's work called

---

62 "Théâtre de l'Opéra-Comique. Rock le barbu, opéra-comique en un acte, paroles de MM. Paul Duport et Deforge, musique de M. Gomis", JD, 16 May 1836, pp. 1-2. Janin was not at all sympathetic to the majority of the opéras-comiques performed. This review is of course tongue in cheek.

63 Guise, ou les Etats de Blois, words by MM. Planard and St. Georges, music by M. George Onslow. Berlioz reviewed it in JD, 10 Sept. 1837, RGM, 17 Sept. 1837, and Chronique de Paris, 8 Oct. 1837.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Le Juif errant. Berlioz commented on the work,

> La scène du juif errant, fort bien rendue par Dérivis, nous a paru renfermer des intentions de la plus grande beauté, et avoir en général été écrite sous l'influence d'une impression poétique fort élevée. Cet ouvrage devrait placer haut M. Monpou dans l'estime du public musical, s'il était jamais possible à un artiste qui s'écarte de la grande route battue par la foule, d'obtenir dans les premiers temps la justice qui lui est due.
>
> (The scene from Le Juif errant, extremely well interpreted by Dérivis, seemed to us to contain designs of the greatest beauty and in general to have been written under the influence of a highly poetic feeling. This work should place M. Monpou high in the esteem of the musical public, were it ever posssible for an artist who deviates from popular taste to be given the justice due to him.)[64]

I have found only one other reference to this work; d'Ortigue in his book La Musique à l'église comments, "Nous devons aussi des éloges sincères et mérités à M. Hippolyte Monpou, dont le Juif errant est plein de mélodie et de sentiment" ("We also owe sincere and merited praise to M. Monpou, whose Juif errant is full of melody and feeling").[65] I can find no other information on this composition, nor any evidence whether it was a full-scale work or not. The theme of Le Juif errant was popular at the time, and Monpou was most probably setting to music a well-known anonymous poem said to have been sung by the pilgrims of the middle-ages. The nineteenth-century Larousse quotes the poem in full.[66] Berlioz's elevated opinion of Monpou is

---

[64] Le Rén., 17 March 1835.

[65] Joseph d'Ortigue, La Musique à l'église (Paris: Didier, 1861), p. 121.

[66] To give just two examples of settings of the theme, see Scribe and Halévy's opera, Le Juif errant (1852), and Eugene Sue's book, Le Juif errant (1845). These and many more are listed in the 19th-Century Larousse.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

gently retracted in subsequent reviews of his compositions. In reviews of Monpou's Deux Reines (1835) and Piquillo (1837) Berlioz notes original melodies, but also that these occur alongside banalities such as the nauseous "Italian cadence". In Piquillo Berlioz criticizes vocal parts that have awkward and ungrateful parts for the singers.[67]

In his reviews of 1834 Berlioz denigrates the public of the Opéra-Comique for its taste in music; the works performed might have been bad, but the audience's demand for and appreciation of them was even worse. But in 1835 he directs his scorn more towards the directors of the Opéra-Comique for continuing to produce such works. His article on the Opéra-Comique in 1836, "De l'Opéra-Comique", rather curiously supports the Opéra-Comique public--to the extent at least of saying it is ready to appreciate music other than what it is presented. However, he also commented in his review of Puget's Le Mauvais Oeil,

> Ce qu'on exige d'eux (je parle du public de l'Opéra-Comique), c'est tout simplement une certaine grace un peu minaudière, une certaine verve un peu turbulante, un certain coloris un peu cru, une certaine invention un peu commune, toutes choses qui aujourd'hui courent presque les rues. Avec la réunion de ces qualités, un peu d'esprit et un peu d'entente de la scène, on doit parvenir aisément à conquérir les affections d'un public qui se montre plus bénévole de jour en jour.
>
> (What one demands of them (I am speaking of the Opéra-Comique public) is quite simply a certain grace that is a little affected, a certain verve that is a little turbulent, a certain colouring that is a little crude, a certain invention that is a little common, all things that today virtually run the streets. With the union of these qualities, a little spirit and a little stage sense, one should easily manage to conquer the affections of a public which shows itself daily to be

---

[67] Piquillo was an opéra-comique in 3 acts, with words by Alexandre Dumas. See RGM, 5 Nov. 1837, pp. 478-479.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

more benevolent.)[68]

By 1837 Berlioz's attacks on the Opéra-Comique directors were becoming fierce. In some reviews he implies that the directors have forced the composer to write a certain type of music in order to have his works included within the Opéra-Comique repertoire. When discussing various faults in Auber's Le Domino Noir, Berlioz concludes,

> Peut-être ces défauts seraient-ils moins remarqués si l'on voulait se placer au point de vue du musicien qui cherche, avant tout, le style le plus propre à agir sur le public actuel de l'Opéra-Comique, et à ne pas sortir du cercle musical dans lequel les usages et les moyens d'exécution de ce théâtre ont enfermé l'art pour ne plus lui permettre d'en sortir.
>
> (Perhaps these faults would be less remarked upon if one wanted to put oneself in the position of the musician who above all searches for the most appropriate style to use on the current public of the Opéra-Comique, and not break from the musical circle in which the habits and the means of execution of this theatre have enclosed the art in such a way that it is no longer allowed to break away.)[69]

For a short period at the beginning of 1835 Berlioz was optimistic about the chances of improvement at the Opéra-Comique because of the forthcoming performances of Robin des bois. Even in its arranged form Robin des bois was still a "work of art"; and a German choir had been hired for the season.

Berlioz's reactions after the first performance were mixed. The German choir was badly directed and Mme Casimir had been unable to resist the temptation to embellish her part with "roulades". The most important thing, however, was that the public liked it; it was a

---

[68] RGM, 9 Oct. 1836, p. 358.

[69] JD, 10 Dec. 1837, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

success. Berlioz hoped this success would prove to the directors that the public did appreciate music other than that of Adam and his ilk, and that they would henceforth enlarge their repertoire. No such transformation took place. Even a change of directors towards the end of 1835 made little difference; the Opéra-Comique continued to be dominated by the works of Adam and Auber.

Alongside his scorn for and mockery of the Opéra-Comique, Berlioz maintained serious concern for its present situation and future, and persistently presented plans for its reform. Apart from his distaste for the music performed at the Opéra-Comique, he was appalled at the low standard of the chorus[70] and the orchestra--his opinion of the chorus only became strongly antagonistic from 1835 onwards--and at the manner in which the principal singers often imitated the Italian style of embellishment. He held Mme Casimir to be the principal offender. He noted, realistically, that constant turnover of repertoire was a major cause of the low standards. Orchestral players and singers were exhausted by having to learn new works so rapidly and never had the time to learn how to perform one opera well. Berlioz was not alone in this observation. Many of his fellow critics were making the same remarks: Naumann in a review of Monpou's Les Deux Reines for the Gazette Musicale comments that "l'orchestre et les choeurs nous ont paru comme à l'ordinaire accablés de fatigue et d'ennui" ("the orchestra and the chorus seemed as usual overcome with

---

70 Choruses in general had a bad reputation in Paris at this time, as A. Cler remarked: "Le choriste ressemble aux asperges, qui n'ont de valeur qu'en boîte; il ne faut jamais le regarder et surtout l'écouter individuellement. . . . En France, à peu d'exeptions près, les choristes ne chantent que par routine" ("The chorus-singer resembles asparagus, that has only any value in a bunch; one must never look at and certainly not listen to them individually. . . . In France, with only a few exceptions, the chorus only sing by habit") (A. Cler, Physiologie du musicien (Paris: Aubert and Co., 1841), p. 51).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tiredness and boredom").[71] However, an anonymous critic for Le Ménestrel, a journal that perhaps more acccurately reflected the general public's knowledge and taste gives a different view of the situation:

> Une vérité qui n'échappe à personne, mais que l'avare critique est souvent trop lente à constater, c'est qu'à aucune époque il n'a été déployé une aussi prodigieuse activité à l'Opéra-Comique que depuis l'administration actuelle. [Voir par example l]es nombreux débuts qui se sont succédé à ce théâtre dans l'espace d'un an, . . . la série des chefs-d'oeuvre nouveaux dont elle a grossi son répertoire, [et] le choix varié des ouvrages repris.
>
> (A truth that escapes no one, but one that the stingy critic is often far too slow to remark upon, is that at no other time has such prodigious activity been seen at the Opéra-Comique than under the present administration. [See for example t]he numerous débuts following one another at this theatre in the space of a year, . . . the series of new masterpieces with which it enlarges its repertoire, [and] the varied choice of revivals).[72]

This was the kind of response for which the Opéra-Comique directors were aiming.

By 1837 Berlioz became both more cynical and more pessimistic about the state of the Opéra-Comique chorus and orchestra. He began to express relief if a new opéra-comique had no choruses; they would have only been abominably sung anyway. He even ironically used the poor standard of the chorus to justify writing uninteresting choral parts. His review of Onslow's Guise says,

> [L]es voix presque toujours écrites en accords plaqués, sans dessins saillants, ont l'air d'accompagner l'orchestre plutôt que d'exécuter la partie principale de l'ensemble musical; mais il faudrait penser un peu à ce que sont les choristes de l'Opéra-Comique, et l'on comprendrait alors l'impossibilité où se trouvait le

---

[71] "Les Deux Reines, musique de M. Monpou, paroles de MM. Soulié et Arnoud", GM, 9 Aug. 1835, p. 265. Signed N** (probably Naumann).

[72] "Opéra-Comique", Le Ménestrel, 28 June 1835, p. 1, unsigned.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> compositeur d'écrire pour eux autrement qu'il ne l'a fait.
>
> ([T]he voices almost always written in sustained chords, without striking designs, appear to be accompanying the orchestra rather than performing a principal part of the musical ensemble; but one has to consider the chorus of the Opéra-Comique a little, to understand how impossible it was for the composer to write for them in any other way than he did.)[73]

In his review of Auber's Le Domino Noir Berlioz comments at some length on the need for good choir schools like those in Germany, and on the efforts of Mainzer and Pastou to try to establish similar schools in France. Thoughout all his criticism Berlioz laments the death of Choron and the closing of his choir school, for which there had been no adequate replacement.[74] Berlioz's vision of the Opéra-Comique, though he was extremely uncertain of the feasibility of such a scheme, was that it should become a second Opéra house which would perform "works of art".[75]

In conclusion we can say that study of these reviews reinforces the points made in Chapter III, namely that Berlioz is able not only to evade saying what he thinks, but also to be dishonest in his criticism. However, seen within the context of editorial demands and the need for diplomacy towards popular composers, his deception is certainly understandable, perhaps even justifiable, as there was little else that he could have done short of refusing to review these

---

[73] Chronique de Paris, 8 Oct. 1837, p. 234.

[74] See for instance JD, 10 Dec. 1837, p. 2. Alexandre Choron (1771-1834), French writer on music, instructor, publisher, and composer. He founded the Institution Royale de Musique Classique et Religieuse , and his work had a "widespread influence on teachers, organists, choralists, and those who were awakening to the importance of music history". (NG)

[75] RGM, 18 Sept. 1836, p. 323.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

works at all, which would have cost him his livelihood.

It was perhaps because he considered the genre, or rather the popular use of the genre, and its public to be inferior that Berlioz was prepared to stoop to such a degree of dissimulation, for, as his treatment of Gomis demonstrates, when Berlioz felt an opéra-comique composer was "serious" he treated him with respect. The question of betrayal of artistic principles is thus not really applicable here, and it is significant that Berlioz's group of reviews of the Opéra-Comique are very different in both style and content from his reviews of the Conservatoire concerts.

Berlioz's articles for Le Rénovateur are the most "dishonest". Possibly this is because the reading public of Le Rénovateur would not have been highly informed about music and would probably even have missed the derogatory innuendoes of many of the articles. Anyone who knew Berlioz well would of course have seen through his dissimulation.

One point in particular that remains perplexing is why, given that he disliked most opéra-comiques and disliked reviewing them, Berlioz should have written some unsigned articles on the subject in 1836. There are several explanations possible. One is that after the continual suppression of the 1834 to 1835 articles he wanted a chance more freely to express what he felt about the Opéra-Comique. Another is that he submitted the articles signed and that Schlesinger told him to sign them with a pseudonym or leave them unsigned. A third explanation--less likely perhaps--is that he had actually begun paradoxically to enjoy writing about the Opéra-Comique.

It must be stressed again that Berlioz did not despise the form

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the opéra-comique, only its use by certain composers; witness the fact that he was later to compose his own opéra-comique.[76]

---

[76] See Appendix C.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter V

Vocal Music: Grand Opera

i.

Grand Opera was the dominating musical genre of the 1830s and one of the chief subjects of the contemporary music criticism. Its importance was such that it demands separate examination before it is studied in relation to Berlioz's criticism.

Grand Opera is described in an early nineteenth-century dictionary, Castil-Blaze's Dictionnaire de musique moderne, as simply drama sung from beginning to end, in contrast to the opéra-comique with its spoken recitatives.[1] Although there is lack of agreement on which works fall into the category of Grand Opera and which do not, a large number of works are seen as belonging to the Grand Opera genre. It is possible for us to propose a much narrower definition than that of Castil-Blaze. Indeed Castil-Blaze himself suggests that his traditional definition is too amorphous and states in concluding his entry, "C'est le caractère d'une pièce, et non les manières diverses dont ses parties sont coordonnées, qui devrait la placer dans l'une ou l'autre categorie" ("It is the character of a piece and not the various ways in which its parts are coordinated that should place a work in one or other category").[2]

The period of Grand Opera is fairly clearly delineated; it covers works written for the Paris Opéra in the first half of the nineteenth century, particularly around 1830 to 1840. The term was used

---

[1] François Castil-Blaze, Dictionnaire de musique moderne, 3rd rvd. ed. (Bruxelles: Cantaerts, 1828), p. 166.

[2] Castil-Blaze, Dictionnaire, p. 166.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sometimes to refer to the Opéra house itself, as well as to the works performed there. Although some editions and many of the stage production booklets are labelled "Grand Opera",[3] the actual title "Grand Opera" was not much used by the composers or librettists themselves.

The following works seem to have been generally classified as Grand Operas: Auber's La Muette de Portici (1828) (the progenitor of Grand Opera), Meyerbeer's Robert le Diable (1831), Auber's Gustave III (1833), Halévy's La Juive (1835), and Meyerbeer's Les Huguenots (1836). Rossini's Guillaume Tell (1829) is frequently called a Grand Opera although according to Dr. Véron, director of the Opéra from 1831-1835, the uniformity of its décor, sites, and costumes did not leave enough opportunity for the visual contrasts required by Grand Opera.[4] However if La Muette can be included as a Grand Opera for its influence on décor and costumes, then Guillaume Tell should also be included for its influence on musical forms, that is, its combination of Italian and French vocal styles. That it is not generally accepted as a Grand Opera, whereas La Muette is, points to the relatively more important role played by the decor, costumes, and staging. Other works that are often cited as Grand Opera are Meyerbeer's Le Prophète (1849) and l'Africaine (1865), Verdi's Don Carlos (1867) and Aida (1871), and Gounod's Faust (1859) and Roméo et Juliette (1867).

---

[3] For instance the booklets for Robert le Diable, Les Huguenots, and Comte Ory. The inclusion of Comte Ory is indicative perhaps of an ignorance on the part of the author, or maybe he is just using the term as it was defined by Castil-Blaze. This is almost certainly the case with the heading of a collection of production booklets by M. Louis Palianti entitled Collection de mises en scène de grands opéras et d'opéra-comiques (Paris: Chez l'Auteur et chez MM. les correspondants des Théâtres, n. d.).

[4] Louis Véron, Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris, III (Paris: de Goret, 1854).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although the most important figures in Grand Opera were undoubtedly Meyerbeer and Scribe, Dr Véron was an important figure too.[5] In his Mémoires he outlines what he sees as the principal characteristics of Grand Opera. Above all he stresses the importance of luxurious stage design, décor, and costumes. He sees the libretto as having the important role of providing dramatic situations and offering the possibility of many contrasts in decor and costumes, and he pays constant tribute to Scribe's mastery in this area. Véron does not mention demands placed on the composer. He implies, however, that the essential task was to draw the crowds by spectacular décor and scenery and that once captive they would have no choice but to become familiar with the music also. Music was certainly not portrayed as one of the important features of the opera; if anything it was the weak point in that it would possibly not be understood.[6] The essential conception of the Grand Opera was that of a multi-faceted work in which the various components combined to create an effective whole. The composer had to work in collaboration with both his librettist and stage producer in designing a grand spectacle.

Opera was becoming a business as well as an artistic venture, and a successful business venture at that.[7] In the social life of the average bourgeois family of the day the opera played an important

---

[5] It should not however be forgotten that La Muette was produced under Lubbert, and Les Huguenots under Duponchel. Duponchel and Ciceri in their roles of stage producer and set designer respectively were also extremely important figures.

[6] Véron, III, 236. Véron suggests here that it was the mise-en-scène that drew the crowd to Robert le Diable and that people only began to appreciate the libretto and music later.

[7] This is the major thesis of W. L. Crosten's excellent book, French Grand Opera--An Art and a Business (1948; rpt. New York: Da Capo, 1972).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

role. The advent of the upright piano and cheap sheet music meant that the opera could be enjoyed at home, and most of the famous arias of the day were arranged for piano and voice, often in simplified versions. W. L. Crosten argues that apart from Hollywood no other venture in history can compete with Grand Opera (particularly during the collaboration of Véron, Scribe, and Meyerbeer) in gauging so accurately the desires of the public.[8] To understand what was new about Grand Opera it is useful to examine separately the various components of libretto, décor, and music.

The libretti for the Grand Opera were almost exclusively the work of Scribe. Scribe is described with a great deal of scorn in the majority of serious reviews at the time. Indeed the antagonism is so strong that it is difficult to keep the importance of Scribe's work in perspective. There is no doubt that his versification was banal and his characterization weak, nor that most emphasis was placed on the organization of large forces. Yet, in his organization of material and choice of subject matter Scribe was both skilled and original. One of the best analyses of his libretti is in Patrick Smith's book, The Tenth Muse.[9] Smith outlines Scribe's talent as a "story planner and scene-and-act organizer--as a stage technician--and as a writer with a comprehensive mind and an endless facility for disguise . . .".[10] Scribe's plots were simple and clear, and full of the action and dramatic contrasts so much sought after by Véron. The subject matter of his libretti was generally historical. There had

---

[8] W. L. Crosten, French Grand Opera, p. 5.

[9] Patrick Smith, The Tenth Muse: A Historical Study of the Opera Libretto (New York: Alfred. A. Knopf, 1970). See also Karin Pendle's thesis on Scribe, mentioned in footnote 23, p. 153.

[10] Smith, The Tenth Muse, p. 211.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

been many operas before with historical libretti, but Scribe's libretti differed in their attempt faithfully to recreate the historical period. As Patrick Smith comments, an opera like Donizetti's Anna Bolena could really have been about any queen in any historic period, whereas with Scribe, in Les Huguenots for example, the story of Raoul and Valentine is set within a larger framework of the St Bartholomew's day massacre.[11] This interest in history was very much a phenomenon of the time, as shown by the vogue for the Middle Ages and also the pioneering work of historians such as Michelet and Quinet.

Some of Scribe's critics however condemned him for not treating his historical subjects seriously enough, in degrading them with his romantic sub-plots. Gustave Planche's review of Les Huguenots ironically neglects to mention the words "Catholic" and "Huguenot" until half-way through the article, making the point that for Scribe the romantic story was more important than the historical facts.[12] Schumann was horrified at the way the St. Bartholomew's day massacre was recounted: "I am not a moralist, but it is too much for a good Protestant when he hears his most hallowed song bawled forth from the stage; too much for him when the bloodiest drama in the history of his church is reduced to a rustic farce simply to earn money and notoriety".[13] Scribe was indeed popularizing history, and to this end

---

[11] Smith, The Tenth Muse, pp. 211-212. The libretto of Anna Bolena was written by Felice Romani (1788-1865).

[12] Gustave Planche, "Théâtres. Académie Royale de Musique: Première représentation des Huguenots", Chronique de Paris, 3 March 1836, pp. 250-253.

[13] Robert Schumann, "The Huguenots", in The Musical World of Robert Schumann: A Selection from his Writings, trans. and ed. Henry Pleasants (London: Victor Gollancz, 1965), p. 138.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he was at times nauseatingly sentimental.[14] Yet his main concern was to appeal to his bourgeois public, and as a man of considerable experience in this area he correctly judged the right mixture of historical fact and sentimentality. The fact remains that Scribe was the first librettist to treat large-scale historical subjects in such a way that the interaction of political or religious forces was portrayed alongside the interaction of individuals.

Scribe designed his libretti with the latest developments in stage production in mind, while being careful to create many opportunities for costume and scenery changes. The Grand Opera always included ballets and choruses and often, as Patrick Smith points out, a climax at the end of the fourth act over a specific historical event such as the Saint Bartholomew's night massacre (Les Huguenots), the Neapolitan revolt of 1647 (La Muette), or the assassination of Gustave III (Gustave III).[15]

Changes in the libretto were mirrored by similar changes in the stage production, décor, and costumes. Historical authenticity began to be an important concern in stage production, alongside an interest in realistic representation. This new interest in stage production started in the late 1820s. In 1827 Lubbert, the current director of the Opéra, set up a special committee to investigate new possibilities in production.[16] In La Muette (1828) much effort was put into

---

[14] Gautier mocks Scribe's obvious coquetry aimed at various sections of the bourgeoisie, quoting lines such as "Ah quel plaisir d'être soldat! Oh! le charmant métier, Que d'être perruquier! Quel sort plein de douceur, Que d'être confiseur!" ("Ah what pleasure to be a soldier! Oh! the charming career of being a wig-maker! What sweet destiny, to be a confectioner!") (Gautier, Histoire de l'art dramatique, I, 256).

[15] Smith, The Tenth Muse, p. 222.

[16] Mentioned in Yves Ozanam, "Recherches sur l'Académie Royale de
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

presenting picturesque scenes of seventeenth-century Neapolitan life. For the famous explosion of Vesuvius on stage in the last act, Ciceri, who was later to become the most important figure in décor design, was sent to La Scala where in 1827 an eruption of Vesuvius had been performed on stage in Pacini's L'Ultimo Giorno di Pompeia. The details of costumes in the stage production booklet for La Muette stresses the use of Neapolitan colours: "Naples bleu-ciel", "Naples lilas", "Naples oiseau de paradis".[17] How these colours differed from their Parisian equivalents is not specified; still the desire for authenticity is there in spirit. This stage production booklet concludes with some advice for provincial theatres, saying that if they wished to change the work from a Grand Opera to an opéra-comique they merely had to speak the recitatives and cut out anything else not designed as an air or ensemble piece.

Although the beginnings of the development of Grand Opera production must be placed before the 1830s it was only after 1830, under the directorship of Dr Véron, that the most dramatic developments took place. Under Dr Véron the stage production was as important as--some even said more important than--the libretto and the music. Véron was aided by an extremely gifted team: for the décor, Ciceri assisted by Feuchères, Séchan, Diéterle, Despléchin, Philastres, and Cambon, for the stage production, Duponchel, and for the costumes, Lepaulle and Lorimier.

---

[16](continued)
Musique (Opéra Français) sous la seconde restauration 1815-1830", Diss. Ecole Nationale des Chartes, III, Paris 1981, 569.

[17] Solomé, Indications générales et observations pour la mise en scène de la Muette de Portici, Grand Opéra en cinq actes, paroles de MM. Scribe et G. Delavigne, musique de M. Auber (Paris: E. Duverger, 1828).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Main developments in décor involved the use of both light and perspective as an aid to realistic representation. The popular boulevard theatres had been experimenting for some time in both these areas, for instance, the panoramas and dioramas of Daguerre produced for the Panorama-Dramatique and later the Ambigu-Comique.[18] Gas lighting, introduced in 1822, was used in vaudeville theatres well before it was used at the Opéra. However, Dr Véron began to exploit it as much as possible.

Ciceri and various members of his workshop had worked in many Parisian theatres and had thus encountered the work that was going on in the boulevard theatres. Ciceri was influenced a great deal by Daguerre's dioramas and also by the historical dramas of the realistic playwrights, Victor Hugo and Alexandre Dumas.[19] In Robert le Diable, Véron's opening flourish, the décor was spectacular, in particular the extraordinary cloister scene of the third act where the nuns awake, rise from their tombs, and dance a seductive ballet. Catherine Join-Dieterle has noted several interesting points about this scene, such as that it was the first time that a ballet had been actually integrated into the dramatic action of an opera[20] and, also, that the

---

[18] The principal of a diorama was to paint a canvas on both sides, with transparent colours on the front and reliefs in black and white on the back. Only the light was mobile--in illuminating the canvas from in front or behind, one could make one or other of the two drawings appear. The graduation of light enables one to obtain effects of night and day and especially of movement, for instance, flames, sun-set, and the ebb and flow of the sea. (This description comes from an article by Nicole Wild, "La Recherche de la précision historique chez les décorateurs de l'Opéra de Paris au XIXème siècle", Report of the Twelfth Congress of the International Musicologial Society, Berkeley, California, 1977, session on "Nineteenth-Century Staging and Romantic Visual Symbolism", p. 456.)

[19] Wild, "La Recherche de la précision historique", p. 453.

[20] Catherine Join-Dieterle, "Robert le Diable: premier opéra romantique", Romantisme, Nos. 28-29 (1980), p. 157.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scene had been suggested not by Meyerbeer but by Duponchel the stage producer (as had the dramatic scene of the last act in the Palermo Cathedral)[21] or perhaps even by Scribe. It is revealing that the most famous scene of Robert le Diable was the original idea of either the stage producer or librettist.

La Juive was the opera with the most extravagant and sensational décor and costumes. The costumes designer, Paul Lormier, did extensive research on the opera's period--Southern Germany between 1400 and 1430--examining engravings, pictures, stained-glass windows, tapestries, and miniatures.[22] For the armour costumes he consulted a book by Pierre Palliot, La Vraye et parfaite science des armoiries (1660);[23] 30,000 francs was spent on the armour alone, out of a budget that totalled 150,000 francs.[24] The following description, taken from the stage production booklet, of a procession in Act I of La Juive gives a good idea of the extravagance of the production:

> [Act I]: Cortége défilant pendant le chant
> 1. Les sonneurs de trompe de l'empereur, précédés de trois gardes à cheval richement armé et équipés.
> 2. Un porte bannière. 3. Vingt arbaletiers. 4. Un porte bannière 5. Deux cardinaux suivis de deux clercs. 6. Deux autres cardinaux suivis de deux clercs. 7. Un porte bannière accompagné d'évêques et des maîtres de différents métiers. 8. Un porte bannière accompagné de deux autres évêques et de quelques supérieurs de confréries. 9. Trois échevins. . . . 10. Cent vingt soldats richement armés et couverts de cottes et de juste au corps en maille d'or. 11. Six trompettes. (Les instruments sont ornés de tabliers richement armoiriés). . . . 12. Six trompettes. 13. Six porte bannières. 14. Vingt gardes arbaletiers. 15. Trois cardinaux suivis de leur pages et de leur clercs. 16. Sous un magnifique

---

[21] Join-Dieterle, "Robert le Diable", p. 162.

[22] Wild, "Recherche de la précision historique", p. 454.

[23] Wild, "Recherche de la précision historique", p. 454.

[24] Marvin A. Carlson, The French Stage in the Nineteenth Century (Metuchen, N. Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1972), p. 77.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dais porté par quatre hérault (un cinqième tient la bride du cheval). Le CARDINAL BROGNY à cheval, suivi de ses pages et de ses gentilshommes et précédé des hérault portant sur les riches coussins de velours les vêtements pontificaux. 17. Dix soldats. 18. Trois hérault d'armes à cheval. 19. Vingt pages de l'Empereur. 20. L'EMPEREUR SIGISMOND, sous une armure des plus ébloissantes. Il monte un superbe cheval harnaché et cuirassé avec tout le luxe imaginable. Lorsqu'il passe devant l'église, dont les portes se sont ouvertes quelques instants avant, on attaque dans l'intérieur le TE DEUM. Des enfants de choeur (huit au moins) sur les marches du temple, agitent alors devant l'Empereur les encensoirs allumés. L'Empereur s'arrête et s'incline devant la maison du Seigneur. Les cloches sonnent à toute volée. Les orgues se font entendre. A ce bruit se mêlent les cries de joie et les NOEL du peuple.

([Act 1] Procession crossing the stage during the singing
1. The emperor's trumpeters, preceded by three guards on horse-back, richly armed and equipped. 2. A banner carrier. 3. Twenty cross-bow men. 4. A banner carrier. 5. Two cardinals followed by two clerics. 6. Two more cardinals followed by two more clerics. 7. A banner carrier accompanying bishops and masters from various professions. 8. A banner carrier accompanying two more masters and several of his colleagues. 9. Three aldermen. . . . 10. One hundred and twenty soldiers richly armed and dressed in gold coats of mail. 11. Six trumpeters (the instruments bear banners richly ornamented by coats of arms). . . . 12. Six trumpeters. 13. Six banner carriers. 14. Twenty guards with cross-bows. 15. Three cardinals followed by their pages and clerks. 16. Under a magnificent dais carried by four heralds (a fifth holds the horse's bridle), the CARDINAL BROGNY on horse back, followed by his pages and gentlemen and preceded by heralds carrying his pontifical clothes on rich velvet cushions. 17. Ten soldiers. 18. Three armed heralds on horseback. 19. Twenty of the emperor's pages. 20. THE EMPEROR SIGISMOND in the most dazzling suit of armour. He rides a superb horse, harnessed and armour-plated with all the luxury imaginable. When he passes in front of the church, whose doors have been opened several moments before, a TE DEUM starts in the interior. From the steps of the church, children of the choir (eight at least) wave lit incense burners before the Emperor. The Emperor stops and bows before the house of God. The church bells ring with all their force. The organ is heard. This noise is mingled with the cries of joy and carols of the people.)[25]

---

25 "Livret de mise-en-scène de la Juive, Opéra en 5 actes de M. E. Scribe, musique de F. Halévy", Louis Palianti, Collection de mises en scène de grands opéras et opéras-comiques, No. 49, p. 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A comparison with what is supposed to be a spectacular scene from Rossini's Moïse shows the extent to which the stage production had developed in the Grand Opera:

[Acte III. Grande Marche]
ORDRE DE LA MARCHE
1) Un chef et douze gardes...
2) Six dames des choeurs...
3) Six hommes des choeurs...
4) Six dames des choeurs...
5) Six hommes des choeurs...
6) Six dames des choeurs...
7) Six hommes des choeurs...
8) Six hommes des choeurs...
9) Oséride, devant quatre prêtres. Ils s'arrêtent pour le solo d'Oséride.
Après le solo, Oséride et les quatres prêtres vont se placer sur le trône côté Jardin. Il s'asseyent. Ici la marche continue.
10) Un chef et huit gardes...
11) Quadrille d'hommes du ballet - En rouge
12) " de dames " "
13) " d'hommes " En bleu
14) " de dames " "
15) " d'hommes " En brun
16) " de dames " "
17) Pharaon, Sinaïde, Aménophis. Officiers derrière Pharaon; sa femme et son fils montent sur le trône côte Cour, Pharaon est au milieu. Les prêtres se lèvent lorsque Pharaon est arrivé sur son trône. Lorsqu'il est assis, les prêtres se rasseyent.

[Act III. Grand March]
ORDER OF THE MARCH
1) A chief and twelve guards...
2) Six ladies of the choir...
3) Six gentlemen of the choir...
4) Six ladies of the choir...
5) Six gentlemen of the choir...
6) Six ladies of the choir...
7) Six gentlemen of the choir...
8) Six gentlemen of the choir...
9) Oseride before four priests; they stop for Oseride's solo.
After the solo, Oseride and the four priests place themselves on the throne, stage left. They sit down. Here the march continues.
10) A chief and eight guards...
11) Quadrille by male dancers - In red
12) " female " "
13) " male " In blue
14) " female " "
15) " male " In brown

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

16) " female " "
17) Pharaoh, Sinaide, Amenophis. Officiers behind Pharaoh; his wife and his son, mount the throne on stage right, Pharaoh is in the middle. The priests rise when Pharaoh reaches the throne. When he is seated, the priests sit down again.)[26]

The décor for Les Huguenots was not so spectacular; indeed for the third act the stage production booklet indicates that the scenery and the décor of Le Pré aux Clercs should be used.[27] The goal of historical authenticity in décor of this period seems to have been more concerned with evoking a mood or creating an atmosphere than with a precise scientific reproduction of how things actually were. Nicole Wild, in her article on nineteenth-century stage production, makes a division betweem two types of historical authenticity. She calls one "synthetic", the desire to evoke the past, and the other "analytic", the desire to reconstitute history. The example she gives for the second type is the extraordinary six months of research that went into the costumes and sets for Aida. Most of the Grand Opera up until 1840 could be classified under the "synthetic" heading. Though there was a desire for historical accuracy, attention to detail was not considered as important as obtaining an impressionistic overview.

The musical organization of Grand Opera, particularly of the works of Meyerbeer, showed a merging of Italian bel-canto and lyricism with the French declamatory style. This combination had already been present in Rossini's Comte Ory and Guillaume Tell and to a lesser extent in his Moïse and Siège de Corinthe. The chorus assumed a role of immense importance. There were fewer solo arias and the musical

---

[26] "Livret de mise en scène de Moïse", Palianti, Collection de mises en scènes, No. 64, pp. 5-6.

[27] Opéra-comique by Hérold and Planard of 1832.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

flow became more continuous with less breaks, organization being into large blocks rather than short sections. The impetus for the use of the chorus as a principal dramatic force came from Spontini's operas La Vestale (1807) and Fernand Cortez (1809), and Auber's La Muette, but it had indeed been a part of the French operatic tradition since Lully. The orchestra, as has been widely documented, played an enormous role in the Grand Opera. Of particular note is the emphasis on percussion and brass instruments and on the exploration of unusual instruments.

The number of Grand Opera performances is enormous. Robert le Diable was performed 558 times by 1893, La Juive 550 times by the same date, and Les Huguenots 1,080 times by 1914. Today not one of these works appears regularly in any opera house repertoire.[28] Meyerbeer, whose name was for many people synonymous with Grand Opera, was undoubtedly its major exponent. Reviews of his operas dominated the Parisian music criticism of the 1830s and for many people he typified the spirit of the age. As it was the operas of Meyerbeer in which Berlioz was most interested and about which he wrote the largest number of articles, I shall be concentrating mainly on these articles and shall only occasionally refer to the other Grand Operas.

Berlioz's relationship to Meyerbeer is both complex and ambiguous. Two points need to be made about the relationship. First, having Meyerbeer as a friend was very important to Berlioz. Meyerbeer was a powerful and influential man at the time and one of the few musicians that Berlioz felt was really interested and sympathetic to

---

[28] Alfred Loewenberg, Annals of Opera: 1597-1940, 2nd rvd. ed. (Geneva: Societas Bibliographica, 1955), cols. 736, 766, and 777.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his music.[29] Of course Berlioz wished to maintain this friendship and it was perhaps inevitable and certainly understandable that his desire to please Meyerbeer played an important role in Berlioz's criticism of Meyerbeer's works.

Second, Berlioz did genuinely appreciate Meyerbeer's music--particularly Les Huguenots--and his grandiose treatment of historical themes. He found Meyerbeer's use of unusual instrumentation and mass vocal effects challenging for their intense dramatic power.

It is necessary to bear in mind that Berlioz's reviews of Meyerbeer are as revealing in what they do not say as in what they do say; once again the tactic of "review by omission" is used. As said in Chapter II, Berlioz's article on Robert le Diable for the Gazette Musicale of 1835 is not a review of the first performance of the work, but an article on one specific aspect of this opera, namely its orchestration. Since it was Meyerbeer's use of the orchestra that most interested Berlioz, and many other critics as well, this was a fairly safe area to choose. Berlioz could be enthusiastic in his praise and was spared the need to dwell on those other aspects of the work he enjoyed less. He was also spared the task of recounting the libretto.

Berlioz nevertheless briefly mentions other aspects of the work other than the orchestra, qualifying each one with a commendatory adjective--for instance, "admirable melodies", "original harmonies", and "profound dramatic thought". Since the adulations are not expanded upon they remain fairly uninformative token tributes.

Berlioz obviously did think very highly of Meyerbeer's capabilities and inventiveness as an orchestrator. The Traité

---

[29] CG II, 1835, 231.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

d'orchestre includes several examples drawn from Robert le Diable, quoting the "Resurrection des nonnes" twice.[30] This scene is described in the Gazette Musicale article as the "plus prodigieuse inspiration de la musique dramatique moderne" ("most prodigious inspiration of modern dramatic music").[31] Berlioz gives a vivid description of its novelty and the way in which Meyerbeer has created the effect of "half-death":

> Les violons, altos, flûtes, hautbois et clarinettes se taisent. Les cors, les trompettes à pistons, trombonnes, ophicléide, timballes et tamtam, gémissent seuls quelques accords sincoppés pianissimo, précédés sur le temps fort de deux coups pizzicato des violoncelles et contrebasses. Puis après chacune de ses horribles strophes, deux bassons seuls viennent glousser un rythme plus animé. . . .
>
> (The violins, violas, flutes, oboes and clarinets are silent. The horns, the valve trumpets, trombones, ophicleide, kettledrums, and tamtam alone are moaning several syncopated pianissimo chords, preceded on the strong beats by two pizzicato strokes in the violincellos and double basses. Then, after each of these horrifying strophes, two solo bassoons begin to cluck a more animated rhythm. . . .)[32]

He stresses that the effect of this passage would be entirely different if any other instruments were used, for it is the particular choice and juxtaposition of instruments that was important and so original.

The orchestration is analyzed in terms of its dramatic and emotional effect. It is not only the overtly dramatic scenes that

---

[30] Berlioz, Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration, suivie de L'Art du chef d'orchestre, (Paris, Bruxelles: Henry Lemoine and Co., n. d; Gregg Intern. Reprint 1970), No. 31, p. 130, and No. 65, p. 280.

[31] Berlioz, GM, 12 July 1835, p. 232.

[32] GM, 12 July 1835, pp. 231-232 (Cohen, trans., p. 120, modified).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

have interesting instrumentation. The entrance of Alice onto the stage, for instance, is announced with carefully chosen orchestration. Berlioz comments admiringly on the effect of calm and freshness acompanying her entrance, created both by the instrumentation of two flutes, two oboes, and two clarinets, and the contrast of these gentle woodwind instruments with the loud metallic frenzy of the preceding "infernal" scene with its percussion, brass, and full string tremulo. Berlioz not only acclaims Meyerbeer's original instrumentation, but also analyzes the reasons why it is effective. He criticized Meyerbeer in one instance for banal instrumentation in the second act:

> Je reprocherai cependant à l'auteur d'y avoir introduit vers la fin les trombonnes et l'ophiclëide, dont la présence n'est motivée par aucune intention dramatique, et dont le tymbre rude et violent dans le forte, ne peut qu'altérer la couleur d'un morceau aussi gracieusement gai.
>
> (I will however reproach the author for having introduced the trombones and the ophicleide towards the end where their presence is not motivated by any dramatic intention, and whose rough and violent timbre in the forte can do nothing but spoil the colour of a piece so graciously gay.)[33]

The use of drum and ophicleide in a dance air was common practice at the time, but, according to Berlioz, dramatically incongruous and should have been avoided by someone of Meyerbeer's status.

The arias of Isabel in Robert le Diable are decorated by innumerable "roulades". Even Alice at times embroiders her otherwise straightforward lines. Berlioz makes no comment on these "roulades" which surely must have annoyed him intensely. If Robert le Diable had been written by someone else, Hérold for instance, perhaps Berlioz

---

[33] GM, 12 July 1835, p. 231 (Cohen trans., pp. 116-117, modified).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

would have unleashed one of his many tirades against "roulades".

The Gazette Musicale article starts by noting the incredible success of Robert le Diable, not only in France, but in the provinces and overseas. This provokes a lengthy digression on the state of orchestras in the provinces, a topic to which Berlioz often returns. In this particular instance it seems suspiciously like "padding", though Berlioz is also making a point about the precision and sophistication required for a Meyerbeer orchestra.

Given the paucity of Berlioz's commentary on aspects of Robert le Diable other than the orchestration, it could be conjectured that he already harboured the rather dismissive view that he was later to print in the fifth evening of Soirées d'Orchestre.[34] Here once again he does not mention any specific faults, but simply describes the work as a very flat modern French opera, during which everyone in the orchestra chatters except for the first violin, trombones, and bass drum (who presumably had the most to play). In the Soirées Berlioz classifies works by the amount of talking done by the members of the orchestra; if a work is very good then the orchestra is silent. Robert le Diable, with several members quiet but the majority talking, would come into the category of the "mediocre".

In reviews of Les Huguenots in the Revue et Gazette Musicale (1836) and Journal des Débats (1836) Berlioz firmly states his preference for this opera over Robert le Diable. He found the style of Les Huguenots more serious, noble, and grandiose. Most other critics shared this preference, although not all. Castil-Blaze, for instance, felt that Robert le Diable was more lively and fresh than Les Huguenots. Before examining Berlioz's reviews of Les Huguenots, I

---

[34] Berlioz, SO, p. 87.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

shall look at what some other critics said about the work.

Virtually all critics of the time felt obliged at some stage or other to write an article on Les Huguenots. From this wide choice of articles, I have chosen to study some written by the more "serious" critics and one by an unknown critic, which, typical of a large number of reviews of the time, to an extent represents the "style admiratif" as described by Desnoyers (see Chapter I). The articles include four articles by Castil-Blaze in the France Musicale (1838);[35] two articles by Blaze de Bury in the Revue des Deux Mondes (1836), when he was aged sixteen, and the Revue des Deux Mondes (1859),[36] after he had become a good friend of Meyerbeer; two articles by Desnoyers in Le National (1836);[37] two articles by Mainzer in the Monde Dramatique (1836); an article by Planche in the Chronique de Paris (1836); George Sand's letter to Meyerbeer in her Lettres d'un voyageur; an article by Schumann on Meyerbeer; various articles by Heinrich Heine in De tout un peu; and an article by the unidentified "Ed. L." (Edouard Lerminier perhaps) in the Nouvelle Minerve (1836).[38]

---

[35] François Castil-Blaze, "Les Huguenots", France Musicale, 13 May 1838, pp. 1-2, 20 May 1838, pp. 1-2, 27 May 1838, pp. 1-3, and 10 June 1838, pp. 1-3.

[36] Blaze de Bury, under the name of Henry Blaze, "Poètes et musiciens de l'Allemagne. M. Meyerbeer", RDM, 5 (March, 1836), 678-711, and, under the name of Henri Blaze de Bury, "De l'ésprit du temps. A propos de musique. M. Meyerbeer", RDM, 23 (Oct., 1859), 645-673.

[37] Louis Desnoyers, "Théâtres de l'Opera. Les Huguenots", Le National, 3 March 1836, pp. 1-3, and 16 March 1836, pp. 1-3.

[38] Joseph Mainzer, "Académie Royale de Musique. Première représentation des Huguenots, opéra en cinq actes de MM. Scribe et Meyerbeer", Parts 1 and 2, Le Monde Dramatique, II (1835) [1836], pp. 234-238 and pp. 247-253.

Gustave Planche, "Première représentaion des Huguenots", Chronique de Paris, NS, 3 March 1836, pp. 250-253, and 6 March 1836, pp. 261-264.

George Sand, "A Meyerbeer. La Musique, Les Huguenots", Lettres

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

An overview of these reviews shows a surprising amount of antagonism towards Les Huguenots, with the exception of George Sand (though she, too, has some qualifications) and "Ed. L.". Rather than analyze each article separately I shall examine them under the divisions of libretto, stage production, and music, as used in the introduction to this section.

Scribe's libretto is unanimously decried by all the critics, but a slight division occurs between those critics who discuss the relationship between the music and the libretto and those who do not really make any connection between the two. Schumann for instance is morally outraged by the entire opera, including both libretto and music, between which he makes no differentiation. Castil-Blaze also makes no clear distinction, though he mentions several passages where he feels the music portrays perfectly the vulgarity of the libretto, such as Marcel's song in the first act, "A bas les maudits". Blaze de Bury's first article discusses Scribe's miserable profanations of religion and history.[39] In his second article he passes lightly over the libretto, saying that the poor literary quality of the libretto was not reflected in the music. George Sand and Mainzer felt that Meyerbeer overcame the shortcomings of his libretto in the last acts, but not entirely in the first three acts. For Mainzer the music

---

[38](continued)
d'un voyageur (1863, rpt. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1869), pp. 313-335.
Robert Schumann, "The Huguenots", in The Musical World of Robert Schumann: A Selection from his Writings, trans. and ed. Henry Pleasants (London: Victor Gollancz, 1965).
Henri [Heinrich] Heine, "Le Grand Opéra. Rossini and Meyerbeer", and "La Première représentation des Huguenots", in De tout un peu, pp. 265-289, and pp. 361-366.
"Ed. L.", "Théâtres. Académie Royale de Musique. Première représentation des Huguenots", Nouvelle Minerve, 4 (1836), pp. 323-328.

[39] Blaze de Bury, RDM (1836), p. 708.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

improved immensely as soon as there was some action in the libretto. He considers that the action starts in the third act but stops again completely in the last act.[40] Planche, though largely unconcerned with the relationship between the music and libretto, does question whether the reason for the poor chorus following the Septuor in the third act was that it was interpreting poor lyrics, and Desnoyers felt that Meyerbeer would have written a more profound work if he had had a more profound libretto. Finally, "Ed. L.", admirably fulfilling the role of the stereotyped "critique littéraire", states that despite the appalling lyrics Meyerbeer overcame all--or nearly all, a slight exception being made of the second act--with his splendid music.

Thus for some critics the poor quality of the libretto did not infringe at all upon the quality of the music ("Ed. L." and Blaze de Bury's second article), for others it did so partially (George Sand, Mainzer, and Planche), or entirely (Desnoyers), and some criticize both the music and libretto, though one is not seen as a consequence of the other (Castil-Blaze and Schumann).

Not many of the critics discussed the mise-en-scène at any length, and those who do mention it are either slightly disparaging or disappointed. Desnoyers and Mainzer were both disappointed, pointing out that less money had been spent this time and how inferior the final result was to Robert le Diable. Planche was very critical of all the sets. He notes the borrowing of sets from Gustave III (as did Mainzer)[41] and found the lighting poor in both the third and fifth acts. Castil-Blaze was also critical, but more of the importance of

---

[40] Mainzer, Monde Dramatique, 1836, pp. 249-251.

[41] They must both be mistaken here, since according to the Livret de mise-en-scène it was the Pré aux Clercs that was used, and not in this act anyway.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the role assumed by the stage production in the Grand Opera than of the specific production of Les Huguenots. He postulated that most of the effect of Les Huguenots was due to stage effects and not to the music. As might be expected, "Ed. L." praises the mise-en-scène highly:

> Ajouterai-je que le succès a dépassé toutes les espérances qu'avaient pu faire concevoir à l'administration de l'Opéra et l'immense talent du compositeur, [et] le luxe et l'éclat des décorations, parmi lesquelles on doit distinguer celle qui, au second acte, nous montre ce vaste escalier de marbre qu'ombragent des arbres magnifiques, les soins d'une mise en scène minutieuse, riche et intelligente.
>
> (Shall I add that the success surpassed all that the opera administration could have been led to hope for by the composer's immense talent, [and] the luxury and brilliance of the decorations, amongst which one in particular in the second act showed a vast marble staircase, shadowed by enormous trees, the work of a meticulous, splendid, and intelligent mise-en-scène.)[42]

This type of response was fairly typical of a number of reviews by minor critics of the time.

There is a common point of admiration in all discussion of the music of Les Huguenots: the "Bénédiction des poignards" and "Grand Duo" of the fourth act, and it was these extracts that were performed as part of the programme for the opening of the new Opéra in 1870. Even Schumann's condemnatory article, in which his emotional perturbation seems to make it difficult for him to put words down on paper, contains a begrudging though qualified respect for the "Bénédiction" and the "Duo". Reviews of recent productions of Les Huguenots still isolate these passages from the rest of the work. Yet other numbers were also appreciated by the critics of the time, in

---

[42] "E. L.", "Les Huguenots", Nouvelle Minerve, 1836, p. 327.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

particular the page's romance from the first act, "Une Dame noble et sage", Marcel's "Chorale theme", the fifth act Trio, and to a lesser extent the third act Duo between Marcel and Valentine and the third act Septet.

Meyerbeer's music was most fully examined by the critic Castil-Blaze whose articles on Les Huguenots are evidently the product of much research. Castil-Blaze first of all objected to Meyerbeer's prosody; he felt that Meyerbeer distorted the rhythms of the French language and at times even set words in such a way as to render them incomprehensible. Saint-Saëns made the same criticism of Meyerbeer at a later date.[43] Castil-Blaze was one of the first to criticize at length Meyerbeer's failure to develop melodies. He felt that Meyerbeer was unable to develop themes and attempted to unify the music by repetition of themes. However, Castil-Blaze's major contention with Meyerbeer concerns the question of borrowings; here, as the renowned arranger of other people's music, Castil-Blaze feels himself to be an unrivalled expert. His search for borrowings or "reminiscences" in Les Huguenots borders on the compulsive. He does not merely name passages and works that he thinks have been used--and he generously suggests that the borrowings could have been purely unconscious--but he also details the precise passages in question.

Both Desnoyers and Planche base their assessment of Meyerbeer's music on the well-used distinction of the time between talent and genius. They claim Meyerbeer to be a man of talent not genius, who worked hard but ultimately lacked inspiration.

Desnoyers sees Les Huguenots as a huge patchwork, with some good

---

[43] Camille Saint-Saëns, "Meyerbeer", Ecole buissonnière: Notes et souvenirs (Paris: Lafitte, 1913), p. 278.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

bits, some trivial, noble, or ugly ones, and all intricately and patiently joined together with the craftsmanship of a jeweller. He felt that Meyerbeer's gift for orchestration had been exaggerated, though his use of unusual instruments such as the viole d'amour was praiseworthy, and disliked his use of "broken" rhythms and "bizarre" harmonies. Desnoyer's lack of tolerance for experimentation in rhythm and harmony is perhaps allied to his fervent support for Italian opera.

Mainzer also found Les Huguenots a mixture of good and bad qualities, had reservations about Meyerbeer's use of harmony and melodic inventiveness, but praised his instrumentation.

One of the most widespread opinions of Meyerbeer's music was that he reconciled the principal properties of Italian and German music and forged a new style, which could be classified as "French". This view was often quoted "parrot-fashion" by people with no knowledge of music at all. Blaze de Bury, in his second article on Meyerbeer (Revue des Deux Mondes, 1859), sees him as incorporating not only Italian and German music, but indeed all music and literature of the time. In reference to Meyerbeer's role at the time he cites Mephistopheles' statement to Faust "On pourrait, je le vois, vous appeler le seigneur Microcosme" ("One could, I see, call you Mr Microcosm").[44] This tendency to confuse eclecticism with profundity was quite common. Meyerbeer was transformed into a symbol of the epoque and his eclecticism seen as a virtue. The popularity of Victor Cousin's philosophy is another instance of the favour held by theories of "eclecticism" at the time, and Cousin's philosophy has suffered the

---

[44] Blaze de Bury, RDM (1859), p. 646.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

same decline as Meyerbeer's music.[45]

Gustave Planche was one of the few people to combat the notion of Meyerbeer's international French style. Planche saw Meyerbeer as attempting to merge Italian and German styles, but with the final result being not a reconciliation, but a loss of virility, a negative victory. Meyerbeer's "blason appartient à toutes les races. Il . . . n'a oublié qu'une chose, de se donner des ancêtres" ("coat of arms belongs to all races. He . . . forgot only one thing, to give himself any ancestors").[46] Planche admits with a certain note of cynicism that Meyerbeer's method of writing was ideal for the French public, who always appreciated an easy victory.[47]

In his first article on Meyerbeer, Blaze de Bury complains of a lack of melody and abuse of modulation, despite excellent orchestration. In his second article he sees Meyerbeer as a great melodist, but then in this article Meyerbeer is faultless. After his Revue des Deux Mondes article of 1836, Blaze de Bury seems to have spent the rest of his life atoning for his early criticism, and his book on Meyerbeer even goes to some lengths to describe Meyerbeer's generosity in forgiving these early "rash" views.[48] Perhaps one of the most unusual comments on Les Huguenots is by Heine. Most reviews (for instance Mainzer, Sand, Castil-Blaze, and even to an extent "Ed. L.") have a decided preference for the last acts of the opera. Heine,

---

[45] Victor Cousin (1792-1867), French philosopher who developed a theory of philosophy that he himself called electicism that was based chiefly on the ideas of Descartes and Kant. His most well known work was Du vrai, du beau et du bien (1853). (GDEL)

[46] Planche, Chronique de Paris, 1836, p. 253.

[47] Planche, Chronique de Paris, 1836, p. 253.

[48] Blaze de Bury, Meyerbeer et son temps (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1856).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

however, while fully aware of the difference in musical styles between the acts and very appreciative of the splendours of the fourth act, claims that the second act is his favourite. His description of this act seems quite removed from reality; he draws comparisons with Shakespearean comedies and talks of melancholy states of feeling that express the desire of joy rather than joy itself.[49] In short, his imagination has transported him into a personal poetic realm. One cannot deny Heine the validity of his own experiences; however the question could be raised whether he perhaps delighted in elaborating on this act in the knowledge that it was the most disliked section of the opera. Heine's attitude to Meyerbeer (as stated in Chapter III) was extremely complex, and it is difficult to understand his motives.

In general terms the major problems that critics found with the music of Les Huguenots were lack of melody and abuse of harmony. Some also felt that Meyerbeer's renown for his instrumentation was exaggerated, while others felt that it was completely justified.

Two final points arising out of this body of criticism are first the attitude towards the characterization of Marcel, and second the opinions of Planche and Castil-Blaze on the standard of performance. Almost all the critics mention, either briefly or at length, the character of Marcel. Mainzer felt that Meyerbeer's music transformed Scribe's pale characterisation, and that Marcel's strong personality was created by the music alone. George Sand was also of this opinion. She exalted Marcel almost above all else in the opera, calling him "une des plus grandes figures dramatiques, une des plus belles personnifications de l'idée religieuse qui aient été produites par les

---

[49] Heine, "Le Grand Opéra. Rossini et Meyerbeer", De tout un peu", pp. 285-286.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

arts dans ce temps-ci" ("one of the greatest dramatic figures, one of the most beautiful personifications of the religious idea that has been produced by the arts in our times").[50] The young Blaze de Bury makes the interesting observation that though Marcel was indeed the most interesting personage of Les Huguenots, Meyerbeer seemed to have thought that provision of a characteristic motif (in Marcel's case, the Chorale theme Ein feste Burg) was sufficient to form a character. Bury feels that a comparison with, for instance, Mozart's "Papageno" shows how characterization by distinctive "motif" could be further developed.[51] Planche, who clearly does not appreciate Meyerbeer's use of a characteristic motif, perhaps unjustly sees the chorale theme as more of an accident than an ornament and questions its use in, for example, the middle of the banquet scene.[52] Whatever the nature of the criticism, Marcel was undoubtedly the character who made the most impression on the critics.

Unfortunately, only two critics, Planche and Castil-Blaze, comment at any length on the standard of performance, and they both thought the standard low. Castil-Blaze did not review the first performance, but performances in 1838. He felt that the chorus and principal singers sang out of tune and that all the acts were marked by hesitations that sometimes developed into real breaks in the continuity. Castil-Blaze described the audience as completely cold and unenthusiastic until the fourth act.

Planche, reviewing the first performance in 1836, also noticed a timidity and indecisiveness in the chorus. He felt this was largely

---

[50] Sand, "A Meyerbeer", Lettres d'un voyageur, p. 318.

[51] Blaze de Bury, RDM (1836), p. 695.

[52] Planche, Chronique de Paris (1836), p. 263.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

confined to the first act and due to the numerous last minute changes made by Meyerbeer which caused confusion in the minds of the chorus. According to Planche both the orchestra and chorus were too loud and the soloists on the whole acted poorly. It is curious that these criticisms are not echoed by other critics who, if they make any comment at all, tend to be more favourable. "Ed. L.", for instance, talks of "le concours de choristes habiles, et de ce prodigieux orchestre si admirablement conduit par M. Habeneck" ("the concurrence of talented choristers and of this prodigious orchestra so admirably conducted by M. Habeneck").[53] The overall pattern of these reviews is to talk first of the libretto, then of the music in either general or specific terms, and finally of the production and standard of performance. Several give a detailed description of the libretto (Mainzer, Planche, and "Ed. L." in particular), while others discuss it in more generalized terms. Many, for instance Desnoyers, Blaze de Bury, Schumann, and Planche, make an attempt to discuss Meyerbeer's historical role and evaluate his music as a product of the time. Discussions of the music make large divisions into harmony, melody, rhythm, and orchestration; and many critics at the same time mention individual pieces that appealed to them. Only Castil-Blaze and, to a lesser extent, Planche offer detailed description of each act and recount the libretto at the same time.

One of the striking things about this collection of reviews is the number of critics who seemed to have been inspired to make quite lengthy digressions on the subject of criticism itself. This is perhaps to be expected in the case of someone like George Sand who, in writing a letter rather than a review, was entitled also to talk about

---

[53] "Ed. L.", "Les Huguenots", Nouvelle Minerve (1836), p. 327.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the role of criticism and relate it to personal experiences. However, other critics raise questions about the role of criticism too. Mainzer talks about the need for the critic to combat idolatrous praise, and, similarly, Desnoyers once again discusses the need to control the "style admiratif" in criticism; while Blaze de Bury and Heine both discuss Meyerbeer as a social phenomenom and Planche expands on the properties of a man of talent.

Francis Claudon states that it is best to talk not just of Meyerbeer, but of the "cas Meyerbeer".[54] It is true that in reviewing Meyerbeer, critics were not only concerned with his music, but also with Meyerbeer as a "social phenomenon".[55] The digressions on the "role of the critic" were perhaps stimulated either directly or indirectly by the question of Meyerbeer's power over the press.

As said before, only Blaze de Bury and Planche expand at length on the quality and reception of the performance, but most critics have a few sentences about the singers and the production, and these invariably come at the end of the article.

To draw some very general conclusions from this body of criticism, the two most striking points are the fierce antagonism towards Scribe's libretto and the ambivalent feelings about the music, in particular in the first two acts. All the critics have some worthwhile things to say; however Planche and Castil-Blaze stand out as the most interesting. They have both clearly taken time over their

---

[54] Francis Claudon, "G. Meyerbeer et V. Hugo: Dramaturgie comparée", in Regards sur l'Opéra. Ballet comique de la Reine à l'Opéra de Pékin, Publications of the University of Rouen (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1976), p. 101.

[55] Jane Fulcher expands very interestingly on this in her article "Meyerbeer and the Music of Society", Musical Quarterly, 67 (1981), 213-229.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

work and go into a great deal of detail. The attention Castil-Blaze has given to the score is admirable; it is even a little surprising given the fact that he fundamentally disliked the work, which he entitled "le choral de Luther mis en musique et en cinq actes par Meyerbeer!" ("Luther's choral put into music and in five acts by Meyerbeer!")[56] This ironical tone is pervasive in all of Castil-Blaze's articles on Les Huguenots.[57]

ii.

Berlioz wrote five articles on Les Huguenots in 1836. The first three he wrote for the Revue et Gazette Musicale (6 March, 13 March, and 20 March) shortly after the première; the article of 6 March recounts the libretto and the others discuss the music. The two remaining articles were written for the Journal des Débats (10 November and 10 December) just after the publication of the score. In 1837 he wrote two articles, for the Revue et Gazette Musicale (21 May) and the Journal des Débats (27 May), on the début of Duprez in Les Huguenots.

Berlioz expresses basically the same opinions in both sets of 1836 articles, though, as might be expected, he gives much more

---

[56] Castil-Blaze, "Giacomo Meyerbeer. Les Huguenots", France Musicale, 13 May 1838, p. 2.

[57] Marie-Hélène Coudroy's dissertation on the press reception of Robert le Diable and Les Huguenots concludes that "le succès de ces ouvrages tient plus encore à des causes accidentelles qui préexistaient dans le public qu'à une influence déterminante de la presse" ("the success of these works was even more the result of accidental causes that were already present in the public than to a determining influence of the press") ("Les Créations de Robert le Diable et des Huguenots de Meyerbeer face à la critique", Diss. Conservatoire Supérieur de Musique de Paris, 1979, p. 208). Even the small sample of critics examined here would tend to suggest that this is true.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

detailed analysis in the Journal des Débats articles and discusses a greater number of individual movements. The articles for the Journal des Débats list more faults than do the Revue et Gazette Musicale articles, and this is obviously the result of a closer study of the written music. The Revue et Gazette Musicale articles, for instance, praise the first act chorus "A Table amis", whereas the Journal des Débats (10 November) article, although appreciative of several good points in the chorus, also notes two small faults, one a laxness in prosody and the other a skipping theme in the worst "Italian style". The manner in which Berlioz details faults in his articles for the Revue et Gazette Musicale is more forthright and direct, while the Journal des Débats articles tend to try to find an excuse for the fault. A good example of this difference in approach can be found in a comparison of the opening of the second Journal des Débats article with the opening of the third Revue et Gazette Musicale article. Both articles discuss the fourth and fifth acts of the opera.

In the Revue et Gazette Musicale article Berlioz states with some relief that the fourth and fifth acts are not comprised of light cavatinas ornamented with fioriture and vocalized passages, or of brilliant and picturesque vocal combinations that could be detached from the drama without it losing much of interest. Instead, states Berlioz, Acts IV and V comprise the drama of the opera for which the first three are just a prelude. The unmistakable inference here is that Berlioz found the first three acts inferior to the last two. In the Journal des Débats article Berlioz appears to be answering criticisms that had been directed against his article in the Revue et Gazette Musicale, criticisms made perhaps by Meyerbeer himself. The Journal des Débats article starts by saying that light cavatinas ornamented with fioriture are not easily given the grace and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

originality Meyerbeer gives them:

> [O]n peut écrire de la musique brillante et avantageuse pour le chanteur, qui soit en même temps dépourvue de toute invention et tissue tout entière de lieux-communs; je le sais. Aussi ne cherchai-je point à diminuer le mérite réel du compositeur dans ce travail ingrat et antipathique à ses habitudes.
>
> ([O]ne can write music that is brilliant and very advantageous for the singer, and that at the same time is devoid of any originality and entirely made up of commonplaces, I know. So, I was not trying to detract from the deserved merit of the composer in this business which is thankless and contrary to his practice.)[58]

The tone is almost petulant, as though Berlioz resents having to qualify his former judgements. In fact he ends by drawing virtually the same conclusion as in the Revue et Gazette Musicale article, since he insists on a difference in quality between the acts; an "ingenious musician" could have written the first three acts but only a "genius" the last two.[59]

Throughout the Journal des Débats articles one senses that Berlioz is cautious not to criticize too strongly and is trying to temper every criticism with an antidote of some sort. To give a few examples, his criticism of the Act I chorus, "L'Aventure est singulière": "Le rythme sautillant qui en fait le fond est peu distingué" ("The skipping rhythm that forms its basis is undistinguished"), is followed by the comment: "On voit que l'auteur n'a écrit ces quelques pages qu'à contre-coeur. . . . " ("One sees that the author has only written these pages against his better judgment . . ."). [60] The criticism of the Act III tutti, "Que le

---

[58] JD, 10 Dec. 1836, p. 1 (Cohen trans., p. 163, modified).

[59] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 1.

[60] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 1 (Cohen trans., p. 155, modified).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ciel": "un trop grand nombre de modulations enharmoniques" ("too many enharmonic modulations"), is followed by the remark: "Beaucoup de grands harmonistes comme lui l'ont quelquefois encouru" ("Many great harmonists like him have sometimes drawn this upon them").[61] Also the criticism of the fourth act where St Bris and Valentine sing different words to the same tune is countered by the remark: "Un instant de lassitude aura sans doute fait glisser le grand compositeur dans cette voie qui n'est pas la sienne" ("A moment of laxness will no doubt have caused the great composer to fall into a style that is not his own").[62] Berlioz's conciliatory manner is not confined to his reviews of Meyerbeer, but is used in other reviews as well, for instance in some of the reviews of Beethoven and Gluck, where it is somehow less objectionable. Perhaps this is because one can accept Berlioz calling Beethoven and Gluck "great composers" or "great harmonists", whereas with Meyerbeer it sounds too much like fawning. These Journal des Débats articles are more conciliatory than usual. As said before, the Revue et Gazette Musicale articles are more straightforward--perhaps too straightforward for Meyerbeer.

I shall now look at Berlioz's articles as a whole, using once again the general divisions of libretto, stage production, and score.

Perhaps one of the most striking points of comparison between Berlioz and the other critics is his tolerance of Scribe. Berlioz thought the libretto of Les Huguenots was good. To quote his general assessment: "[L]e nouveau livret de M. Scribe nous paraît admirablement disposé pour la musique et plein de situations d'un intérêt dramatique incontestable" ("M. Scribe's new libretto seems to

---

[61] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 1 (Cohen trans., p. 159).

[62] JD, 10 Dec. 1836, p. 1 (Cohen trans., p. 167, modified).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

us to be admirably arranged for the music and full of situations of an incontestably dramatic interest").[63] His recounting of the story in the first Revue et Gazette Musicale article is serious and straightforward, not at all ironical. The only criticism Berlioz makes of the organization of the libretto is that in Act V the passing across the stage of Marguerite de Valois's litter is a gratuitous contrast, not one motivated by the drama itself.[64] Of all the critics, Berlioz is the only one to have approved so wholeheartedly of the libretto in itself.

Berlioz was however led to question several other details of the libretto and its relation to the music. While other critics only at times mentioned a connection between the libretto and the music, for Berlioz they were intimately connected. For instance here is how he describes the second act of Les Huguenots:

> Le second acte a été jugé très sévèrement, et fort mal à mon avis. L'intérêt n'en est pas à beaucoup près aussi grand que celui du reste de la pièce; mais la faute en est-elle au musicien? Et celui-ci pouvait-il faire autre chose que de gracieuses cantilènes, des cavatines à roulades et des choeurs calmes et doux, sur des vers qui ne parlent que de rians jardins, de vertes fontaines, de sons mélodieux, de flots amoureux, de folie, de coquetterie, et de refrains d'amour que répètent les échoes d'alentour? nous ne le croyons pas; et certes, il ne fallait rien moins qu'un homme supérieur pour s'en tirer aussi bien.
>
> (The second act has been judged very severely and very poorly in my opinion. The interest is not anywhere near as high as that of the rest of the play; but is this the musician's fault? And could he compose anything other than the gracious cantilenas, cavatinas roulades, and the calm and sweet choruses on lines that only speak of pleasant gardens, of verdant fountains, of sweet harmonies, of words of love, of folly, of coquetterie and of amorous strains that echo everywhere? We do not think so; and indeed nothing less than a superior man was

---

63 RGM, 6 March 1836, p. 76 (Cohen trans., p. 146).

64 RGM, 6 March 1836, p. 76.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

needed to manage as well with them.)[65]

H. Robert Cohen has elaborated upon this point in his thesis on Berlioz's criticism of opera, and he takes it to be one of the fundamental features of Berlioz's critical code:

> For Berlioz, an operatic composition can be no greater than its libretto: lack of variety and contrast in the drama prevents the good composer (one who follows the dramatic logic of the text) from attaining interesting musical results.
> . . . . . .
> Berlioz is more concerned with the opportunities that a libretto offers for musical development than he is with the specific subject matter.[66]

This is a very valid point, and explains to a degree Berlioz's uncritical assessment of Scribe's literary ability; but to a degree only, because what it does not explain is why someone with Berlioz's appreciation of great literature and skill in writing (this applies not only to his criticism but to his libretti as well) should remain so uncritical of Scribe.[67] Other questions can be raised about Berlioz's attitude, expressed in his reviews of Les Huguenots, to the relationship between libretto and music. For instance, one might

---

[65] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 1 (Cohen trans., p. 156, modified).

[66] Cohen, "Berlioz on the Opera", pp. 38, and 41.

[67] In 1839 Berlioz even began negotiations with Scribe over a project for an opera called La Nonne sanglante, based on Lewis's The Monk. Nothing final came of the collaboration, which as David Cairns puts it "was almost inevitably abortive, owing to fundamental lack of confidence on both sides" (Glossary, Memoirs, p. 706). In his Mémoires Berlioz portrays Scribe as an opportunist, and gives the impression that Scribe had treated him badly over the affair with the Nonne sanglante. It is surprising then that Berlioz could still ask Scribe if he would assist in turning the Damnation de Faust into an opera, with the name Méphistopheles (CG III, 1847, 473 and 489). Obviously, regardless of his personal opinions, Berlioz never lost sight of the practical and material advantages that could be gained from a collaboration with Scribe.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wonder how often he reasoned that a poor libretto meant poor music, to justify the music of other composers. Not very often in fact. He did not like the libretto of La Juive, for instance, nor much of its music, yet he does not offer Halévy the pretext that he offered Meyerbeer. The same point could be made about many other works.

So, the example in question, the second act of Les Huguenots, needs to be examined more closely. Berlioz wonders whether Meyerbeer could have composed different music for lines such as "pleasant gardens", "verdant fountains", and the like, thereby giving the impression that these lines appear over the course of the act. The libretto shows however that all the offending quotations come only from Scene i, Marguerite's opening air, and the following dialogue with her page Urbain. Berlioz asks whether anything other than cantilenas, cavatinas, and roulades could have been composed for these lines. There are only two cavatinas in the opera, in the first and fourth acts, and both are labelled. The opening section of Marguerite's air could, it is true, feasibly be called a cavatina also. Marguerite's air is certainly encumbered by roulades, but to such an extent that one can only wonder (as with Isabelle's roulades in Robert le Diable) why Berlioz was not outraged. Castil-Blaze, not nearly as vigilant a detractor of roulades as Berlioz, commented on this air, "[C]est le plus pénible et le plus contourné de tous les recueils de vocalises qu'on ait jamais destinées à la Bravoure des premières chanteuses" ("[I]t is the most horrid and contorted collection of vocalises that has ever been destined to the Bravore of principal singers").[68] In the Revue et Gazette Musicale article of 20 March Berlioz comments on the entry of Raoul into the ballroom in the

---

[68] "Les Huguenots", France Musicale, 27 May 1838, p. 3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

fifth act:

> A peine les protestans ont-ils appris le massacre de leur frères, qu'ils doivent interrompre par un cri le porteur de la nouvelle, et se précipiter hors de la salle sans écouter d'inutiles détails. Ce défaut est du poète, je le sais, peut-être aussi le musicien n'a-t-il pas fait pour le pallier tout ce qu'il aurait pu. Plus le libretto est prolixe, plus la partition devrait marcher rapidement.
>
> (Scarcely have the Protestants learnt of the massacre of their brothers than they are obliged to interrupt the newscarrier with a cry and race out of the hall without listening to useless details. This is the librettist's fault, I know, and perhaps also the musician hasn't done all he could have to mitigate it. The more verbose the libretto is, the more rapidly the music needs to move.)[69]

Talking about the same scene in the Journal des Débats article of 10 December, Berlioz states that the major fault with Raoul's air is the very fact that it is an air.[70] The point is that the composer does have a choice of form, he is not entirely bound by the libretto, and thus he too can be at fault. In a way, this contradicts the argument built around the second act. This contradiction, coupled with Berlioz's slight distortion of facts about the layout of the second act and his failure to comment on issues for which his dislike was renowned, suggests that Berlioz was not saying what he really felt about the act. He develops his argument about Meyerbeer being cornered and unable to write anything but second-rate music as a cover-up for his distaste for the music; in this way he could criticize the music without criticizing Meyerbeer.

It is interesting that the faults in the second act later detailed by Berlioz, such as abrupt tonal transitions and too many

---

[69] RGM, 20 March 1836, p. 90.

[70] JD, 10 Dec. 1836, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

enharmonic modulations, are purely musical faults, or in other words faults unrelated to the problem of the musical setting of the libretto.[71]

As said earlier, though Berlioz rarely discusses stage production or décor at any length, he usually devotes a great deal of attention to singers' interpretations and acting. The articles on Les Huguenots are no exception. Berlioz comments briefly on the production, "Les ballets sont courts, fort heureusement: la mise en scène et les costumes font le plus grand honneur au goût savant de M. Duponchel, et plusieurs décors sont d'un effet magnifique" ("The ballets are short, luckily; the production and the costumes do M. Duponchel's wise taste great honour, and much of the scenery is magnificently effective").[72] Although he does not mention it, the fact that the production was less extravagant than Robert le Diable could only have pleased Berlioz, which his remark on the ballets indicates. On the level of performance Berlioz remarks, "Les acteurs, les choeurs et l'orchestre ont rivalisé de zèle et de talent. L'exécution a été des plus remarquables, sous le double rapport de l'intelligence et de la précision" ("The actors, the chorus, and the orchestra rivalled each other's zeal and talent. On the level of both intelligence and precision the performance was one of the most remarkable").[73] Then follows a short enthusiastic appraisal of each of the performers in

---

[71] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 2. Thus Berlioz's system, though true in many instances, does occasionally break down, and he criticizes works, such as those of Wagner, that are nevertheless dramatically perfectly consistent. As Katherine Kolb Reeve states in her dissertation: "[E]ven when presented with a lucid and unequivocal dramatic 'reason' Berlioz pronounced himself undeterredly against certain musical gestures and practices" (Reeve, Poetics, p. 216).

[72] RGM, 6 March 1836, p. 77 (Cohen trans., p. 150).

[73] RGM, 6 March 1836, p. 77 (Cohen trans., p. 149.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which particular attention is given to Nourrit and Falcon. All Berlioz's articles talk of the enormous success of the work: "Dès les premiers actes, deux morceaux ont été redemandés, et l'enthousiasme croiss[ait] jusqu'à la fin" ("Right from the first acts, two pieces were encored and the enthusiasm grew consistently until the end"),[74] and: "Le succès de cet admirable ouvrage croît à chaque représentation. . . ." ("The success of this admirable work grows with every performance . . ."). [75] As shown in the previous section, the only other critic who goes into detail about the standard of performance and the reception of the first performances is Planche, and he is quite critical.

There would need to have been a greater number of critics saying the same things for us to take Planche's opinion in any way as a criterion. Yet it is still interesting that Berlioz's views are so different, given the high level of performance he usually demanded and his insistence on precision in the orchestra and choir. Perhaps he was being less exacting than usual. Berlioz's reviews of Duprez's début in the 1837 production of Les Huguenots are more critical. Here he approaches Planche's, and also Castil-Blaze's opinion of the 1838 performances, as he quite firmly criticizes the negligence of the chorus: "Soit négligence, soit défaut de mémoire, toujours est-il qu'en maint endroit des Huguenots ils ont commis les erreurs les plus graves" ("Whether from negligence or memory lapses, it still remains that in many places in Les Huguenots they committed very grave errors"), and to a lesser extent the orchestra: "L'orchestre a bien aussi quelques peccadilles à se reprocher" ("The orchestra has also to

---

[74] RGM, 6 March 1836, p. 73 (Cohen trans., p. 136).

[75] RGM, 13 March 1836, p. 81.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be reproached for several peccadillos").[76] Berlioz felt that more rehearsals were needed and that the standard of performance would improve with time. It could be that he felt freer to comment on the performance once the success of the work was well assured. Even eight months made a difference to this freedom. In the Revue et Gazette Musicale articles of March 1836 the possibility of anyone disliking Meyerbeer seemed remote, yet by November the Journal des Débats articles are discussing two rival schools, those who liked and those who disliked Meyerbeer. It could also be the case, however, that the performances of 1837 really were inferior to those of 1836.

Berlioz's approach to the music of Les Huguenots is more analytical and detailed than the approach of any of the other critics. He examines each act separately, noting which sections are good and at the same time mentioning anything he feels could be improved.

The particular sections Berlioz likes are roughly the same as those marked by the other critics: the Act I cavatina, "Une Dame noble et sage", the Act III "Septuor", the Act IV "Bénédiction des poignards" and "Grand Duo", and the Chorale theme sung by Marcel. Berlioz adds more to the list however: Marcel's Act I "A bas les maudits", the Act III section of three choirs in ensemble, and the entire fourth act, not only two isolated numbers.

As said before, Berlioz joined the majority of critics in preferring Les Huguenots to Robert le Diable, and he also joined them in preferring the last two acts of Les Huguenots to the first three, though he continually stressed that the first three acts also had their good points. Marcel was Berlioz's favourite character and, unlike Blaze de Bury, Berlioz writes appreciatively of the manner in

---

[76] JD, 27 May 1837, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which Meyerbeer created the character, saying that it was not merely a matter of giving him a characteristic tune, but also of the accompanying harmonies and instrumentation (for instance the manner in which Marcel's recitatives were accompanied only by the sombre notes of the cello).[77] Meyerbeer's use of instrumentation and of mass vocal effects, and the strength of his dramatic expression, shown particularly in the fourth act, were what impressed Berlioz most of all. He points out numerous passages where there is a striking use of an individual instrument, for instance, the viole d'amour accompaniment in the second act "Choeur des baigneurs", the cello interplay in the fourth act "Grand Duo" (section "Tu l'as dit"), and the bass-clarinet accompanying Marcel in the fifth act Trio. He was impressed by Meyerbeer's ability to intensify dramatic expression by his careful and intelligent choice of instrument or instruments. The accompaniment to Marcel's first act aria, "A bas les maudits", was an instance described by Berlioz as a striking combination of instruments: the high piccolo coupled with the grave double-bass and pianissimo bass drum accompaniment. He uses the word "strange" to describe this instrumentation, and it is not really clear whether by this he did not also imply that it was a little odd.[78]

Berlioz does not talk about Meyerbeer's "lack of melody", yet he did not seem very taken with many of Les Huguenots' melodies, except for the cavatina, "Une Dame noble et sage". He was more impressed by Meyerbeer's manipulation of vocal effects--in particular the effect of the large chorus, but also of various interesting juxtapositions. For instance, he liked the third act dispute between two groups of women,

---

[77] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 1.

[78] RGM, 13 March 1836, p. 82.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which was animated by the "choc des dissonnances de seconde mineure et majeure, jetées avec force sur un débit syllabique brusquement accentué. . . ." ("shock of the dissonances of minor and major seconds flung forcefully into the midst of a flowing, syllabic, tersely accentuated passage . . . ").[79] Berlioz enjoyed Meyerbeer's occasional uses of syncopated or broken rhythms, of an ostinato bass (in the third act Duo and "Bénédiction des poignards"), and of counterpoint. One of his favourite passages was the countrapuntal juxtaposition of the three choruses in the third act, which he goes so far as to compare favourably with the three orchestras in the ball scene of Don Giovanni.[80]

In several places Berlioz notes original modulations which are effective because of their unexpectedness, for instance, in the assassin's song in the fifth act. In his description of the fourth act, however, every element is seen as excellent: unexpected harmony, original modulations, interesting rhythms, powerful use of massed voices, and exciting instrumentation. Berlioz describes in detail the entire climactic build-up of the act with such imagination and pacing that the notes virtually spring off the page. To quote a short section:

> Après quelques mots prononcés à voix basse, les moines font signe aux assistans de se mettre à genoux et les bénissent en traversant lentement les différens groupes. Alors, dans un paroxisme d'exaltation fanatique, tout le choeur reprend le premier thème, Pour cette cause sainte; mais cette fois, au lieu de diviser les voix en quatre ou cinq parties, comme auparavant, le compositeur les rassemble à l'unisson et à l'octave, en une seule masse compacte, au moyen de laquelle la tonnante mélodie peut braver les cris de l'orchestre et les dominer tout-à-fait; en outre, de deux en deux mesures dans les

---

[79] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 2 (Cohen trans., p. 161, modified)

[80] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> intervalles de silence qui séparent chaque membre de la phrase, l'orchestre se gonfle jusqu'au fortissimo, et, au moyen d'une attaque intermittente des timballes secondées d'un tambour, produit un ralement étrange, inouï, qui frappe de consternation l'auditeur le plus inaccessible à l'émotion musicale.
>
> (After several low-spoken words, the monks signal to those present to kneel, and, slowly passing amongst the various groups, they bless them. Then, in a paroxysm of fanatic exaltation, the whole choir takes up the first theme, "Pour cette cause sainte"; but this time, instead of dividing the voices into four or five parts as before, the composer joins them together in unison and in octaves, in a single compact mass, by means of which the thundering melody can brave the roar of the orchestra and dominate it completely. What is more, every two measures in the intervals of silence that separate each part of the phrase, the orchestra swells up to a fortissimo and, by means of intermittent attacks by the kettledrum seconded by a drum, produces a strange unparallelled death-rattle that instils consternation into even the listener the most untouched by musical emotion.)[81]

Although no critic neglects to mention the glories of this scene, no-one managed to produce such a convincing explanation of why it was great.

Berlioz regrets several small points about Les Huguenots, the main one being the lack of overture, upon which both Mainzer and Castil-Blaze also remarked. On other matters, too, Berlioz agrees with the disapproval of fellow critics, in particular Castil-Blaze. For instance, in common with Castil-Blaze, Berlioz notes some problems with prosody in the Act I "A Table amis" (though not to anywhere near the same extent as Castil-Blaze does), some banal rhythms in the Act I chorus, "L'Aventure est singulière", and, again, in "A Table amis". Berlioz even comments very discreetly on Meyerbeer's lack of development of melody, noting "quelquefois même de mélodies si piquantes dans leur laconisme, qu'on regrette presque de ne pas les

---

[81] JD, 10 Dec. 1836, p. 2 (Cohen trans., p. 168, modified).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

voir développées comme de véritables thèmes" ("sometimes even melodies so piquant in their brevity, that one almost regrets not seeing them developed as real themes").[82] Other faults noted by Berlioz can be grouped under the three headings: faults of harmony, faults of dramatic consistency, and unspecified faults, that is ones that are noted but not elaborated upon.

Faults of harmony are very minor. Berlioz details abrupt tonal transitions in Act II (which have already been mentioned), too many enharmonic modulations very close to one another, again in Act II in the tutti "Que le ciel", and too many modulations in the Act IV Duet.

The faults of dramatic inconsistency are clearly of the most importance to Berlioz. He details and expands upon four such faults. The first is in the finale of the third act where a second orchestra is placed on the stage. Berlioz comments that "le drame n'exigeait pas ce déploiement extraordinaire de forces instrumentales, et la musique n'y gagne pas assez pour le justifier" ("the drama did not demand this extraordinary display of instrumental forces, and the music is not thereby sufficiently enhanced to justify it").[83] The second fault is in the fourth act, where Saint-Bris and Valentine sing very different words to the same tune: "[L]a phrase musicale sous laquelle le compositeur a placé ces paroles de sentimens si opposés, [est chantée par] deux personnages dont l'un tremble et l'autre menace" ("[T]he musical phrase to which the composer has put these words so different in character [is sung by] by two people, one trembling and the other menacing").[84] Berlioz consistently objected

---

[82] RGM, 13 March 1836, p. 82.

[83] JD, 10 Nov. 1836, p. 2 (Cohen trans., p. 162).

[84] JD, 10 Dec. 1836, p. 1 (Cohen trans., p. 166).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to this practice, particularly in Italian opera.

The last two faults of dramatic inconsistency detailed by Berlioz are in the fifth act. The first, on which I have already commented, occurs when Raoul interrupts the ball with an aria to tell of the massacre and the aria has itself to be interrupted as the Huguenots rush from the ballroom to aid their brothers. The other fault is also connected with Raoul's air, but this time it is the silences between verses to which Berlioz objects. These silences Berlioz takes as meaning to suggest Raoul's feeling of suffocation, yet he feels that "un pareil degré de vérité n'est pas celui qui convient à un grand théâtre comme l'Opéra, où l'éloignement et le bruit de l'orchestre empêchent le spectateur de remarquer l'expression du visage. . . . " ("such a degree of truth is not fitting to a large theatre like the Opéra, where the distance and the noise of the orchestra prevent the audience from noticing the expressions on the faces . . ."). [85] This type of error, unnoticed in this instance by any other critic, was usually identified by Berlioz, especially where the music did not follow the dramatic implications of the text.

Finally, the unspecified faults noted by Berlioz are in the first, second, and third acts. He states that the accompaniment to Raoul's romance in the first act is much more interesting than the romance itself, thereby implying that he does not like the romance. About the second act finale he said,

> Le final, fort dramatiquement conçu, et plein d'effets d'orchestre saisissans, ferait la fortune d'un autre compositeur, mais pour Meyerbeer il n'est pas ce me semble d'une assez grande originalité sous le double rapport de la pensée et de la forme.
>
> (The finale, very dramatically conceived and full of

---

[85] JD, 10 Dec. 1836, p. 2 (Cohen trans., p. 170).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> striking orchestral effects, would make the fortune of any other composer, but for Meyerbeer it doesn't seem to me to be original enough, either in thought or form.)[86]

Precisely what he thought about the "thought" and "form" he does not state. Several times Berlioz commented that Marcel's solo with harps, "Voyez le ciel s'ouvre", in the fifth act was not up to the standard of the rest of the opera, but once again he does not give any reasons why it was not.

The fault implied in all three of these instances is that of lapsing into a second-rate, "empty" style--a fault that was remarked upon by nearly all the other critics as well. Berlioz does not elaborate in these cases. Perhaps as part of his policy of minimizing faults he did not wish to draw attention to too many cases where Meyerbeer was writing "in a style not his own".

Berlioz's Meyerbeer articles concentrate very much on the music. He neither digresses at length on other areas nor tries to explain Meyerbeer's social and intellectual position.

Berlioz basically liked the same sections of Les Huguenots as the other critics. He had the same preferences regarding individual acts and disapproved of several of the same faults, such as abuse of harmony and Italianisms (in vocal ornamentation). Where he differed most, as has already been pointed out, is in his detailed analysis of the music and in his study of the opera as a vehicle of "dramatic expression". He thought the dramatic expression occasionally rang false, but culminated magnificently in the fourth act. A close examination of Berlioz's analysis of the music shows that in his appreciation of the opera the fourth act stands out well above the

---

[86] RGM, 13 March 1836, p. 82.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

others. He has little good to say about the second act and sees the first, third, and fifth acts as being of mixed quality.

The general impression of the music of Les Huguenots given by the other critics is that of a flawed work with good and bad sections lying side by side. Although Berlioz says fundamentally the same thing, the overall impression he gives is different. Berlioz portrays Les Huguenots as a masterpiece in which there are several lapses, almost like slips of the tongue or pen, where Meyerbeer forgot himself or bowed momentarily to theatrical conventions. Berlioz aimed at toning down the lapses, and in the case of the second act he simply avoided detailing them altogether.

It is unlikely that Meyerbeer had ever bribed Berlioz. However, as mentioned in Chapter III, Meyerbeer's personal backing was of extreme importance to Berlioz, and the suspicion does remain that, for diplomatic reasons, in the case of Robert le Diable and Les Huguenots he was not always saying what he really thought about the music or performance.

Despite these qualifications, there can be no doubt that Berlioz genuinely appreciated Meyerbeer's talents, in particular his inventive instrumentation. Two articles have been written insisting upon Berlioz's sincere liking for Meyerbeer, one by Patrick Besnier and the other by Charles Stuart.[87] Besnier expresses anger at Boschot's implication that Meyerbeer was "paying Berlioz off".[88] He sees great similarities in Berlioz's and Meyerbeer's dramatic aspirations and even suggests that the reason why Berlioz's projected opera La Nonne

---

[87] Patrick Besnier, "Berlioz et Meyerbeer", Revue de Musicologie, 63 (1977), pp. 35-40. Charles Stuart, "Did Berlioz really like Meyerbeer?", Opera, 3 (Dec. 1952), 719-725.

[88] See Adolphe Boschot, Un romantique sous Louis-Philippe.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sanglante[89] was aborted was that Meyerbeer had already effectively covered the subject. Stuart also feels that Berlioz and Meyerbeer were "within certain limits trying to achieve the same things in opera".[90] There is undoubtedly some truth in this statement. Berlioz was very close to Meyerbeer in his love for the grandiose and his interest in instrumentation, but in certain fundamental aspects Berlioz differed radically from Meyerbeer, such as in his development of thematic material.

Charles Stuart's article looks closely at Berlioz's review of Le Prophète, demonstrating how Berlioz's praise outweighs his criticism. Though this review is outside the scope of this study, it is worth looking briefly at what Berlioz says in his correspondence concerning Le Prophète.

First of all there are a series of odiously fawning letters from Meyerbeer to Berlioz expressing his concern at Berlioz's ill-health and his hope that Berlioz can still come to the dress rehearsal. To quote one small extract from a letter written 15 April 1849 just before the first performance:

> Je vous aime immensément, vous le savez. Mais ce soir, je vous crains encore plus que je vous aime, par le désir que j'éprouve que ma partition vous impressionne en bien.
>
> Mille compliments et mille remerciements de ce que vous êtes venu avant-hier soir.
>
> Votre tout dévoué et tremblant
>
> Meyerbeer

---

[89] Some of Berlioz's music for La Nonne sanglante still survives (La Nonne sanglante, partition d'orchestre, MS fol. autograph, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale). In his article "Berlioz's Bleeding Nun" (Musical Times, 107 (July 1966), 584-588) A. E. F. Dickinson analyzes the fragments. He seem to me to overestimate the value of the music, and I tend to agree with Hugh Macdonald's assessment of the music as "undistinguished" (NG). Gounod eventually took over the libretto and his opera La Nonne sanglante was performed 18 Oct. 1854 at the Opéra.

[90] Stuart, "Did Berlioz really like Meyerbeer?", p. 723.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> (I love you immensely, you know that. But this evening, I fear you even more than I love you, because of the desire that my score should make a good impression on you.
>
> A thousand compliments and thanks for attending the night before last.
>
> Your trembling and devoted
> Meyerbeer [91]

Berlioz in a letter to his sister Nanci shortly after his review of Le Prophète says,

> Meyerbeer a le bon esprit de ne pas trop mal prendre les quatre ou cinq restrictions que j'ai introduites dans mes dix colonnes d'éloges. J'aurais voulu lui épargner la pénible impression que ces critiques exprimées avec une certaine énergie, lui ont fait éprouver; mais il y a des choses qui doivent absolument être dites; je ne puis pas laisser croire que j'approuve ou que je tolère seulement ces transactions d'un grand maître avec le mauvais goût d'un certain public.
>
> (Meyerbeer has the sense not to take too seriously the four or five qualifications that I introduced in my ten columns of eulogies. I would have liked to spare him the unpleasant impression these criticisms, expressed with a certain energy, gave; but there are some things that absolutely must be said; I cannot let it be thought that I approve or that I even tolerate these transactions of a great master with the bad taste of a certain public.)[92]

This statement is interesting for it shows that once again Berlioz has been kinder in his review than other critics, yet also that he himself has been much sterner towards Meyerbeer than in previous reviews. Berlioz's attitude of tolerance towards Meyerbeer's "weak patches" has turned to one of censure. His letter to Nanci continues,

> La partition néanmoins contient de très belles choses à côté de choses très faibles et de fragments détestables. Mais la magnificence incomparable du spectacle fera tout passer. Quelle tâche aujourd'hui que celle de faire réussir un opéra! Que d'intrigues! que de séduction à

---

[91] CG III, 1849, 620.

[92] CG III, 1849, 624.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> opérer, que d'argent à dépenser, que de dîners à donner! ...Cela me fait mal au coeur. C'est Meyerbeer qui a amené tout cela et qui a ainsi forcé Rossini d'abandonner la partie.
>
> (The score does nevertheless contain some very beautiful things alongside some extremely weak things and detestable fragments. But the incomparable magnificence of the spectacle will make it all alright. What a job it is today to make an opera succeed! What intrigues! What seductions to work, what money to spend, what dinners to give!...This makes me sick at heart. It is Meyerbeer who has caused all this and who has thus forced Rossini to give the game up.)93

This is a cry of despair, over the way musical advancement functioned, and shows Berlioz's resentment against Meyerbeer for his responsibility in the situation.

Meyerbeer, through his close friend the conductor Girard, had arranged for some scenes from Berlioz's Damnation de Faust to be performed at the prestigious Société des concerts (Conservatoire concerts), 15 April 1849. Was this an intelligent pre-première bribe?[94] Perhaps this gesture did affect Berlioz's judgement a little. If he were indeed aware of it, he might have moderated his criticism, but if so it would most probably have been unconscious, the impression given in the correspondence is that of someone who had taken great pains to be "honest". I would agree with Stuart that the tone of Berlioz's review of Le Prophète is straightforward and that he gives no hint of prevarication.

At the time of the première of Les Huguenots Berlioz was not overly concerned about Meyerbeer's method of opera production, but was rather very impressed by the amount of time taken in rehearsals. By 1849 he was understandably beginning to feel a little revolted by the

---

93 CG III, 1849, 624-625.

94 Mentioned by Boschot, Stuart, and others.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

whole rigmarole involved in producing a Meyerbeer opera. As time passed and Meyerbeer's fame solidified into legend--which led Heine to remark, "the mother of Meyerbeer was the second woman in history to see her son accepted as divine"[95]--Berlioz felt more able to state exactly what he felt about Meyerbeer.

To recapitulate, there is some doubt about Berlioz's sincerity in certain parts of his reviews of Les Huguenots, but less, if any, in his later reviews of Le Prophète. Certainly Berlioz felt Les Huguenots was a much better opera than Le Prophète. His great admiration for Les Huguenots is shown by the number of examples he uses from it to demonstrate points in his Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration.[96] Although Berlioz's editors would have requested that he write on Grand Opera, it was clearly a genre that interested him (unlike the average opéra-comique of the day). It could be said that in his reviews of the genre, he was, to an extent, raising theoretical issues that would later be of some importance to him when composing his opera Les Troyens.

---

[95] Quoted in Bernard Van Dieran, Down Among the Dead Men (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1935), p. 144.

[96] Five of the major examples in the Traité come from Les Huguenots.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter VI

Orchestral and Instrumental Music: Conservatoire Concert Series

The Société des concerts (the official name of the Conservatoire concert series) was registered as a private organization, but received an annual government subsidy of 2,000 francs and had free use of the Conservatoire hall. The orchestra was composed of faculty, both students and graduate, and its "strictly professional management and performing practices made its orchestra the best anywhere . . .".[1] It was renowned throughout Europe and envied even in Germany, the bastion of fine orchestras. Eight concerts were held each year during the winter season. The subscription list for the series consisted of a chosen 1,100.[2] It is not known precisely how this list was chosen, but "social status and personal influence--and chiefly the former--must have governed the process".[3] The series was popular amongst Parisian literati: Balzac, Hugo, de Vigny, Fontenay, and the artist Eugène Delacroix were subscribers.[4] As stated in the introduction, the Société was founded in 1828 by François Habeneck who conducted the orchestra until his death in 1849.[5] Berlioz saw the

---

[1] William Weber, Music and the Middle Class, p. 69.

[2] Berlioz repeatedly gives the figure 1,200 as the number of subscribers, for instance in his article in Le Rén., 25 Jan. 1835. William Weber gives the figure 1,100 (p. 70) which is the figure that I have taken to be more correct, given that both Antoine Elwart, Histoire de la Société des concerts (Paris: Castel, 1860), pp. 115-116, and Arthur Dandelot, La Société des concerts du Conservatoire de 1828 à 1897 (Paris: G. Havard, 1898), p. 8, give 1,078 as the number of tickets available.

[3] Weber, Music and the Middle Class, p. 70.

[4] Weber, Music and the Middle Class, p. 71.

[5] François-Antoine Habeneck (1781-1849), French violinist and
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

motivating force behind the establishment of the concert series to be the desire of a substantial number of people to become better acquainted with the music of Beethoven. This desire was fulfilled, as Beethoven became the most performed composer at the concerts. During the first thirty-one years of the society, Beethoven's nine symphonies were variously performed:[6]

1st	symphony	13	times	6th	symphony	51	times
2nd	"	26	"	7th	"	52	"
3rd	"	28	"	8th	"	14	"
4th	"	24	"	9th	"	19	"
5th	"	53	"				

The concert programmes were eclectic; a Beethoven symphony might be performed alongside an operatic aria, a solo fantasia, and sections from a requiem. The following programme, that of the first concert in 1828, gives a good idea of this mixture of musical genres:

> 1. Symphonie héroïque--Beethoven.
> 2. Duo de l'Opéra Sémiramus--Rossini.
> 3. Solo pour le cor à pistons, composé et exécuté par M. Meifred.
> 4. Air--Rossini.
> 5. Concerto nouveau de violon--Rode.
> 6. Choeur de Blanche de Provence--Cherubini.
> 6. Ouverture des Abencerrages [sic]--Cherubini.
> 7. Kyrie et Gloria de la Messe du Sacre--Cherubini (exécuté à grand choeur).[7]

Over the following years less Italian operatic arias were performed, perhaps in response to criticism from the press. The audience for the concerts was necessarily small; it came to represent

---

[5] (continued)
conductor and composer. (NG)

[6] The following list is quoted in Elwart, p. 309.

[7] Quoted in Elwart, pp. 130-131.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the elite of the musical intelligentsia and by its very exclusiveness attained a degree of prestige.

For Berlioz the Conservatoire concerts were manna. They provided him as a composer with the opportunity of hearing the works of the composers he most respected, and as a critic with the opportunity to write about music that really inspired him. The vocabulary he used in describing the Conservatoire hall is quasi-religious; he would talk of "un sanctuaire", of an "atmosphère embaumée de poésie ("atmosphere embalmed in poetry"). Attending Conservatoire concerts was an act of devotion to what Berlioz saw as the only musical institution in Paris dedicating itself solely to music. The enthusiasm of the audience was all the more impressive given the hall's uncomfortable seats and bad lighting.

Berlioz referred to the public attending the concerts as the only group of people capable of understanding truly great music and set them apart from the public which frequented the Opéra and the Théâtre Italien. With an almost paternal air he noted the growth in understanding of the Conservatoire concert audience, which had at one stage found Beethoven's music difficult and bizarre, but now responded to it with frenetic enthusiasm. He traces a similar development with respect to Gluck, though the resulting audience enthusiasm is milder than that for Beethoven. Berlioz does not portray the public as faultless. For instance he writes that "ce public-là . . . se trompe souvent malgré tout, puisqu'il lui arrive maintes fois de revenir sur ses propres décisions. . . ." ("this public . . . often makes mistakes in spite of everything, since it often happens that it goes back on its own decisions . . ."). [8] Yet he considered that its sensitivity,

---

[8] RGM, 22 Jan. 1837, pp. 29-30.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

its openness to new forms and new emotions, made it receptive to further change.

Within this general audience elite Berlioz once again positions the smaller elite of impassioned souls who like him are devoted to great music, who "donne parfois au lieu d'applaudissemens des pleurs ou des frémissemens d'une bien autre éloquence que celle des claqemens de mains" ("sometimes instead of applause give tears or sighs of quite a different eloquence from the clapping of hands").[9] He observed the growing popularity of Beethoven's music during the 1830s with great satisfaction, but also with a few misgivings, in that in becoming well-known Beethoven was becoming "à la mode" and attracting the attention of dilettantes as opposed to amateurs. In his review of a Conservatoire concert of 1835 Berlioz writes with distaste of a young dilettante who slept during the performance of the Beethoven symphony, but awoke for the Rossini aria; he had come to the concert because it was fashionable to do so, not because he liked the music of Beethoven.[10] Berlioz wished that Beethoven could be spared such disrespect, and would have preferred that his music remain the domain of those few who really appreciated it. This "closet" attitude towards Beethoven is also reflected in Berlioz's attitude to the duration of the Conservatoire concert series itself.

In his first and last reviews of the Conservatoire concerts Berlioz usually makes a melancholy comment on the shortness of the season. He often counters this however by adding that perhaps it is a

---

[9] Le Rén., 14 June 1835, p. 1.

[10] In a review for the RGM, 19 Feb. 1837, pp. 63-64, he comments ironically on the fashionableness of Beethoven, recounting how a trio by Pixis was mistakenly announced as by Beethoven, and vice versa. The audience responded with enthusiasm to the Pixis and coldness to the Beethoven.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

good thing that the season is so short since "la musique, comme toutes les sensations pures et vives, veut des organes dont l'habitude n'ait pas émoussé la sensibilité. . . ." ("music, like all pure and alive sensations, needs organs whose sensitivity has not been blunted by use . . .").[11] On another occasion he commented that "il ne faut les entendre [Beethoven etc.] qu'à de longs intervalles; et voilà pourquoi la rareté des séances du Conservatoire est elle-même une des conditions de leur succès" ("one must hear them [Beethoven etc.] only at long intervals and this is why the rarity of the Conservatoire meetings is itself one of the conditions for their success").[12] This is a surprising view considering how Berlioz had complained so trenchantly elsewhere of the lack of good music performed in Paris. He is nevertheless quite adamant that the series should last only for a short season and maintained this opinion even in the face of attacks on the exclusiveness of the institution.

With regard to this last point Berlioz slightly changed his opinion over the 1830s. In an article in Le Rénovateur of 1835 he wonders whether there could indeed be more than 1,200 people in Paris capable of appreciating the music performed at the concert series.[13] By 1837 he is a bit more worried about the issue and feels some compunction for those who do not have the chance to attend the concerts: "[M]alheureusement c'est un public fort restreint. Le peuple des amateurs n'y étant point admis, et n'ayant pour alimenter ou développer son goût pour la musique que des concerts, à très-peu d'exceptions près, ridicules ou mesquins, conserve ses préjugés et son

---

[11] RGM, 27 April 1834, p. 133.

[12] RGM, 30 April 1837, p. 152.

[13] Le Rén., 25 Jan. 1835, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ignorance" ("[U]nfortunately it is a very limited public. The lay population is not admitted at all, and having only concerts which, with very few exceptions, are ridiculous or paltry, to develop and sustain its taste for music, conserves its prejudices and ignorance.")[14] His answer to this problem is not to open the Conservatoire doors, but to encourage artists to break the barriers between institutions by playing Beethoven, for instance, in other venues. Liszt is cited as an artist who was breaking down such barriers by giving concerts variously at the Conservatoire, Opéra, Salle Erard, and elsewhere. Berlioz himself attempted to do the same with the concerts he was to give during the rest of his life, but he was emotionally bound to the preservation of the Conservatoire concert series as a select organization and dreaded its sancity being broken by brash intruders drawn by curiosity, rather than devotion.

To Berlioz's gratification, in the second half of the 1830s the music of Gluck and Mozart began to be performed fairly regularly at the concerts. He was less happy though about the performances of Weber's music, which he felt were both too few in number and too limited in repertoire, as only the Euryanthe overture was performed a great deal.[15] Berlioz criticized the programmes of the Conservatoire concerts for lack of variety.[16] His ideal programme would have been a mixture of old and new music; for instance he enthusiastically praised a programme in 1837 that combined the music of Ries and Cherubini with the music of Beethoven and Gluck.[17] But he disliked the eclecticism

---

[14] Chronique de Paris, 7 May 1837, p. 310.

[15] RGM, 12 March 1837, p. 89.

[16] RGM, 14 Feb. 1836, p. 55.

[17] RGM, 26 March 1837, p. 101.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the programmes combining the music of Beethoven with, for instance, popular arias; and he comments that the public, though initially accepting such practices, had begun expressing their discontent also. When in a concert in 1834 the violinist Haumann ended his fantasia on "la prière de la Muette" with a set of fashionable pizzicato variations, Berlioz cried out against such degradation of music. Other audiences might expect such antics, he wrote, but not the Conservatoire audience.[18] Surprisingly, however, he appeared to enjoy some of the solo performances in between large works. These soloists were often members of the orchestra, such as the oboist Brod, the flautist Tulou, and the cellist Franchomme, who frequently performed fantasias or sets of variations of their own composition.[19] Berlioz always mentioned these compositions, even if only briefly, and he remarks in one of his reviews of 1837 that a solo performed in between works of great emotional content could give the audience time to rest:

> Un fragment de la Messe du Sacre de M. Chérubini succédait au chef-d'oeuvre de Beethoven. C'est à tort, selon nous, qu'on l'avait ainsi placée; puisque le programme annonçait une fantaisie pour le hautbois, il eût été plus convenable de la mettre après la symphonie. L'auditoire aurait eu le temps de se reposer, et, sans rien faire perdre de son effet au solo gracieux et élégant de M. Brod. . . .
>
> (A fragment of Cherubini's Messe du Sacre followed the Beethoven masterpiece. In my opinion it was wrong to place it there; since the programme announced an oboe fantasia, it would have been more appropriate to place it after the symphony. The audience would have had time to rest, and none of the effect of the gracious and

---

[18] Le Rén., 11 May 1834, p. 1.

[19] Henri Brod (1799-1839), French oboist and composer.
Jean-Louis Tulou (1786-1865), French flutist.
Auguste Franchomme (1808-1884), French cellist and composer.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

elegant solo of M. Brod would have been lost. . . .)[20]

In other instances he is not so charitable towards "solo fantasias" and indeed generally writes of them with displeasure, listing them as things to be avoided alongside "cavatines italiennes","opéras-comiques en un act", "contredanses" et cetera. In another 1837 Conservatoire concert review he is very critical of a set of clarinet variations performed after a Beethoven symphony, and states that the solo- virtuosi should realize the danger they run in performing alongside the music of Gluck and Beethoven and desist from playing in these concerts.[21] The context was obviously important; for instance the solos performed by artists at the Conservatoire concerts were more tasteful than the showy arrangements of popular arias often performed in the fashionable salons of the day. Yet despite the fact that Berlioz seemed to have enjoyed some of the Conservatoire concert solos, ultimately he did not consider either these solos, or their showy counterparts, as appropriate to the concert series.

Beethoven and Gluck were the two figures dominating Berlioz's reviews of the Conservatoire concerts. He frequently devotes more than half his review to their works, gives a detailed descriptive analysis of the music, and in the case of Gluck notes all the places where the performance diverged from the score.

Berlioz was perhaps aware that the intensity of his enthusiasm for Beethoven's music laid him open to attack and so carefully notes passages where Beethoven could be said to have erred in some way. In a review in which he is clearly answering criticism accusing him of

---

[20] RGM, 30 April 1837, p. 152.

[21] RGM, 12 March 1837, p. 89.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

deifying Beethoven, Berlioz argues that he is merely stating the truth; he then points to those instances where he has, as he puts it, detailed the small faults that link Beethoven to humanity. The review continues with what Berlioz labels an unemotional and objective account of the Beethoven C minor symphony, where he relates not his own but the audience's reaction, which is, needless to say, one of rapturous enthusiasm.[22]

A certain amount of new music was performed at the Conservatoire concerts, and while Berlioz always examined it conscientiously, it was rarely with great enthusiasm or at great length. It is difficult at times to discern what he felt about some of his contemporaries. As he himself said, there were "fort peu de compositeurs vivants sur lesquels je puisse exprimer à peu près franchement ma pensée. . . . " ("very few living composers about whom I can more or less frankly express my opinion . . ").[23] I shall briefly examine Berlioz's reviews of contemporary orchestral and instrumental music, expanding the scope slightly to include reviews other than those of the Conservatoire concerts and bearing in mind the necessary diplomacy involved in writing about his contemporaries.

As already stated, Berlioz did not write extensively on the contemporary music performed at the Conservatoire concerts and other scattered instrumental or orchestral concerts. When he does discuss the work of young composers he frequently deals with the problems they faced as composers rather than with the quality of their works. The composers whose work Berlioz most appreciated and wrote about were Le Sueur, Liszt, Cherubini, and Urhan. Other composers whose works,

---

[22] JD, 18 April 1835, pp. 1-2.

[23] CG II, 1838, 434.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

being occasionally performed, were reviewed by Berlioz were Hiller, Onslow (reviewed several times), Rousselot, Reber, Spohr, Turbry, Täglisbeck, and Ries.

It is difficult to separate Berlioz's opinion of the compositions of Liszt and Chopin from his comments on their roles as virtuoso performers. I shall thus discuss Berlioz's examination of their music in the concluding section of this chapter, where I shall briefly examine his opinion of virtuosi.

Le Sueur was Berlioz's teacher and mentor and assumed a paternal as well as pedagogical role in Berlioz's early years in Paris.[24] In his articles (particularly in the obituary notice of 1837)[25] Berlioz conveys both respect for Le Sueur as an individual and admiration for his music.

Le Sueur's influence on Berlioz's ideas about music was extensive. Octave Fouque in his book Les Révolutionnaires de la musique comments at length on the similarities between Berlioz and Le Sueur. He mentions amongst other points Le Sueur's desire for each of his Masses to be appropriate to the occasion, his wish to be able to write his own words, his sense of the grandiose, his dislike of unmotivated vocal fugues (such as fugal amens), and the lack of piano music in his

---

[24] Jean-François Le Sueur (1760-1837), French composer and writer on music. One of the most prominent musicians during the Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration, he distinguished himself as a composer of religious music and operas, the most famous of which was Ossian ou les bardes (1834). He taught composition at the Conservatoire from 1818 to 1837 and also devoted the last years of his life (1830-1837) to theoretical writings. (NG) An excellent book has just recently been published on Le Sueur by Jean Mongrédien, Jean-François Le Sueur: Contribution à l'étude d'un demi-siècle de musique française (1780-1830), 2 vols (Berne: P. Lang, 1980).

[25] JD, 15 Oct. 1837, pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

repertoire.[26] Fouque extravagantly claimed that "si Berlioz est Dieu, Lesueur assurément fut son prophète" ("if Berlioz is God, Le Sueur was surely his prophet"), and that "le meilleur de l'oeuvre de Lesueur est Berlioz" ("Le Sueur's best work is Berlioz").[27] Certainly, in his reviews of Le Sueur Berlioz dwells noticeably on the above issues, in particular on the importance of writing music appropriate to the occasion and the text. He remarks in his review of Le Sueur's Oratorio Noémi, "La naïveté et le charme douloureux de ces paroles se retrouvent en entier dans la musique" ("The naïvety and mournful charm of these words can be found again in their entirety in the music"),[28] and often quotes Le Sueur's fugue "Quis enarrabit caelorum gloriam" as an example of a successful vocal fugue that is dramatically motivated.[29] However, as David Cairns comments, "Berlioz . . . disagreed fundamentally with Lesueur's Gluckian theory of music as the obedient servant of text and dramatic idea, believing instead in a Beethovian symphonic ideal of music 'wholly in command'".30

For Berlioz, Le Sueur represented most significantly "la sublimité du style biblique" ("the sublime biblical style"). His skilful manoeuvring of large forces and simplicity of forms[31] and his cunning in evolving a method of composition that enabled his music to

---

[26] Octave Fouque, Les Révolutionnaires de la musique (Paris: C. Lévy, 1882).

[27] Fouque, pp. 9 and 180. Fouque writes Le Sueur as one word.

[28] JD, 21 Nov. 1835, p. 2.

[29] JD, 9 Aug. 1835, p. 3.

[30] Cairns, Glossary, Memoirs, p. 686.

[31] Berlioz at times however found the forms too simple when performed in an orchestral hall: "ses simples, trop simples combinaisons, ont produit le plus triste effet. . . ."("these simple, too simple combinations produced the saddest effect. . .") (CG I, 1829, 252).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be properly heard in a cathedral filled Berlioz with admiration, and surely acted as an inspiration for his own Requiem. It must have been a pleasure for him to analyse the work of a friend whose works he sincerely admired, despite the differences in their opinions.

When he boasted of his unbiassed approach to the music of his enemies, Berlioz probably had Cherubini uppermost in his mind. Extracts from Cherubini's music, largely religious, were often performed at the Conservatoire concerts. Berlioz responded to them with enthusiasm, to the extent of calling Cherubini's Requiem in C Minor (in particular the Marche de la communion and Agnus dei) the work of a poet and musician--a high recommendation and one that he reserved normally for composers such as Beethoven and Gluck.[32] A performance of an air from Cherubini's opera Les Abencérages prompted Berlioz to place it in "l'école de Gluck" and laud it for its "profondeur tragique, . . . son orchestre parlant et ses formes dédaigneuses de futiles ornemens" ("tragic depths, . . . its talking orchestra and its forms scornful of futile ornaments").[33] His reservations about Cherubini's music were connected with its dramatic inappropriateness. In particular he considered that Cherubini gave rough and bombastic interpretations of religious texts,[34] and also that he used repeated vocal "amens"[35] and dramatically unmotivated fugues.[36] In his two reviews of Cherubini's book Cours de contrepoint

---

[32] Le Rén., 30 March 1834, p. 1, and GM, 27 April 1834, p. 134.

[33] Le Rén., 27 April 1834, p. 1.

[34] JD, 23 June 1835, p. 1, and RGM, 6 March 1836, p. 79. The article is unsigned (see Appendix B).

[35] In Cherubini's Pater noster, JD, 12 Feb. 1835, p. 2.

[36] JD, 9 Aug. 1835, p. 3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

et fugue Berlioz scoffs at the idea that the fugue is the basis of all composition, to the neglect of melody, application of music to the drama, the expression of the passions, and other important areas.[37] In his commentary on Cherubini's "Dies irae" from the C Minor Requiem, Berlioz suggests that the text could have been interpreted in a more complex and invigorating manner if the author had been able to break through the barriers of orchestral organization to which he was bound. In other words Cherubini had gone as far as he could within the limitations of his orchestration, but it was possible to go still further.[38] Though Berlioz makes this statement in specific reference to one extract, surely it has implications for all of Cherubini's music. Thus without denying Berlioz's genuine appreciation of Cherubini's gift for expressive music it can be said that he had misgivings not only about Cherubini's "dramatic improprieties", but also about the conservatism of his orchestration, which was in any case a related issue for Berlioz.

The works of Cherubini and Le Sueur reviewed by Berlioz were, with the exception of some of Cherubini's works for unaccompanied choirs, portions of larger works designed for grand ensembles. Although he eulogized over the chamber music (chiefly that of Beethoven) performed by groups such as the Tilmant, Müller, and Baillot quartets[39] and various chamber groups organized by Liszt,

---

[37] Le Rén., 21 Sept. 1835, pp. 1-2, and JD, 22 Dec. 1835, pp. 1-2.

[38] JD, 9 Aug. 1835, p. 3.

[39] Tilmant Quartet: Théophile Tilmant (1799-1878), French violinist and conductor, formed a quartet with his cellist brother Alexandre. (NG) During the 1830s he held Matinées at which chamber music was performed. In 1838 he formed the Société de la musique de chambre, which performed works by contemporaries and by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. (Fétis) Berlioz discusses the Quartet in Le Rén., 8

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berlioz only occasionally elaborated on the actual performances. Indeed, any discussion of the quartet members tended to examine their merits as interpreters of Beethoven.[40] On several occasions, however, he does devote major portions of articles to discussion of Beethoven's chamber music.[41]

A performance in 1834 of some of the chamber music of Henri Reber inspired Berlioz to write an article about Reber's music for Le Rénovateur. In the article he expresses admiration in general terms for Reber's instrumentation, expressiveness, and original harmonies.[42] Half the article is about the iniquities of the Concours for the Prix de Rome, and a great deal of the impetus behind Berlioz's enjoyment of

---

[39](continued)
Feb. 1835, p. 1, where he states that the other members of the quartet were violinist Claudel and violist Urhan.

Müller: German family of musicians, four brothers of which (Karl, Georg, Gustav, Theodor) formed a string quartet that toured all over Europe from about 1832 to 1855. Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven were their principal repertoire. (NG) They performed in Paris at Soirées held by Maurice Schlesinger.

Baillot Quartet: Pierre Baillot (1771-1842), French violinist and composer, organized various chamber music concerts in Paris from 1814 onwards. The members of his quartet were Baillot, Vidal, Urhan, and Norblin. (CG I, 244, n. 1)

[40] A most striking example of this occurs in Berlioz's review of the Tilmant Quartet for Le Rén., 12 Jan. 1834, where he discusses each performer separately in relation to the role of their particular instrument in a Beethoven Quartet. Another example can be found in the RGM, 5 Feb. 1837, pp. 50-51.

[41] For example, Le Correspondant, 6 Oct. 1829, p. 215, and JD, 12 March 1837, p. 1.

[42] Le Rén., 20 July 1834, p. 1.

Henri Reber (1807-1880), French composer and teacher. He attended the Paris Conservatoire where he studied harmony under Reicha and composition under Le Sueur. He wrote several works for theatre, largely opéras-comiques, though his main interest was in instrumental music. He taught at the Conservatoire from 1862, and is remembered chiefly for his Traité d'harmonie (1862). (NG) Frédéric Robert (author of the NG article) gives the date of Reber's first chamber works as circa 1835. Berlioz's Le Rén. article of July 1834 shows that in fact these chamber pieces were written at an earlier date.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reber's music seems to be derived from the fact that he failed the Concours. Berlioz details the benefits of not being sent to Rome and comments on the consequent original style of Reber, "[R]ien de plus éloigné des formes ou plutôt des formules scholastiques, que le style tout individuel qui caractérise ses compositions" ("[N]othing is more removed from the scholastic forms, or rather formulae, than the completely individual style that characterizes his compositions.")[43] Berlioz does not review Reber's chamber music again, though in 1861 he wrote on the publication by Richault of four of Reber's symphonies.[44]

The Le Rénovateur article on Reber is in fact typical of several of Berlioz's reviews of contemporary composers in which the composer's work is used only as a springboard from which to launch an attack on the Concours and the conservatism of the Conservatoire. In general Berlioz finds the actual music of these contemporary composers uninspiring though relieved by interesting passages. The chief virtue of such music lies in its being the product of composers excluded from the system. This is the case with Berlioz's reviews of Rousselot,[45] who never won the Prix de Rome, and Léfebure,[46] who succeeded only in gaining a second prize.

The most famous French composer of chamber music at the time was Georges Onslow.[47] Onslow is mentioned quite frequently by Berlioz, but

---

[43] Le Rén., 20 July, 1834.

[44] JD, 23 July 1861. See ATC, pp. 341-347.

[45] Scipion Rousselot (1800-18?), French composer and cellist. Le Rén., 17 Feb. 1834, p. 1.

[46] Victor Léfebure (1811-1840), French pianist and composer. Le Rén., 5 Nov. 1835, p. 2.

[47] Georges Onslow (1784-1853), French composer of English descent. He studied theory and composition with Reicha at the Conservatoire and wrote a number of songs and piano variations and three

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with great reticence. He seems to have appreciated Onslow's use of harmony most of all, but he rarely writes more than a few sentences about his music, either merely announcing that it was performed[48] or giving just a few phrases of moderate praise.[49] An excellent example of Berlioz's evasive style occurs in one of these reviews of Onslow's music: "La beauté calme de plusieurs de ses adagio et de la verve pétulante de la plupart de ses finales (presto) témoignent de la facilité avec laquelle il manie les styles les plus opposés" ("The calm beauty of several of his adagios and the lively animation of most of his finales prove the facility with which he manages the most opposing styles").[50] It is hardly an example of great facility with opposing styles to be able to write calm adagios and lively finales.

Apart from Beethoven's chamber music, the only chamber music Berlioz discusses at any length is that of Urhan. He also discusses Urhan's music for solo piano and small ensembles.[51] Urhan's mystical

---

[47] (continued)
operas, but his major output was his chamber music, of which he wrote amongst other works thirty-four string quintets and thirty-five string quartets. His chamber music was performed in Paris and some of it was printed in the late 1830s by Breitkopf & Härtel. (NG)

Another composer of chamber music at this time, French pianist and composer Henri Bertini (1798-1876), is mentioned only once, in passing, by Berlioz during the period under consideration; he finds a Sextet by Bertini "plein de verve et de fraîcheur" ("full of life and freshness") (Le Rén., 5 April 1835, p. 1).

[48] RGM, 6 March 1836. The article is unsigned, see Appendix B.

[49] RGM, 27 March 1836, p. 98.

[50] JD, 10 Sept. 1837.

[51] Chrétien Urhan (1790-1845), French violist, violinist, and composer of German descent, well-known for his improvisation and sight-reading on many instruments, and above all for his viola playing. He was a member of the Baillot quartet and played the viola in Anton Bohrer's quartet (German brothers Anton and Max Bohrer visited Paris in 1827 and performed the late Beethoven string quartets with Tilmant and Urhan). His promotion of Bach, Handel, and Schubert impressed Liszt, who asked him to play in his concerts of Beethoven's
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Christianity and prudery were obviously the cause for some ridicule in the sophisticated musical circles of the day. Berlioz admired Urhan's strength of character, his sincerity, and the way all his activities, including his music, seemed to be an extension of his faith. Urhan was also a champion of Beethoven. An outstanding viola player, he performed the solo in Harold en Italie many times. In all his reviews of Urhan's music Berlioz comments on the peculiar intimacy of the works and the need for them to be performed in correspondingly intimate surroundings with a select audience of sympathetic intelligent listeners. Berlioz stresses that in order to appreciate Urhan's music the listener must be able to enter into the spirit of the music; this is particularly the case with his composition Auditions:

> Pour toutes les personnes placées hors du point de vue de l'auteur, les auditions sont une oeuvre absurde, pour celles au contraire qui ont assez de religiosité dans l'âme pour pouvoir comprendre l'exaltation d'un artiste à la fois pieux et passionné comme M. Urhan, cet ouvrage, dans son audacieuse simplicité, sera la source des plus vives émotions.
>
> (For all people who do not understand the author's point of view, Auditions is an absurd work; for those, on the contrary, who have enough religiosity in their soul to be able to understand the exaltation of an artist both pious and passionate like M. Urhan, this work, with its audacious simplicity, will be the source of the most lively emotions.)[52]

Berlioz seems to feel some reticence in criticizing Urhan's music, almost as though in criticizing the music he felt he would be criticizing the validity of the religious experience. Consequently, much of what Berlioz writes about Urhan takes the form of sympathetic

---

[51](continued)
music at the Salle Erard. (NG)

[52] JD, 21 Nov. 1835, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reverie--but not all, however.

Urhan's composition Auditions was inspired by a mystical experience in which an angel accompanied by an Aeolian harp sang to him; his music attempts to convey that experience as precisely as possible. Berlioz applauds the attempt and describes in great detail the way the Aeolian harp is represented on the piano, but finally admits that he feels the harp would have been better represented by the viole d'amour (an instrument often used by Urhan) and the angel by a ten to twelve year old boy rather than a female singer.[53] The only other direct criticism Berlioz makes of Urhan is of one of the pieces, "Orage", from Urhan's piano composition Lettres à Elle, in which Berlioz felt Urhan had mistakenly tried to represent a "storm" of the heart by sounds associated with a meteorological storm, depicting rather the "mugissemens d'une tempête véritable que les mouvemens tumultueux d'un orage du coeur. . . ." ("roar of a real tempest than the tumultuous movement of a storm of the heart. . ").[54] Berlioz's appreciation of Urhan seems to stem from admiration for his integrity rather than from real involvement with his music. Indeed the very conditions that Berlioz says are required for an appreciation of Urhan's music hint at its limitations: music that could only be really appreciated by people with the same religious piety as Urhan was never going to attain the universal significance of, say, the music of Beethoven or even the works of Le Sueur. Berlioz nevertheless understood Urhan's desire to write for and perform to intimate gatherings only.

---

[53] JD, 26 Aug. 1836, p. 1.

[54] JD, 26 Aug. 1836, p. 1. The same point is also mentioned in Le Rén., 16 Nov. 1834, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berlioz writes little about any of the contemporary symphonies performed at the Conservatoire concerts, but there are three specific complaints that he makes. First the music, though skilfully and carefully composed, is finally too scholastic and lacks excitement and originality;[55] second the work resembled Beethoven symphonies too strongly;[56] and third the symphony needed to be heard again or be given more time for absorption before it could be examined properly. This last point appears to have been dissimulation since it was unlikely that Berlioz would hear the works again, or at least not for some time.[57] The only relatively detailed accounts by Berlioz of contemporary symphonies are in his reviews of Hiller.[58] Although he appreciates many features of Hiller's symphonies, such as "la mélodie distinguée, l'harmonie toujours pure et claire, et l'ordonnance générale pleine de tact et de goût" ("the distinguished melody, the always pure and clear harmony, and the general organization full of tact and taste"),[59] his praise is moderate and circumspect. Hiller represents another instance of the "correct" and academic approach

---

[55] See for instance his reviews of Thomas Täglichsbeck (1799-1867), German violinist and composer, in RGM, 31 Jan. 1836, p. 38, JD, 24 Feb. 1836, p. 2, and RGM, 9 April 1837, p. 123, and his review of Louis Spohr (1784-1859), German composer, violinist, and conductor, in JD, 23 June 1835, p. 3.

[56] See his reviews of Rousselot in Le Rén., 17 Feb. 1834, and of Ferdinand Ries (1784-1838), German pianist, composer, and copyist, in RGM, 26 March 1837, p. 101.

[57] See his reviews of François Turbry (1795-1859), French composer, in Le Rén., 12 Oct. 1835, p. 1, and Onslow in Le Rén., 8 April 1834, p. 1, and GM, 27 April 1834, p. 134.

[58] Ferdinand Hiller (1811-1885), German pianist, composer, and conductor. He lived in Paris from 1828 for almost seven years and was a close friend of Berlioz's during this time. (NG) Major reviews of Hiller are in Le Rén., 29 Dec. 1833, and JD, 25 April 1835.

[59] JD, 25 April 1835, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with only the occasional flash of poetic inspiration, and was linked more to Haydn than to Beethoven.[60]

During the 1830s Liszt and Berlioz were good friends, corresponded regularly, and did what they could to help each other. Liszt's arrangements of Berlioz's Symphonie fantastique, Lélio, and sections from Harold en Italie played a role in making these compositions known to a wider public and provoking an interest in Berlioz's works outside Paris. Schumann's laudatory article on the Symphonie fantastique was based entirely on Liszt's piano transcription of 1835.[61] When in Weimar in 1852 and 1855, Liszt organized festivals of Berlioz's works, and in the second concert Berlioz himself conducted the Symphonie fantastique and the first performance of Liszt's Piano Concerto in E flat with Liszt as soloist.[62] The question of whether his friendship with Liszt biassed Berlioz's critical judgement is difficult to answer. Perhaps it affected him more in what he neglected to criticize, since it is surprising that Berlioz is not more critical of Liszt for his choice of programme in the early 1830s and his abuse and distortion of scores.

Liszt's use of variation form and arrangements of popular operas were not criticized by Berlioz, who felt that Liszt did not use the

---

[60] The article in the JD, 25 April 1835, distinguishes the last two movements of Hiller's first symphony as being superior to the rest of the work because of "une tendance poétique plus en harmonie avec les exigences de l'époque" ("a poetic tendency more in keeping with the demands of the time"). Another contemporary composer that Berlioz classed in the school of Haydn rather than Beethoven was J. J. Printemps, a composer from Lille (see his review in RGM, 17 Sept. 1937, pp. 415-416).

[61] Written for the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik of 1835.

[62] Quoted in the "Register of Persons" in Alan Walker, ed., Franz Liszt (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1976), p. 373.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

forms merely to display his technical skill:

> Dans une foule de passages de ces nouvelles oeuvres, il est aisé de reconnaître le plus haut mérite purement de pensée, d'où résulte un effet absolument indépendant du prestige de l'exécution. Je citerai, entre autres parties remarquables sous ce rapport, l'introduction de sa Fantaisie sur le Pirate, où une phrase de deux mesures est traitée avec un art admirable, sans ornements, sans traits, sans le secours d'aucun des nombreux moyens que la pyrotechnie musicale mettait à sa disposition.
>
> (In a host of passages in these new works it is easy to recognize the highest merit purely of thought, which results in an effect that is absolutely independent of the prestige of the performance. I cite, amongst other remarkable passages in this respect, the introduction to his Fantaisie sur le Pirate, where a phrase of two beats is treated with an admirable art, without ornaments, brilliant passages, or the help of any of the numerous means that musical pyrotechnicality puts at his disposal.)[63]

This quotation comes from an article of 1836 in which Berlioz talks of a modification in Liszt's style as a performer, implying a corresponding modification in Liszt's compositional technique. That is, the rhetorical decorations added by Liszt to the music of others were also to be found in his own compositions of the time, for instance in his variations on Paganini's La Campanella. In 1837 Liszt himself wrote of the change in his compositional and performance style and of how in his early years everything he performed aimed primarily to highlight his virtuosity and serve his self-esteem.[64] Liszt's declaration seemed to liberate Berlioz, and two months later he wrote a direct criticism of Liszt's earlier style, for the Journal des Débats, in which he disparages the way Liszt used to distort the

---

[63] RGM, 12 June 1836, p. 200.

[64] He wrote about the change in his articles "Lettres d'un bachelier ès-musique", RGM, 1837. Cited in Chapter I.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Beethoven C sharp minor Piano Sonata:

> [S]uivant l'usage alors adopté pour se faire applaudir du public fashionable: au lieu de ces longues tenues des basses, au lieu de ces voix mourantes des dessus, au lieu de cette sévère uniformité de rhythme et de mouvement dont je viens de parler, il plaça des cadences, des tremoli, il pressa et ralentit la mesure, troublant ainsi pas des accens passionnés le calme de cette tristesse, et faisant gronder le tonnerre dans ce ciel sans nuages qu'assombrit seulement le départ du soleil. . . . Je souffris cruellement, je l'avoue, plus encore qu'il ne m'est jamais arrivé de souffrir en entendant nos malheureuses cantatrices broder le grand monologue du Freyschütz; car à cette torture se joignait le chagrin de voir un tel artiste donner dans le travers où ne tombent d'ordinaire que les médiocrités.
>
> ([F]ollowing the habit then adopted to draw the fashionable public's applause, instead of those sustained notes in the bass, those dying voices in the upper parts, and the severe uniformity of rhythm that I have just spoken of, he put cadences and tremoli, he hurried and slowed down the beat, thus agitating by his passionate accents the calm of this sadness, and making thunder growl in this cloudless sky that darkened only with the sunset. . . . I suffered cruelly, I must admit, more even than I have ever suffered in listening to our unfortunate singers ornament the Grand Monologue of Freischütz, since to this torture was added the sorrow of seeing such an artist fall into the rut that ordinarily only mediocrities fall into.)[65]

Liszt had begun to drop his mannerisms from around 1832 onwards, and Berlioz was many times able to describe with great emotion an instance where Liszt's performance of the Beethoven C sharp Sonata moved him to tears. It goes without saying that Liszt was not

---

[65] JD, 12 March 1837, p. 1. Berlioz's previous discussion of Liszt's mannerisms in performance had been much more circumspect. A review for the JD, 25 April 1835, p. 3, reproachs him gently: "C'est le seul perfectionnement dont son talent nous paraisse susceptible" ("It is the only improvement to which his talent seems susceptible"), and a review in the RGM, 12 June 1836, p. 199, mentions that Liszt had been criticized: "Bien des critiques amères avaient été adressées à Liszt. . . ." (Many bitter criticisms have been made of Liszt. . ."). Berlioz does not make any direct criticism himself here, though he does suggest that attacks from the press had forced Liszt to reconsider his style.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tampering with the text on this occasion.[66] Although Berlioz disliked being drawn into the contemporary game of comparing virtuosi, he clearly felt that because of the variety of his skills Liszt was the most outstanding performer at the time. Apart from his brilliant technical virtuosity, he also played with great expression: "[I]l parle piano comme Goëthe parlait allemand, comme Moore parle anglais, comme Weber parlait orchestre" ([H]e speaks piano like Goëthe speaks German, like Moore speaks English, like Weber speaks orchestra").[67] He performed his own compositions magnificently, but interpreted the works of other composers with extraordinary empathy. As mentioned earlier, Berlioz came to view Liszt in a missionary light, as one devoted to "le beau et à l'utile" ("the beautiful and the useful"), who spread the appreciation of great music by his expressive performances of Beethoven, and indeed of Berlioz himself, to so many different audiences. In 1836, when Liszt and Thalberg fought their public pianistic duel, Berlioz refused to cast his vote for one or the other. While his articles on the concert are measured in praise for both, he nevertheless expresses great admiration for Thalberg's taste, calm, poise, and technical skill; all qualities which caused many, including Fétis, to prefer him to Liszt. Commenting in an article for the Chronique de Paris of 1837, on the mania for assessing the respective talents of the two artists, Berlioz says quite casually, with regard to Liszt, "L'avantage est donc incontestablement de son côté; cela nous a toujours paru aussi évident qu'inutile à dire. . . ." ("The advantage is incontestably on his side; this has always appeared

---

[66] To give just one reference, see RGM, 12 June 1836, p. 200.

[67] Le Rén., 11 March 1834, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to me as evident as it is unnecessary to say. . ."). [68] The same would have applied to a comparison with Chopin.

Liszt's arrangements of the Symphonie fantastique, Lelio, and sections from Harold were approved by Berlioz. He saw them not so much as sets of variations but as complete identifications with and even, to an extent, developments of his works. He was a little worried at times by what he saw as Liszt's penchant for the "genre enharmonique" [69] and his "abus de modulations enharmoniques" ("abuse of enharmonic modulations)" [70] in orchestral writing, and he wondered if the tendency was the result of Liszt's being a piano player: "Les musiciens d'orchestre sont encore peu familiarisés avec ces modulations dont se jouent les pianists. . . ." ("Orchestral musicians are still not familiar with the modulations enjoyed by the pianists. . ."). [71] In comparison with the strong antagonism of critics such as Schumann, [72] Berlioz was relatively tolerant of virtuosi. He occasionally commented adversely on a number of the showy solo pieces popular at the time, objecting most strongly to their length and florid ornamentation. He also wrote about the ease with which a young virtuoso performer could attain fame in comparison with a young composer, but cynically noted at the same time the rapidity of the virtuoso's decline from fame. [73] There were a number of virtuosi,

---

[68] Chronique de Paris, 19 March 1837, p. 193.

[69] Le Rén., 29 April 1835, p. 1.

[70] JD, 25 April 1835, p. 1.

[71] Le Rén., 29 April 1835, p. 2.

[72] Discussed in Leon B. Plantinga, Schumann as Critic (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 196-218.

[73] JD, 17 Jan. 1836, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

particularly violinists, whose playing Berlioz clearly enjoyed, though he never wrote about them at length, such as Ole Bull, Baillot, Ernst, and the harpist Labarre.[74] Amongst the host of pianist-composers in Paris at the time, Berlioz singled out the tasteful and refined compositions and playing of George Osborne and the more adventurous piano works of Jules Benedict.[75] Berlioz does not often discuss Chopin either as a performer or a composer. The occasions where he does are largely when Chopin had played in a public concert, for instance in one of Berlioz's own concerts or at Benefit concerts.[76] The majority of Chopin's performances at this time were in salons.

The most negative remarks made by Berlioz about Chopin are on his use of rhythm. In the Mémoires Berlioz states that Chopin pushed rhythmic freedom too far and that the orchestra in his piano concerto was practically a superfluous accompaniment. In an article of 1837 for the Chronique de Paris he writes, "Peut-être l'originalité et la fraîcheur de ces nouvelles formes seraient-elles plus senties, si dans l'exécution Chopin prodiguait moins les altérations du mouvement, s'il

---

[74] Ole Bull (1810-1880), Norwegian violinist and composer. For Baillot, see footnote 39, p. 241.
Heinrich Ernst (1814-1865), Moravian violinist and composer.
Théodore Labarre (1805-1870), French harpist and composer.

[75] George Alexandre Osborne (1806-1893), Irish pianist and composer. RGM, 3 April 1836, pp. 111-112.
Jules Benedict (1804-1885), English composer, conductor, and pianist of German descent. RGM, 3 April 1836, pp. 111-112. In this review Berlioz is sympathetic towards a composition based on Faust, though he suggests that such a subject really demands orchestral treatment. The same is hinted at in an earlier review by Berlioz of a work by Benedict, Notre-dame de Paris--rêverie musicale: "[Benedict est] renfermé dans un cadre trop étroit à notre avis. Pour un vaste poème, comme celui de Victor Hugo, il fallait, une forme plus grande . . . ." (["Benedict is] enclosed in a medium that is too narrow in our opinion. For a vast libretto, like that of Victor Hugo, a larger form was nesessary. . .") (Le Rén., 28 Sept. 1834, p. 1).

[76] Le Rén., 15 Dec. 1833.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conservait à la mesure un peu plus de régularité" ("Perhaps the freshness and originality of these new forms would be felt more if in his performance Chopin produced less changes of movement, if he kept to the beat with a bit more regularity").[77] One could interpret Berlioz's classification of Chopin as a "salon artist" as implied criticism: "Chopin d'ailleurs, était uniquement le virtuose des salons élégants, des réunions intimes. Ernst ne redoute point les théâtres, les vastes salles, le grand public, la foule" ("Chopin, again, was strictly the virtuoso of the elegant salon, the intimate gathering. For Ernst, vast halls, crowded theatres, the great pulsating public, hold no terrors"),[78] and similarly his description of unichord pianos:

> [P]ianos unicordes, [sont] destinés à exécuter dans les boudoirs élégans du grand monde les ravissantes Mazurkas, les Caprices si ingénieux de Chopin, mais qui ne résisteraient pas à l'exécution foudroyante, aux compositions plus orchestrales de M. Liszt.
>
> ([U]nicord pianos [are] designed to perform the ravishing Mazurkas, the so ingenious Caprices of Chopin, in the elegant boudoirs of grand society, but they would not be able to withstand the thunderous performance of the more orchestral compositions of M. Liszt.)[79]

Ernst and Liszt emerge triumphant from such comparisons.[80]

In his correspondence Berlioz's references to Chopin are few but generally affectionate; for instance in a letter to Liszt he mentions with satisfaction an article by Heine in which Chopin is praised: "Notre ami Heine a parlé dernièrement de nous deux dans la Gazette

---

[77] Chronique de Paris, 18 June 1837, p. 404.

[78] Mém. II, ch. lvi, 276/538.

[79] JD, 25 April 1835, p. 1.

[80] Katherine Reeve expresses a similar opinion to this in her dissertation, p. 120.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Musicale avec autant d'esprit que d'irrévérence, mais sans méchanceté aucune toutefois; il a en revanche tressé pour Chopin une couronne splendide qu'il mérite au reste depuis longtemps" ("Our friend Heine spoke of us two recently in the Gazette Musicale, with as much liveliness as irreverence, but with no nastiness all the same. On the other hand he wove a splendid crown for Chopin, which he has deserved for a long time moreover.")[81] Though Chopin's music is not disparagingly spoken of by Berlioz, there is nevertheless a reserve in what he does say that makes it clear he did not regard Chopin as a major composer. Berlioz's first review of Chopin's music reveals a bemused fascination and describes the music as some exotic apparition: "Ses mélodies toutes imprégnées des formes polonaises, ont quelque chose de naïvement sauvage qui charme et captive par son étrangeté même. . . . [O]n est tenté de s'approcher de l'instrument et de prêter l'oreille comme on ferait à un concert de sylphes ou de follets" ("His melodies impregnated with Polish forms have something naively wild that charms and captures one by its very strangeness. . . . [O]ne is tempted to approach the instrument and bend an ear to it as one would do at a concert of sylphes or sprites.")[82] Berlioz comments that he finds the best way to listen to Chopin's music is to abstract oneself from all received ideas 'idées reçues', and not to apply oneself specifically tc either Chopin himself or his music.

However, the charms of the music are seen finally as ephemeral, since Berlioz clearly believed that the originality, the unexpectedness, and the nuances of the work were inherent in the performance:

---

[81] CG II, 1838, 411.

[82] Le Rén., 15 Dec. 1833, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Malheureusement il n'y a guère que Chopin lui-même qui puisse jouer sa musique et lui donner ce tour original, cet imprévu qui est un de ses charmes principaux; son exécution est marbrée de mille nuances de mouvement dont il a seul le secret et qu'on ne pourrait indiquer.
>
> (Unfortunately there is hardly anyone but Chopin himself who can play his music and give it that original touch, that unexpectedness which is one of its principal attractions; his performance is marbled by a thousand nuances of movement, that he alone has the secret of, and that one is unable to point to.)[83]

A review of Chopin's piano concerto in 1834 talks briefly of "verve", "grâce", and "ravissantes arabesques",[84] and he makes an unconvincing excuse for his lack of commentary on the music by saying that people might accuse him of praising Chopin through friendship: "J'aurais beaucoup à dire sur Chopin et sa musique; mais je craindrais le reproche banal de camaraderie" ("I would have a lot to say about Chopin and his music, but I fear the banal reproach of friendship"). This excuse is specious, because this worry does not stop Berlioz from commenting at length on the music of Meyerbeer. The disinclination to talk about Chopin's music came perhaps from an unsureness about how to discuss it. In an article for the Chronique de Paris of 1837 Berlioz spoke of Chopin as being primarily a composer: "[I]l étonne souvent par le scintillement capricieux de sa fantaisie; ce qu'on aime tant en lui, c'est moins le pianiste (bien qu'à ce titre il ait très peu de rivaux) que le compositeur" ("[H]e frequently astonishes us by the capricious scintillation of his imagination; what one loves so much in him is less the pianist (though he has very few rivals for this title) than the composer").[85] Yet as already pointed out, Berlioz rarely

---

[83] Le Rén., 15 Dec. 1833, p. 1.

[84] Le Rén., 23 Feb. 1834, p. 1.

[85] Chronique de Paris, 18 June 1837, p. 403.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

examined Chopin's compositions. Perhaps the most appreciative comment made about Chopin's music is in an 1835 review of the Adagio from his Piano Concerto in F: "[T]out ce que la grace a de plus engageant est réuni aux pensées les plus profondes et les plus religieuses. . . ." ("[A]ll that is most engaging in grace is united with the most profound and religious thoughts . . ."). [86] The second part of this sentence uses words that imply a deeper level of appreciation by Berlioz. On the whole he seems to have appreciated Chopin's music as a sensory phenomenon enchanting him at the moment, but he seems uncertain about its ultimate value.

Though Berlioz rarely wrote at length on any of his contemporary composers, he certainly championed their cause--which was after all his own cause as well. Many times in his criticism he wrote about the insurmountable problems facing the young composer in Paris--problems of arranging performances of his works, hiring halls and musicians, copying parts, the awesome Droit des pauvres or "poor tax" (which took a quarter of the profits), and getting works published. [87] If the composer actually reached the stage of having a work accepted for performance, there was no guarantee that it would be performed as written. As Berlioz imaginatively puts it, the French government would never let a poor copy of Michelangelo's Moses be exhibited as the real thing, yet this is what constantly happened to the maligned composer. [88]

---

[86] Le Rén., 5 Jan. 1835, p. 1.

[87] To name just two of the reviews where he discusses these problems, see Le Rén., 15 Dec. 1833, and Le Rén., 22 June 1834.

[88] Le Rén., 22 June 1834, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Conclusion

If Berlioz's music criticism is viewed comprehensively, one can see that he uses a quite different vocabulary in discussing works he really does like, works he likes well enough, and works he dislikes. I have mentioned this vocabulary in specific instances in previous chapters and shall examine it more closely here, for it provides some guidelines to, and an overview of, Berlioz's judgements in music.

Berlioz's vocabulary of praise centres around his criticism of Beethoven, Gluck, and to a lesser extent Weber. As he said in a letter of 1838: "Mes sympathies les plus vives sont pour Gluck et Beethoven d'abord, pour Weber ensuite" ("My most lively sympathies are for Gluck and Beethoven first, then for Weber").[1] The actual words used by Berlioz in describing the music of these three composers are not all commonly used as words of praise, but for him they perform that function and by association carry the connotations of praise when applied to other composers.

Berlioz uses certain words to convey the greatness of a piece of music or of a composer, and these words are often connected with size, for example "immense", "gigantesque", "majesté", and "colossal". To describe the essence of the "great works", Berlioz employs words such as "génie", "passion", "poésie", "pensée poétique", "vérité d'expression", "pensée religieuse", and "poésie sublime"; where the keyword is definitely "poésie".[2] When Berlioz is describing specific features of

---

[1] CG II, 433.

[2] In comparing two Beethoven trios, one of which he preferred to the other, Berlioz wrote, "C'est de la prose magnifique, il est vrai; mais la belle poésie est plus belle encore" ("It is magnificent prose, that is true, but beautiful poetry is more beautiful still") (RGM, 19 Feb. 1837, p. 64).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

great works, the most striking aspect of his vocabulary is the strength and energy of the words: "oppositions les plus saisissantes" ("the most striking oppositions"), "contrastes les plus imprévues" ("the most unexpected contrasts"), "pleine de fougue", "de colère", "d'amour" ("full of fire", "anger", "love"), "péroraison foudroyante" ("overwhelming ending"), "foule d'idées brillantes et énergiques" ("host of brilliant and energetic ideas"). He describes the effect such music has on him in quite physical terms; the music "fait battre le coeur", makes him "frémir", gives him "un spasme nerveux", provokes "exclamations furieuses mêlées de larmes et d'éclats de rire" ("furious exclamations mixed with tears and shouts of laughter"), or, to give a longer example from an 1837 Revue et Gazette Musicale article, "De la musique en général":

> [L]'émotion croissant en raison directe de l'énergie ou de la grandeur des idées de l'auteur, produit successivement une agitation étrange dans la circulation du sang; mes artères battent avec violence, les larmes qui d'ordinaire annoncent la fin du paroxysme, n'en indiquent souvent qu'un état progressif, qui doit être de beaucoup dépassé. En ce cas, ce sont des contractions spasmodiques des muscles, un tremblement de tous les membres, un engourdissement total des pieds et des mains, une paralysie partielle des nerfs de la vision et de l'audition, je n'y vois plus, j'entends à peine; vertige...demi-évanouissement.
>
> ([The] emotion, growing in direct relation to the energy or grandeur of the author's ideas, successively produces a strange agitation in the circulation of the blood; my arteries beat with violence; tears, which ordinarily announce the end of a paroxysm, often indicate only a progressive state that is going to be greatly surpassed. In this case, it is the spasmodic contractions of muscles, a trembling in all the limbs, a total numbing of the hands and feet, a partial paralysis of the nerves of vision and hearing, I do not see any longer, I scarcely hear, vertigo...half fainting.)[3]

---

[3] RGM, 10 Sept. 1837, pp. 406-407.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berlioz's reactions to music that he loved are thus distinguished primarily by their dynamism, enthusiasm, and the continual use of certain keywords, such as "poésie", "poète", "génie", and "sublime". These keywords formed a module of terms of praise from which Berlioz borrowed when wishing to intimate greater music. So he could talk of a section of a composition that had a poetic tendency or expressed "passion", and this was to be taken to mean that this section was superior.

As repeatedly stated, there is never any uncertainty when Berlioz really appreciated something; on the contrary his feelings are conveyed almost overwhelmingly.[4] In the Beautiful in Music Edouard Hanslick denies music's ability to express any definite emotion, stating that it can express only the dynamics of emotion and be described only by such qualifying adjectives as "elegant", "vigorous", "graceful", and "fresh".[5] Berlioz's vocabulary of "secondary praise" makes use of just such words; it could be said that for Berlioz, while great works expressed strong emotions and passions, lesser works expressed only the various dynamic properties of these emotions. Berlioz was at times quite specific about which emotions he felt music could express, listing, for instance, such emotions as "l'amour heureux, la jalousie, la gaîté active et insouciante, l'agitation pudique, la force menaçante, la souffrance et la peur" ("happy love, jealousy, active and carefree gaiety, modest agitation, menacing force, suffering and fear").[6]

---

[4] See Appendix B on the unsigned articles.

[5] Edouard Hanslick, The Beautiful in Music, trans. G. Cohen, ed. Morris Weitz (New York: Bobbs-Merril, 1957).

[6] RGM, 8 Jan. 1837, p. 16.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As mentioned in previous chapters, Berlioz's mode of secondary praise can be reduced to a number of frequently used set phrases such as "mélodie distinguée", "le charme mélodique", "une simplicité élégante", "harmonie distingué", and individual words such as "calme", "clair", "vivacité", "goût", "tact", "grâce", "naïveté", délicatesse", and "doux". The "secondary" composer is usually a man of talent not genius, capable but not inspired, and one who writes with taste rather than passion. In one sense, for Berlioz this represented the difference between the eighteenth-century and the nineteenth-century composer and was typified by his comparisons between the symphonies of Haydn and Beethoven. Yet in another sense, of course Berlioz made no such crude dichotomies. He saw Gluck as expressing passions in the manner of Beethoven,[7] and many of his own nineteenth-century contemporary composers as bound by the same limitations as Haydn; he saw, that is, the expression of passion as timeless. Berlioz uses his phrases of secondary praise with great facility and to such an extent that they almost become formulae, and, as said in Chapter III, they at times seemed to be used as a screen to disguise a lack of response to the music.

These two "modes of praise" are not mutually exclusive. Berlioz occasionally used words from the second list in conjunction with stronger words of the first group (particularly when describing Weber or Beethoven adagios) and arrives at phrases such as "prodige de délicatesse". When describing works he openly dislikes, Berlioz is curt and unambiguous. Typical phrases are "le style de salon" ("the salon style"), "instrumentation plate" ("flat instrumentation"),

---

[7] In an article for the RGM, talking of Gluck, Berlioz writes, "[L]a vérité d'expression . . . est de tous les temps" ("[T]ruth of expression . . . is eternal") (RGM, 26 Feb. 1837, p. 71).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"style flasque" ("flabby style"), "phraséologie vulgaire" ("vulgar phraseology"), "harmonie commune" ("common harmony"), "pauvreté d'harmonie" ("poor harmony"), and "monotone rythme" ("monotonous rhythm"). Of note is his continual use of words such as "vulgaire" and "commun" and his similar use, when distinguishing those who appreciate great music, of "aristocratie musicale". In both cases he refers not to a class distinction but to a hierarchy of musical taste and ability.

Poor music also seems to have produced a physical effect on Berlioz. Although he fortunately does not mention it often, he does describe it picturesquely in the Revue et Gazette Musicale article, "De la musique en général":

> Il y a un vigoureux contraste, . . . celui du mauvais effet musical, produisant le contraire de l'admiration et du plaisir. Aucune musique n'agit plus fortement en ce sens, que celle dont le défaut principal me paraît être la platitude jointe à la fausseté d'expression. Alors je rougis comme de honte, une véritable indignation s'empare de moi, on pourrait, à me voir, croire que je viens de recevoir un de ces outrages pour lesquels il n'y a pas de pardon; il se fait, pour chasser l'impression reçue, un soulèvement général, un effort d'excrétion dans tout l'organisme, analogue aux efforts du vomissement, quand l'estomac veut rejeter une liqueur nauséabonde. C'est le dégoût et la haine portés à leur terme extrême; cette musique m'exaspère, et je la vomis par tous les pores.
>
> (There is a vigorous contrast, . . . that of a bad musical effect, producing the opposite of admiration and pleasure. No other music operates more strongly in this sense than that in which the principal fault appears to me to be platitude linked with false expression. Then I blush as with shame, real indignation takes hold of me; one could, on seeing me, think that I had just been the victim of an unpardonable outrage. To get rid of this impression there is a general expulsion, an effort of excretion in all my body, like the efforts of vomiting when the stomach wants to get rid of a noxious liquid. This is disgust and hatred taken to their most extreme limits. This music exasperates me, and I vomit it from

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

all my pores.)[8]

The format of Berlioz's reviews of opera has already been discussed in Chapter V. Such a format does not really exist for his reviews of instrumental and orchestral music; however, apart from the question of dramatic motivation, he usually mentioned various aspects of musical organization such as rhythm, instrumentation, harmony, and melody.

Berlioz strongly criticized the monotonous square-cut rhythms, "la carrure", that proliferated in, for instance, most of the opéras-comiques of the day. Yet he by no means advocated rhythmic anarchy and indeed was critical of composers who used rhythms that were too irregular, particularly in vocal music, where he felt it led to serious problems for the singers.[9] Similarly, though critical of predictable use of harmonies, particularly antagonistic to repeated V-I cadences, and encouraging to composers who employed interesting modulations, Berlioz disliked compositions with too many modulations and abrupt changes of harmony.[10] As has been mentioned, Berlioz praised those composers who showed an interest in original instrumentation and explored the expressive possibilities of various instruments, and he deplored the bombastic, noisy instrumentation of many of his contemporaries with their over-use of the bass-drum and brass. All musical elements were ultimately judged in terms of their expressive qualities and capacity for dramatic nuances and contrasts; and this included melody, for even though it did not hold the supreme

---

[8] RGM, 10 Sept. 1837, p. 407.

[9] He mentions this in his reviews of Monpou, Le Rên., 17 March and 8 Aug. 1835, and of Louise Bertin, RGM, 20 Nov. 1836.

[10] This is mentioned in his reviews of Monpou, Liszt, and Bertin.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

place in the musical organization it was still a major means of dramatic expression.

ii.

Berlioz's early criticism has two recurring concerns that demand some concluding comments. The first is the desire to be objective or, alternatively, to show that genius can make mistakes. This relates basically to the issue of dramatic motivation. The second concern is the role of the "elite" in Berlioz's aesthetics, which in turn relates to his worship of "poetic" music.

Berlioz's habit of carefully detailing what he saw as faults in the works of composers he esteemed has already been mentioned in relation to Meyerbeer and to a lesser extent Beethoven. It occurs also in his reviews of Gluck, Cherubini, and Mozart. This habit is distinct in two ways from the mundane listing of faults necessarily engaged in by the critic. First, the faults are commented on very self-consciously, at times with an air of self-righteousness and at others with astonishment and surprise or disappointment. Second, the faults revolve around certain issues, which in the main are the use of "Italian cadences", "vocalized amens", and "unmotivated fugues", as well as maladroit interpretations of texts, particularly of religious texts. With Gluck the faults noted are more specific. Berlioz notes small things such as inadequate instrumentation[11] and monotonous harmonies in some accompanied recitatives.[12]

To give a few examples, he found the "cadence italienne" in a

---

[11] GM, 16 Nov. 1834, pp. 365-366.

[12] GM, 25 Nov. 1834, p. 378.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scene from Mozart's Magic Flute, in a Mozart motet, and in the slow movement of Beethoven's eighth symphony. Berlioz described the "cadence italienne" in the latter in three different articles:

> [E]n outre, les deux dernières mesures se composent de la plus usée des formules harmoniques, celle de la cadence italienne, dont Beethoven s'était gardé de faire usage jusqu'alors, et qu'on ne trouve qu'avec un étonnement profond à la fin d'une conception si poétique et si neuve.
>
> ([B]esides, the two last measures make up one of the most hackneyed harmonic forms, the Italian cadence, which Beethoven had been careful not to use up to this point and which one finds with but profound astonishment at the end of such a poetic and new conception.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale)

> Croirait-on que cette ravissante idylle finit par celui de tous les lieux communs pour lequel Beethoven avait le plus d'horreur, par la cadence italienne!
>
> (Could one believe that this ravishing idyll finishes with that of which, of all that is commonplace, Beethoven had the most horror, the Italian cadence.)
>
> (Journal des Débats)

> [M]alheureusement cet admirable morceau est un peu écourté . . . et la fin (chose incroyable) n'est autre que la cadence italienne. . . .
>
> ([U]nfortunately this admirable piece is a little shortened . . . and the end, astonishingly, is none other than the Italian cadence . . . .)
>
> (Le Rénovateur)[13]

The "vocalized amen" was found in, for example, the Beethoven Resurrexit and Gloria from the Missa solemnis. Of the Gloria Berlioz wrote,

> D'ailleurs ce choeur finit, Dieu me pardonne de le dire, par un de ces amen vocalisés et fugués que j'ai déjà signalés maintes fois chez d'autres compositeurs comme

---

[13] GM, 22 Feb. 1835, p. 66, unsigned. JD, 20 Feb. 1835, p. 2. Le Rén., 17 Feb. 1835, p. 1. Two other instances can be found in the RGM, 14 Feb. 1836, and the JD, 1 May 1836.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> un contresens barbare.
>
> (Furthermore, this chorus finishes, God forgive me for saying it, with one of those fugal and vocalized amens, which I have already pointed out many times in other composers as a meaningless barbarity).[14]

Berlioz denigrated the practice as early as 1829 in an article for Le Correspondant, "Considérations sur la musique religieuse":

> Je défie quiconque est doué du sentiment musical et écoute sans préventions une fugue sur Amen, de ne pas prendre le choeur pour une légion de diables incarnés, tournant en ridicule le saint sacrifice, plutôt que pour une réunion de fidèles assemblés pour chanter les louanges de Dieu.
>
> (I defy anyone gifted with musical feeling who listens without bias to a fugal Amen not to take the choir for a legion of incarnate devils turning the holy sacrifice into ridicule, rather than for a reunion of the faithful assembled to sing the praises of God.)[15]

The problem of the vocalized amen was in fact just another aspect of the problem of text interpretation. The question of text interpretation is a larger issue than the others just mentioned, and although it can be discussed here in terms of Berlioz's fault-finding it also needs a more general discussion relating to his set ideas on interpretation of texts.

Mozart and Cherubini are the composers who suffered most from Berlioz's pinpointing of text misinterpretation, and in nearly all cases it was in relation to their interpretation of religious texts. Cherubini's setting of the words Da Robur in his unaccompanied "O Salutaris" is attacked by Berlioz:

> [J]e me permettrai de soumettre respectueusement à l'auteur une observation sur la manière de dire le Da robur fer auxilium. Les basses prononcent ces mots sur

---

[14] JD, 20 Feb. 1835, p. 2.

[15] Le Correspondant, 21 April 1829, p. 54.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> une phrase énergique et fière, symbole de la force (robur). Sur cent compositeurs qui ont traité le même sujet depuis Gossec, il n'y en a pas deux peut-être qui aient évité de jouer ainsi sur les mots au lieu d'en exprimer le véritable sens. L'O salutaris est une prière, n'est-ce pas? Le chrétien y demande à Dieu de la force et du courage. . . . C'est donc un être faible qui prie, et sa voix, en prononçant le da robur, doit être aussi humble que possible, au lieu d'éclater en accens qui tiennent plus de la menace que de la supplication. Cela me semble une absurdité palpable.
>
> (I shall take the liberty of respectfully suggesting an observation to the author on the manner of saying the Da robur fer auxilium. The basses pronounce these words with an energetic and fierce phrase, the symbol of strength (robur). Of a hundred composers who have set this same subject since Gossec, there are only two perhaps who have avoided playing thus on the words instead of expressing their true sense. The O salutaris is a prayer, is it not? In it the Christian asks God for strength and for courage. . . . It is therefore a weak being who prays, and his voice, in pronouncing the Da Robur, should be as humble as possible, instead of breaking into syllables which hold more menace than supplication. This seems to me to be a palpable absurdity.)[16]

This quotation is repeated verbatim in another article for the Journal des Débats of 1835.[17] Berlioz similarly attacks a chorus from Cherubini's Requiem, stating that the word "clamari" should be interpreted quietly, being the voice of a penitent sinner, and not screamed. Berlioz's indignant criticism of the Tuba Mirum from the Mozart Requiem is quite amusing if one bears in mind how Berlioz was later to interpret the words in his own Requiem:

> Le Tuba mirum débute par une phrase sublime, qui n'aboutit à rien et dont l'instrumentation est impuissante. Pourquoi un seul trombonne, est-il chargé de sonner l'appel terrible qui doit retentir par toute la terre et réveiller les morts au fond de leurs tombeaux. Pourquoi faire taire les deux autres trombonnes? quand, au lieu de trois, trente, trois cent même ne seraient pas de trop? serait-ce parce que le mot tuba exprime le

---

[16] Le Rén., 8 April 1834, p. 1.

[17] JD, 23 June 1835, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> singulier et non le pluriel? C'est faire une injure à Mozart que de lui supposer un instant une aussi sotte idée.
>
> (The Tuba Mirum starts with a sublime phrase that leads to nothing and whose instrumentation is feeble. Why is a sole trombone given the job of sounding the terrible call that should spread all over the earth and awaken the dead at the bottom of their tombs? Why make the other two trombones quiet when, instead of three, thirty, three hundred even, would not be too many? Has this been done because the word tuba is in the singular and not the plural? It is an insult to Mozart to assume for even a moment that he could hold such a stupid idea).[18]

It has already been mentioned that Berlioz wrote with a certain glee in describing instances when Gluck and particularly Beethoven had broken "rules", notably of harmony. In other instances Berlioz clearly feels bewildered by some of Beethoven's harmonies, and though he makes an effort to understand why Beethoven used them he fails to find any real justification.[19] However, Berlioz incorporates these faults of harmony into his total vision of Beethoven, whose genius does not suffer an eclipse. As Berlioz says:

> [P]ourquoi enlever à la physionomie d'un grand homme ses traits mêmes les plus défectueux? Croyez-vous que les imperfections de ces natures puissantes n'offrent pas un charme réel d'originalité à qui sait les comprendre? Et ne savez-vous pas que l'enthousiasme est frère de l'amour?
>
> ([W]hy take even the most defective qualities away from the physiognomy of a great man? Do you not think that the imperfections of these powerful natures offer real charm of originality to those who know how to understand them? And don't you know that enthusiasm is the brother of love?)[20]

---

[18] Le Rén., 30 March 1834, p. 1.

[19] Katherine Reeve gives an excellent account of Berlioz's reaction to Beethoven in her Chapter "Freedom and its Limits" in her dissertation.

[20] JD, 22 March 1835, p. 2. This quote is interesting retrospectively, since, in a sense, it represents the view that Jacques

(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The sentiment expressed in this quotation seems to refer specifically to Beethoven's "unusual" harmonies and does not really represent Berlioz's attitude to the other "faults" that I have detailed; on the contrary he expressed many times his lack of understanding of, for instance, Beethoven's use of "cadences italiennes". As has been mentioned in Chapter V, Berlioz tried to excuse Meyerbeer's faults, and he occasionally does the same thing with the faults he finds in other composers, for instance in the following proviso about Mozart's use of a "cadence italienne": "L'auteur était sans doute pressé de finir, car il a eu bien soin, dans tous ses autres ouvrages, d'éviter cette sotte et fatigante formule harmonique . . . ." ("The author was no doubt in a hurry to finish, because he has taken care in all his other works to avoid this stupid and tiring harmonic formula . . .").[21] Clearly Berlioz felt that only extenuating circumstances could have caused Mozart to use the cadence.

There are two suggestions to be made here. The first is that Berlioz's "fault-finding" came from a desire to prove his impartiality and objectivity; this applies particularly to Gluck and Beethoven. Berlioz was clearly sensitive to attacks on his partiality and wished to establish the fact that his judgements were not "blind", and by pointing to faults in his "genii" he was proving his unbiassed approach. Occasionally he goes to quite some lengths to prove his objectivity, giving extravagantly severe reviews of certain works of Weber and Beethoven, as in the following review of Weber's first

---

[20](continued)
Barzun recommends adopting towards Berlioz's own music.

[21] RGM, 14 Feb. 1836, p. 55.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

symphony:

> On n'y rencontre en effet, ni cette verve, ni cet imprévu dans les formes, ni cette soudaineté de mouvemens, . . . ni cette grâce mélodique irrésistible qu'on trouve dans Oberon . . . [L]e style . . . est flasque, sa phraséologie vulgaire, son harmonie commune, son instrumentation plate, tellement qu'on dirait à l'entendre qu'elle a remporté le grand prix de composition au concours de l'Institut. Le premier morceau contient cependant une progression harmonique d'un beau caractère à la coda; mais outre la nullité de tout ce qui précède, on est désagréablement surpris de retrouver là un air populaire français, . . . la Pipe de Tabac. . . . Le menuet n'est qu'une pâle imitation des menuets de Mozart et de Haydn, et le final ne vaut guère mieux. Il eût été peut-être plus convenable de ne pas faire de cet ouvrage une critique aussi minutieusement sévère et de le signaler tout simplement comme une production de peu d'importance; mais nous avons cru devoir exprimer notre pensée à ce sujet avec d'autant plus de crudité que bien des gens ont taxé d'engouement nos élans d'enthousiasme pour Weber, et qu'il était de notre devoir en ce cas de faire preuve d'impartialité.
>
> (In fact one does not find there either the verve, the unexpectedness in the forms, the suddenness of movement, . . . or that irresistible melodic grace that one finds in Obéron. . . . [T]he style . . . is flabby, its phraseology vulgar, its harmony common, its instrumentation flat--so much so that one could say in listening to it that it had gained first Prize at the Institut concours. The first piece does however contain an attractive harmonic progression in the coda; but beside the emptiness of all that precedes this, one is disagreeably surprised to find a popular French air, . . . la Pipe de Tabac. . . . The minuet is only a pale imitation of Mozart's and Haydn's minuets, and the finale is scarcely better. It would have been perhaps more suitable not to do such a scrupulously severe critique of this work and simply point it out as a production of little importance; but we thought it was our duty to express ourselves on this subject with even more frankness, since many people have taxed our bursts of enthusiasm for Weber with infatuation, and it was our duty in this case to show a proof of our impartiality.)[22]

Berlioz gives a similarly severe review of the "Credo" from

---

[22] JD, 23 June 1835, pp. 2-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Beethoven's Missa Solemnis.[23]

The second suggestion is that Berlioz's listing of faults in text interpretation (and this applies largely to criticism of Cherubini and Mozart) stemmed in a way from his fundamentally rigid ideas about text interpretation. His fixed ideas on the interpretation of religious texts have already been discussed; once again, as early as 1829, Berlioz had outlined his basic objection to many interpretations of such texts:

> Rien n'est pourtant plus commun, c'est un style adopté par les musiciens, et ce qu'il y a de plus inconcevable, c'est qu'ils l'appellent style religieux. Quel style, grand Dieu, que celui qui substitue au sentiment humble et touchant de la prière ce qu'on croirait l'expression d'une rage forcenée. . . .
>
> (Nothing is however more common, it is a style adopted by musicians, and what is even more inconceivable is that they call it the religious style. What a style, great God, that substitutes what one would think was the expression of a frenzied rage for the humble and touching sentiment of a prayer . . . .)[24]

This was a view that remained with him all his life. To give just one more example, in a review of a mass by Massimino, Berlioz comments,

> Quel avantage y a-t-il à dire: "Paix! paix! paix! . . . sur la terre" . . . au lieu d'employer la phraséologie naturelle? . . . Heureusement l'auteur n'a placé le monosyllabe que sur des notes douces; mais combien d'autres avant lui avaient jeté ce malheureux mot sur de violents accords frappés avec force par l'orchestre et les voix, de sorte que les chanteurs, au lieu de représenter les anges souhaitant le calme et le bonheur aux hommes justes, semblaient s'écrier avec colère: Paix! comme un magister impatienté qui imposerait silence à ses élèves.

---

[23] JD, 18 April 1835, p. 2. He retracts this opinion of the Credo at a later date, though making no reference to the earlier opinion expressed in the JD article.

[24] Le Correspondant, 21 April 1829, p. 54.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> (What advantage is there in saying, "Peace! peace! peace! . . . on earth" . . . instead of using natural phraseology? . . . Luckily the author put the monosyllable only on the soft notes, but how many others before him have thrown this unfortunate word on violent chords struck with force by the orchestra and the voices, in such a way that the singers, instead of representing angels wishing calm and happiness to all just men, seem to cry "Peace!" to them with anger, like an impatient master imposing silence on his pupils.)[25]

Occasionally Berlioz commented more specifically on faults that stemmed from a misunderstanding of the fundamental nature of a text, for instance the oriental and sacred subject of the "Fuite d'Egypte" demanded appropriately simple and calm harmonies, "l'usage des accords parfaits, de préférence à celui des harmonies chromatiques et des septièmes diminuées. . . ." ("the use of perfect cadences, in preference to chromatic harmonies and diminished sevenths . . ").[26] Berlioz stated more baldly still that some subjects simply could not be set to music at all. Monpou, for instance, was misguided in trying to set the last scene of Othello to music, since it was not possible to do so: "Ces vers ne sont point faits pour être chantés, et la scéne n'est pas coupée musicalement. Devant de pareilles difficultés, tous les efforts de l'art seraient vains; chercher à les surmonter c'est poursuivre une chimère" ("These verses are not in any way made to be sung, and the scene is not musically arranged. In the face of such difficulties, all the efforts of art would be in vain; to try and surmount them is to pursue a chimera").[27] At a later date he appears to revise his opinion on this and lists the characters of

---

[25] RGM, 3 Sept. 1837, p. 401.

[26] RGM, 11 June 1837, p. 204.

[27] Le Rén., 25 Jan. 1835, p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Othello and Desdemona as susceptible to musical treatment:

> L'amour, l'enthousiasme, la mélancolie, la joie, la terreur, la jalousie, le calme de l'âme sont des sentimens et des passions parfaitement propres au développement des forces musicales; l'ambition, les intrigues politiques, au contraire, ne s'y prêtent en aucune façon. Voilà pourquoi Roméo, Juliette, Tybald, le frère Laurence, Othello, Desdémona, Ariel et Caliban lui-même pourront être d'admirables personnages chantans, quand Richard III et Macbeth ne sauraient figurer dans un opéra sans perdre les principaux traits du caractère que leur a donné Shakspeare [sic], ou tourmenter inutilement la musique, en lui demandant des expressions qu'elle ne possède pas.
>
> (Love, enthusiasm, melancholy, joy, terror, jealousy, calm of the soul are feelings and passions perfectly suited to the development of musical forces; ambition, political intrigues, on the contrary, do not lend themselves to it in any way. That is why Romeo, Juliet, Tybald, the friar Laurence, Othello, Desdemona, Ariel, and Caliban himself could be admirable singing characters, whereas Richard III and Macbeth cannot figure in an opera without losing the principal character traits that Shakespeare has given them, or without uselessly tormenting the music, in asking of it expressions that it does not possess.)[28]

iii.

Berlioz's fixed ideas on text interpretation underlie his criticism and recur continually. His ideas on what was "beautiful" in music show a similar rigidity despite his protestations to the contrary.

In an apparently serious letter to his friend Edouard Rocher in 1833 Berlioz wrote,

> Mon père me traite comme tous les pères traitent tous les fils; tandis que je suis, moi, une exception. Oui, exception par mon caractère, par ma vie antérieure, par ma sensibilité exaltée, par mon mépris de la vie et de la mort, par mes idées sur tout.
>
> (My father treats me like all fathers treat their sons;

---

[28] JD, 10 Sept. 1837, referring to Ferdinand Lavaine's work, La Fuite d'Egypte.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> whereas I am, myself, an exception. Yes, an exception by my character, by my past life, by my exalted sensibility, by my scorn of life and death, by my ideas on everything).[29]

Berlioz's correspondence during the 1820s is similarly full of anguished self-conscious statements; he saw himself pushed inexorably towards the career of a musician, it being the only outlet for his unusual sensitivity:

> Je suis entraîné involontairement vers une carrière magnifique. . . .
>
> (I am drawn involuntarily towards a magnificent career. . . .)[30]

> [C]'est une certaine puissance motrice que je sens en moi, un feu, une ardeur que je ne saurais définir, qui se dirige tellement vers un seul point: la grande musique, dramatique ou religieuse, que je ne l'éprouve pas même pour la musique légère. . . .
>
> ([T]here is a certain motivating power that I feel in me, a fire, an ardour that I am unable to define, that directs so much towards the one point: great music, dramatic or religious, that I do not even experience for light music. . . .)[31]

> [M]ême actuellement je suis capable de produire du grand, du passionné, de l'énergique, du vrai, du beau enfin.
>
> ([E]ven now I am capable of producing greatness, passion, vigour, and truth, and energetic things, and things of beauty too").[32]

It was almost as though Berlioz saw himself as called to fulfil a mission: certainly he came to view music as a religion, a "sacred

---

[29] CG II, 90.

[30] CG I, 1824, 64.

[31] CG I, 1825, 85.

[32] CG I, 1825, 101.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

art".

Although Berlioz admitted that "le beau" was not the same for every individual and that the "beau relatif" was a necessary corollary, he himself obviously did believe in a "beau absolu".[33] He coped with this seeming contradiction by defining music as "l'art d'émouvoir par des sons les êtres sensibles, intelligents, instruits et doués d'admiration. Elle ne s'adresse qu'à eux, et voilà pourquoi elle n'est pas fait pour tout le monde" ("the art of moving people by sound who are sensitive, intelligent, informed, and gifted in admiration. It only addresses them, and this is why it does not suit everyone");[34] thus suggesting that only people so defined were capable of understanding the "beau absolu". Berlioz's elite group, his "petit nombre de fidèles" mentioned earlier in this thesis, was presumably comprised of believers in the "beau absolu", to the extent that they all appreciated similar music so that any small differences could be put down to varying backgrounds.

Berlioz's criticism aimed to diffuse the love of "great music", to educate the public, or, in the words of Katherine Kolb Reeve, Berlioz aimed to form a listening public capable of appreciating the music of Beethoven and Gluck. At the same time I feel that Berlioz also enjoyed the sense of superiority and exclusiveness that being part of a small elite gave him. This is reflected not only in his attitude to the Conservatoire concerts, but also in certain attitudes towards the "great composers"; he actually did not want Gluck and Beethoven to become popular, since this seemed necessarily to entail a

---

[33] He at times made emotional outbursts such as: "[J]'aimerais mieux être fou et croire au beau absolu" (I would rather be mad and believe in absolute beauty") (ATC, p. 47).

[34] Le Correspondant, 22 Oct. 1830, p. 110.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cheapening of their "genius": "[P]eut-être que Gluck redeviendra à la mode...par le feu éternel! Si cela arrivait; il faudrait murer la porte du Conservatoire; c'est déjà bien assez pour lui d'avoir subi cette honte une fois" ("[P]erhaps Gluck will become fashionable again...by the eternal fire! If that happened, it would be necessary to wall up the Conservatoire door; it is already enough for him to have been subjected to that shame once").[35] Experience of the dilettantes of Italian opera obviously soured Berlioz's view of "popularity", which for him implied only superficial appreciation; it was better that great works remained the exclusive property of a chosen few than that they should be debased by ignorant enthusiasts.[36] There were other ways of furthering musical education, and Berlioz comments regularly and very encouragingly on the attempts made by various individuals to foster musical appreciation amongst the people. He pointed in particular to the work done by Joseph Mainzer and his choirs of working men in Paris[37] and the work of a certain Aubery du Boullay, who operated in Provence where he organized and inspired instrumental playing in numerous small towns. The towns would all join together several times a year for a grand "congrès philharmonique". Berlioz claimed that the success of these meetings was "une preuve de la rapidité avec laquelle se répand le goût de la musique dans les classes inférieures de la population. . . ." ("a proof of the rapidity with which the taste for music is spreading in the lower

---

[35] RGM, 24 April 1836, p. 135.

[36] See Chapter VI.

[37] JD, 18 Sept. 1836, JD, 31 Jan. 1837, p. 2, and RGM, 4 Dec. 1836.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

classes of the population . . . ").[38] He also felt that the army should be taught singing in its spare time[39] and encouraged the efforts of a M. Beer to improve the standards of the military bands.[40] The introduction of choral teaching in primary schools in 1836 was seen as another step towards forming a musical public.[41] Romain Rolland said of Berlioz that "il méprise le peuple".[42] Katherine Reeve makes a useful distinction between "la foule" and "le peuple", "the former denoting the eternally repugnant profanes vulgus, the latter calling forth utopian fantasies of universal harmony and progress . . .".[43] Rolland's comment makes more sense if we substitute "la foule" for "le peuple", for Berlioz did seem to cherish some hopeful ideals about the possibility of educating "le peuple". It is not always easy to make the distinction, however. When, for instance, Berlioz says, "ce qui me dégoute le plus, c'est la certitude où je suis de la non-existence du beau pour l'incalculable majorité des singes humaines!" ("what disgusts me the most is the certainty from where I am of the non-existence of beauty for the incalculable majority of human monkeys!"),[44] there is a lurking suspicion that he could he referring to all of humanity.

In Berlioz's utopian vision of the ideal society, in his nouvelle

---

[38] JD, 31 Jan. 1837, p. 2.

[39] JD, 9 Aug. 1835, p. 2.

[40] JD, 18 Sept. 1836, p. 2.

[41] JD, 31 Jan. 1837, p. 2.

[42] Romain Rolland, Musiciens d'aujourd'hui, 19th ed. (Paris: Hachette, 1949), p. 6.

[43] "Poetics of the Orchestra", p. 105.

[44] Corr. Inéd., 1857, 240.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Euphonia, the massed public is hand-picked; was Berlioz's vision of the ideal audience perhaps no more than a greatly expanded elite?

Berlioz's position as a composer in the Paris musical world was never easy; his lifelong struggle for recognition and understanding is well-documented in his Mémoirs and correspondence. To an extent, Berlioz's music criticism provided an outlet for discussing some of the problems a composer faced at the time and also provided him with the opportunity to discuss and promote his musical ideals. Perhaps his criticism contributed to an amelioration of taste, to a better understanding of Beethoven or Gluck. It is unlikely, however, that he contributed much to an amelioration in conditions for composers at the time.

What clearly emerges from the study of these early reviews is the degree of diplomacy involved in being a critic, and in particular a composer-critic. Whether it was a case of not offending a powerful friend, as with Meyerbeer, or of not offending fellow critics, discouraging young composers, or alienating theatre directors or newspaper editors, Berlioz had at all times to strive for the delicate balance between honesty and loss of integrity.

Yet the most enduring image of Berlioz emerging from his criticism is that of an idealist whose love of music was so passionate, and governed his life to such an extent, that even the treadmill of daily criticism could not dull its ardour.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix A

Bibliography of Berlioz's Articles (1823-1837)

From 1823 to 1837 Berlioz contributed articles to the following journals:[1]

LE CORSAIRE (1823-1825, 1828)

LE FIGARO (1828)

REVUE MUSICALE (1828-1832)

LE CORRESPONDANT (1829-1830)

BERLINER ALLGEMEINE MUSIKALISCHE ZEITUNG (1829)

REVUE EUROPEENNE (1832)

REVUE DE PARIS (1832)

L'EUROPE LITTERAIRE (1833)

GAZETTE MUSICALE (1834-1835)

LE RENOVATEUR (1833-1835)

JOURNAL DES ARTISTES (1834)

JOURNAL DES DEBATS (1834-1837)

LE MONDE DRAMATIQUE (1835)

REVUE ET GAZETTE MUSICALE (1836-1837)

CHRONIQUE DE PARIS (1837)

---

[1] Care has been taken to reproduce the exact title of each of these articles.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1823

Le Corsaire

12 Aug. CORRESPONDANCE. POLEMIQUE MUSICALE.

pp. 2-3. Signed "HECTOR B....."

1824

Le Corsaire

11 Jan. POLEMIQUE MUSICALE. LES DILETTANTI.

MONSIEUR LE CORSAIRE,

p. 2. Signed "H. B....."

1825

Le Corsaire

19 Dec. POLEMIQUE MUSICALE.

Sur Armide et Gluck.

MONSIEUR LE REDACTEUR,

p. 2. Signed "H. B."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1828

Le Corsaire

22 May — CORRESPONDANCE.
A MONSIEUR LE REDACTEUR DU CORSAIRE.
p. 3.

Le Figaro

21 May — CORRESPONDANCE.
A M. Figaro.
p. 3.[2]

Revue Musicale

16 May — CORRESPONDANCE.
Monsieur Le Rédacteur,
pp. 405-406.

1829

Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung

7 Feb. — Paris, Januar 1829.
Auber's neueste Oper, "la Fiancée" (die Braut). Text von Scribe.
pp. 46-48. Unsigned.

---

[2] Pierre Citron (CG 1, p. 165) suggests that an article that appeared in L'Album (18 Dec. 1828), "La Jeune France", is possibly by Berlioz. I think it is not by Berlioz, but possibly by Henri Blanchard.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1829

Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung

6 June	Paris den 21. Mai 1829. Erste Vorstellung der Oper "les deux nuits," von Bouilly und Scribe, Musik von Boieldieu. pp. 183-184. Unsigned.
27 June	Die deutsche Oper in Paris. pp. 205-207. Signed "B."
11 July	Paris, im Juni 1829. [La Dame Blanche] pp. 224. Unsigned.
18 July	Aus Paris. Königliche Akademie der Musik in Paris. pp. 226-228. Unsigned.
17 Oct.	Neue Pariser Opern. ("Zwei Nachte," Oper, von Scribe gedichtet und von Bojeldieu komponirt,) pp. 334-336. Unsigned.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1829

Le Correspondant

21 April — CONSIDERATIONS SUR LA MUSIQUE RELIGIEUSE.
pp. 54-55. Signed "H."

4 Aug. — BEAUX-ARTS.
BIOGRAPHIE ETRANGERE.--BEETHOVEN.
pp. 179-180. Unsigned.

11 Aug. — BEAUX-ARTS.
BIOGRAPHIE ETRANGERE.--BEETHOVEN.
p. 187. Unsigned.

6 Oct. — BEAUX-ARTS.
BIOGRAPHIE ETRANGERE.--BEETHOVEN.
Suite et fin,
pp. 251-252. Signed "H."

1830

Le Correspondant

22 Oct. — BEAUX-ARTS.
APERCU SUR LA MUSIQUE CLASSIQUE ET LA MUSIQUE ROMANTIQUE.
pp. 110-112. Signed "H. B."[3]

---

[3] Reproduced in part in VM I, 241-260.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1832

Revue Européenne

March-May, III, LETTRE D'UN ENTHOUSIASTE SUR L'ETAT ACTUEL DE LA MUSIQUE EN ITALIE. Florence. Le théâtre de la Pergola. I Montecchi ed i Capelli [sic]. La Vestale, de Paccini. L'orchestre, les choeurs, les chanteurs. Service funèbre du jeune Napoléon Bonaparte. L'organiste.--Gènes. L'Agnèse, de Paer. Indifférence des Génois pour Paganini.--Rome. La fête del Corpus Domini. Le choeur de Castrati. La musique militaire. Miserere d'Allegri. Musique des églises. Théâtres. Chanteurs, choeurs et orchestre. Chant des montagnes romaines. Les Pifferari. L'institut de France et ses musiciens pensionnaires à Rome.--Naples. Théâtre Saint-Charles. Théâtre del Fondo. Opéra buffa de Donizetti. Exécution du requiem de Mozart. Conjectures sur Milan et Venise.

pp. 47-64. Signed "H. B."[4]

---

[4] Reproduced in Mém., chs. xxxv, xxxix, and xli, and, in part, in VM II.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1832

La Revue Musicale

31 March, LETTRE D'UN ENTHOUSIASTE SUR L'ETAT ACTUEL DE LA MUSIQUE EN ITALIE. (Extrait de la Revue européenne.)

FLORENCE. Le théâtre de la Pergola. I Montecchi ed i Capelli [sic]. La Vestale, de Paccini [sic]. L'orchestre les choeurs, les chanteurs. Service funèbre du jeune Napoléon Bonaparte. L'organiste.--GENES. L'Agnèse de Paer. Indifference des Génois pour Paganini.--ROME. La fête del Corpus Domini. Le choeur de Castrati. La musique militaire. Miserere d'Allegri. Musique des églises. Théâtres. Chanteurs, choeurs et orchestre. Chant des montagnes romaines. Les Pifferari. L'Institut de France et ses musiciens pensionnaires à Rome. NAPLES. Théâtre del Fondo. Opéra buffa de Donizetti. Exécution du Requiem de Mozart. Conjectures sur Milan et Venise.

pp. 65-68. Unsigned.[5]

9 April, LETTRE D'UN ENTHOUSIASTE SUR L'ETAT ACTUEL DE LA MUSIQUE EN ITALIE. Suite.

pp. 73-75. Unsigned.

---

[5] Exact reproduction of preceding article in Revue Européenne.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1832

Revue de Paris

23 Dec. — Galerie Biographique DES ARTISTES FRANCAIS ET ETRANGERS. V.--HECTOR BERLIOZ. pp. 281-298.[6]

1833

L'Europe Littéraire (old series)

8 May — JOURNAL D'UN ENTHOUSIASTE. pp. 123-124.[7]

12 June — ACADEMIE DES BEAUX-ARTS. CONCOURS ANNUEL DE COMPOSITION MUSICALE. pp. 182-183.[8]

---

[6] Although this article is signed by d'Ortigue, it was prepared from an autograph in Berlioz's hand (held at the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale papiers divers No. 38). Reproduced in part in Mém., ch. xii, and d'Ortigue, Le Balcon de l'Opéra.

[7] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xxxvi, VM II, 121-125, and SO, No. 1, pp. 47-52.

[8] Reproduced in VM II, 5-13, and Mém., ch. xxii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1833

L'Europe Littéraire (old series)

19 July — CONCOURS ANNUEL DE COMPOSITION MUSICALE.
pp. 246-247.[9]

1833

Le Rénovateur

9 July — REVUE MUSICALE.
p. 1.
[extract from L'Europe Littéraire article, 19 July 1833]

8 Dec. — REVUE THEATRALE. ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--Première représentation de la Révolte au Sérail, ballet en 3 actes de M. Taglioni, décors de M. Ciceri, costumes de M. Duponchel, musique de M. Th. Labarre.
p. 1. Signed "H. B."

[9] Reproduced in VM II, 17-29 and 33-43, and Mém., ch. xxiii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1833

Le Rénovateur

15 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE. CONCERTS.
[Hiller, Liszt, Chopin]
p. 1.

20 Dec. -- Le concert annoncé pour dimanche prochain par M. Hector Berlioz doit piquer vivement la curiosité publique. Nous extrayons du libretto l'exposé de la représentation qui doit avoir lieu.
p. 1.
[K. Holoman attributes this unsigned announcement to Berlioz. It seems very probable to me also.]

29 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE. CONCERTS.
Concerts Montesquieu.--
Concerts Musard.
p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Gazette Musicale

2 Feb.	INSTITUT. CONCOURS DE MUSIQUE ET VOYAGE D'ITALIE DU LAUREAT. pp. 35-38.[10]
27 April	CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE. Cinquième, sixième et septième concerts. pp. 133-135.
1 June	GLUCK. pp. 173-176.
8 June	GLUCK. (SUITE ET FIN). pp. 181-185.
20 July	Le Suicide par enthousiasme. NOUVELLE. pp. 229-231.

[10] Reproduced in part in Mém., chs. xxii, xxx, and xli.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Gazette Musicale

27 July	Le Suicide par enthousiasme. (SUITE). pp. 237-239.
3 Aug.	Le Suicide par enthousiasme. (SUITE). pp. 248-250.
10 Aug.	Le Suicide par enthousiasme. (SUITE ET FIN.) pp. 255-256.[11]
7 Sept.	SERVICE FUNEBRE DE CHORON. pp. 285-287.[12]

[11] Reproduced in part in SO, No. 12, pp. 175-196, and VM II, 311-340.

[12] Reproduced in Journal des Artistes, 5 Oct. 1834, pp. 216-20. Article is reproduced exactly except for the omission of several paragraphs towards the end.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Gazette Musicale

5 Oct.	UN BENEFICIAIRE ET RUBINI A CALAIS. pp. 317-319.[13]
12 Oct.	GUILLAUME TELL, DE ROSSINI. pp. 326-327.
19 Oct.	GUILLAUME-TELL, Second article. pp. 336-339.
26 Oct.	GUILLAUME-TELL, Troisième article.--2e acte. pp. 341-343.
2 Nov.	GUILLAUME-TELL, 4e article.--3e et 4e acte[s]. pp. 349-351.
2 Nov.	HISTORIQUE DE LA REPRESENTATION DE RUBINI A CALAIS. pp. 351-352.
9 Nov.	Iphigénie en Tauride. pp. 360-361.

[13] Reproduced exactly in JD, 10 Oct. 1834.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Gazette Musicale

16 Nov. — Iphigénie en Tauride.
ler acte.--2me article.
pp. 365-367.

23 Nov. — Iphigénie en Tauride.
ler acte.--3me article.
pp. 377-378.

7 Dec. — Iphigénie en Tauride.
3me [sic] et dernier article.
pp. 389-390.

Journal des Débats

10 Oct. — Rubini à Calais.
[With the note:] "Tel est le titre d'une anecdote que nous trouvons dans le dernier Numéro de la Gazette musicale racontée, avec autant d'esprit que de verve, par M. Hector Berlioz."
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

5 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE.

DON GIOVANNI.--LE REVENANT.

DON GIOVANNI, Opéra de Mozart.--

LE REVENANT, opéra en 3 actes;

paroles de M. Albert de Calvimont,

musique de M. Gomis.

pp. 1-2.

12 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE.

p. 1.

19 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--THEATRE

ITALIEN.--CONCERTS.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--Le Château

d'Urtubi, poéme de MM. Delurieu et

Raoul, musique de feu Henri Berton

fils. THEATRE ITALIEN. --Gianni di

Calais, opéra de Donizetti.

CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE.

p. 1.

27 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE ET LITTERAIRE.

TRAITE DE COMPOSITION DE BEETHOVEN.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

2 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.

Premier Concert du Conservatoire.--

Soirée musicale de Mme Stokausen.--

L'Athénée musical. OPERA-COMIQUE:

Une Bonne Fortune.

p. 1.

9 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.

LES LAUREATS DE L'INSTITUT.--M.

Marliani.

Théâtre-Italien.--Il Bravo.

p. 1.

17 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.

Deuxième concert du Conservatoire.

p. 1.

23 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.

p. 1.

2 March REVUE MUSICALE.

3e CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.--

Symphonie pastorale.

pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

11 March

REVUE MUSICALE ET THEATRALE.

CONCERT DE M. HAUMAN.--4e Concert du Conservatoire.--OPERA.

--Don Juan, musique de Mozart, paroles de MM. Emile Deschamps et Castil Blaze.

p. 1.

16 March

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA--Première représentation de Don Juan, musique de Mozart, paroles de MM. Emile Deschamps et Henri Castilblaze, divertissemens de M. Coraly, décorations de MM. Ciceri, Léon Feuchère [sic], Filastre et Cambon.

pp. 1-2.

23 March

REVUE MUSICALE ET LITTERAIRE.

DON JUAN.--(2e article.)

pp. 1-2.[14]

---

[14] In this review, and in most of those following which have Revue musicale et théâtrale or littéraire, the theatre or literature section is not done by Berlioz.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

30 March

REVUE MUSICALE.

CONCERTS.--Cherubini et Mozart.--

Les deux requiem.

p. 1.

8 April

REVUE MUSICALE ET THEATRALE.

SEPTIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.

pp. 1-2.

13 April

REVUE MUSICALE.

SOUVENIRS D'ITALIE.

p. 1.

20 April

REVUE MUSICALE.

LA CHAPELLE SIXTINE A ROME

pp. 1-2.[15]

27 April

REVUE MUSICALE.

CONCERTS.--Beethoven, Cherubini,

Haumann, Ponchard.

p. 1.

---

[15] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xxxix, and VM II, 153-176.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

11 May

REVUE MUSICALE ET LITTERAIRE.

p. 1.

18 May

REVUE MUSICALE.

REPRISE DE LA VESTALE.

p. 1.

25 May

REVUE MUSICALE.

SOUVENIRS D'ITALIE.

pp. 1-2.

1 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

REOUVERTURE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.--

Première représentation de Lestocq;

paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M.

Auber.

p. 1.

8 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

LES DILETTANTI DE BORDEAUX ET

BEETHOVEN.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

15 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE NAUTIQUE.--OPERA-COMIQUE.

Première représentation de

l'Aspirant de marine.--Débutans.

p. 1.

22 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

p. 1.

2 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-ALLEMAND.--

THEATRE VENTADOUR.--

OPERA-COMIQUE.

p. 1.

13 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--

La Vestale.--Mlle Falcon.--

OPERA-COMIQUE.--L'Angelus.--Le

Petit Chaperon.--Ponchard, Couderc,

Mlle Massy.--Fête musicale de

Londres.

pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

20 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

Quatuors, M. Henri Reber.

p. 1.

27 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--Première représentation de Un caprice de femme, paroles de M. Lesguillon, musique de M. Paer.--Reprise du Revenant.

p. 1.

3 Aug.

REVUE MUSICALE.

Fête musicale de Londres.

(Deuxième article.)

p. 1.

11 Aug.

REVUE MUSICALE.

Service funèbre de Choron

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

16 & 17 Aug. REVUE MUSICALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--La Vestale.

THEATRE NAUTIQUE.--Le Nouveau Robinson.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--

Douze libretti, avec cette épigraphe: Tout pour la musique, par F. L. Berthé.

p. 1.

24 Aug. REVUE MUSICALE.

CONCERTS.

p. 1.

31 Aug. REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--Première représentation de le Fils du Prince, opéra-comique en deux actes, paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. de Feltre.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

14 Sept.

REVUE MUSICALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--

Guillaume Tell; Robert le Diable.

pp. 1-2.

21 Sept.

REVUE THEATRALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE

MUSIQUE.--Première représentation

de la Tempête, ballet en deux actes

de M. Coraly, musique de M.

Schneitzoeffer, décors de MM.

Ciceri, Feuchères et plusieurs

autres.

p. 1.

28 Sept.

REVUE MUSICALE.

LES CHARMES DE PORTICI, rondo

brillant.

NOTRE-DAME DE PARIS, rêverie

musicale, pour piano, dédiée à

Victor Hugo, par Jules Benedict

--LE CHALET.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

9 Oct. REVUE MUSICALE.
OPERA.--THEATRE ITALIEN--
THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
p. 1.

14 Oct. BOIELDIEU.
p. 1.

18 Oct. REVUE THEATRALE.
THEATRE NAUTIQUE.--Première représentation de Chao-Kang, ballet, pantomine en 3 actes avec un épilogue par M. Henri.
p. 1.

26 Oct. REVUE MUSICALE.
THEATRE VENTADOUR.--Chao-Kang, par M. Henri.--CONCERTS d'Haumann.
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

2 & 3 Nov.

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--Première représentation de le Marchand forain, opéra en 3 actes, paroles de M. Planard, musique de M. Marliani.

Avis aux lecteurs assez désoeuvrés pour lire mes feuilletons.

p. 1.

16 Nov.

REVUE MUSICALE.

A ELLE, lettres pour le piano, par Chrétien Urhan, avec cette épigraphe. "Peut-être dans la foule une ame [sic] que j'ignore, Aurait compris mon ame et m'aurait répondu". (LAMARTINE.)

p. 1.

27 Nov.

REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE-NAUTIQUE.--La dernière Heure d'un Condamné. CONCERTS.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1834

Le Rénovateur

5 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE-ITALIEN.--Ernani, musique de M. Gabussi.--OPERA-COMIQUE.--La Sentinelle perdue, paroles de M. Saint-George [sic], musique de M. Rifaut.

pp. 1-2.

14 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE-ITALIEN.--Débuts de Mlle Brambilla. OPERA-COMIQUE.--Débuts de Mlle Annette Lebrun.--THEATRE VENTADOUR.--Choristes allemands.--

p. 1.

23 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA.--Guillaume Tell.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--Reprise de Zémire et Azor.--CONCERTS.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

La Gazette Musicale

11 Jan. TELEMACO,
Opéra italien de Gluck.
pp. 10-13.

18 Jan. PREMIER BAL DE L'OPERA.
pp. 22-24.

1 Feb. LETTRES A ELLE, pour le piano,
par Chrétien Urhan.
Prix: 4 fr. 50 c.
pp. 40-41.

3 May CONCERT HISTORIQUE DE M. FETIS.
pp. 155-156.

12 July DE INTRUMENTATION [sic] DE ROBERT
LE DIABLE.
pp. 229-232.

18 Oct. CHANTS POUR LE PIANO, de Meyerbeer,
pp. 342-343.

25 Oct. CHANTS POUR LE PIANO, de Meyerbeer,
(Deuxième et dernier article.)
p. 351.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Journal des Débats

25 Jan. SOCIETE DES CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE. PREMIER CONCERT.
pp. 1-3. Signed "H..."

12 Feb. DEUXIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 1-2. Signed "H."

20 Feb. TROISIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. Symphonie de Haydn.--Symphonie de Beethoven.
pp. 1-2. Signed "H."

22 March SOCIETE DES CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE. 4e CONCERTS [sic].
pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxx."

12 April CINQUIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. Symphonie en si bemol de Beethoven; grande Scène de Beethoven, chantée par Mlle Falcon; Solo de violoncelle, par M. Franchomme; Andante de la symphonie en la de Beethoven; grande choeur d'Euryanthe, de Weber; ouverture de Fidelio, de Beethoven.
pp. 1-2. Signed "H."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Journal des Débats

18 April — SIXIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 1-2. Signed "H..."

25 April — CONCERTS DE M. LISTZ [sic].
Hôtel-de-ville (salle Saint-Jean).
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxx".

23 June — DERNIERES SEANCES DU CONSERVATOIRE.
--GYMNASE MUSICAL.
pp. 1-3. Signed "H..."

21 July — DE LA MUSIQUE EN PLEIN AIR.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxx."

9 Aug. — LE REQUIEM DES INVALIDES ET LE TE DEUM DE NOTRE-DAME. MM. CHERUBINI ET LESUEUR.
pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxx."[16]

[16] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xiii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Journal des Débats

5 Sept. — DES MUSICIENS AMBULANS ALLEMANDS ET ITALIENS.
pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxx".[17]

13 Sept. — SOUVENIRS D'UN HABITUE DE L'OPERA. (1822-1823.)
pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxxxx".[18]

27 Sept. — DE LA PARTITION DE ZAMPA.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".[19]

2 Oct. — DU SYSTEME DE GLUCK EN MUSIQUE DRAMATIQUE.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".[20]

---

[17] Reproduced in Mém., chs. xli and xxxix.

[18] Reproduced exactly in Le Ménestral, 10 April 1836, except for omission of last few paragraphs. See also VM I, 385-399, and Mém., ch. xv.

[19] Reproduced in MM, pp. 131-141.

[20] Reproduced in VM II, 265-277, and ATC, pp. 173-179.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Journal des Débats

16 Oct. DES DEUX ALCESTES DE GLUCK.
(Premier Article.)
pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxxxx."

23 Oct. DES DEUX ALCESTES DE GLUCK
(Deuxième et dernier Article.)
pp. 1-2. Signed Hxxxxx"[21]

15 Nov. DU DON JUAN DE MOZART
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."[22]

21 Nov. MUSIQUE RELIGIEUSE.
Rachel, Noemi, Ruth et Booz,
oratorios de M. Lesueur.--Auditions
de M. Urhan.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."[23]

---

[21] Reproduced in VM II, 281-307, and ATC, pp. 180-188.

[22] Reproduced in MM, pp. 3-13.

[23] Reproduced in MM, pp. 59-67.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Journal des Débats

22 Dec. ENSEIGNEMENT MUSICAL.

Cours de contre-point et fugue, de M. Cherubini.--

Traité de composition, de Beethoven. Chez M. Maurice Schlesinger, rue de Richelieu, 97.

pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".

Le Monde Dramatique

June, vol. I SPECTACLES DE PARIS.

LE PORTEFAIX. Opéra comique en trois actes, musique de M. GOMIS.

pp. 84-86.

July, vol. I SPECTACLES DE PARIS.

DEBUT DE MADAME LAURI ET DE M. SERDA.

pp. 148-150. [Article unsigned, however listed as by Hector Berlioz in the index.]

Aug., vol. I DU REPERTOIRE DE GLUCK A L'ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.

pp. 180-181.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Monde Dramatique

Aug., vol. I

SPECTACLES DE PARIS.
ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.
L'ILE DES PIRATES
--Ballet-Pantomine, en quatre actes, par MM. Henry et xxx, musique de MM. GIDE, CARLINI, ROSSINI et BEETHOVEN; décorations de MM. PHILASTRE, CAMBON, DESPLECHIN, SECHAN, FEUCHERES et DIETERLE. pp. 199-200. [Unsigned, listed as "H. B" in the index. Prod'homme attributed it to Berlioz. I am still uncertain. It could be by Henri Blanchard.]

Le Rénovateur

5 Jan.

REVUE MUSICALE.
CONCERTS
[Ernst-Francilla Pixis].
p. 1.

11 Jan.

REVUE MUSICALE
[Paisiello].
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

18 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE.
ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE--THEATRE ITALIEN--L'OPERA-COMIQUE.--Première représentation de Robin des Bois.
p. 1.

25 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE.
CONCERTS.--Concert de M. Hippolyte Monpou.
p. 1.

1 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.
THEATRE ITALIEN.--I Puritani
p. 1.

8 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.
ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--OPERA-COMIQUE.--CONCERTS.--DEUXIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.--MATINEES DE M. TILMANT.
p. 1.

17 Feb. REVUE MUSICALE.
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

1 March

REVUE MUSICALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--Première représentation de La Juive, opéra en cinq actes, de M. Scribe, musique de M. Halevy [sic], décors de MM. Diéterle, Delplechin [sic], Sechan [sic] et Léon Feuchère [sic].

pp. 1-2.

5 March

REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.--La Marquise, paroles de MM. St-Georges et Lewen, musique de M. Adam.--Début de Mlle Fargueil.--THEATRE ANGLAIS.

p. 1.

17 March

REVUE MUSICALE.

CONCERT DES ELEVES DE CHORON, à l'Hôtel-de-Ville.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

29 March

REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE ITALIEN: Marino Faliero; musique de M. Donizetti.--THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE: Le Cheval de bronze; musique de M. Auber, paroles de M. Scribe.

pp. 1-2.

5 April

REVUE MUSICALE.

CONCERTS.

p. 1.

12 April

REVUE MUSICALE ET THEATRALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--THEATRE-FRANCAIS.--OPERA.--Bénéfice de Mlle Taglioni.--Première représentation de Brezilia, ballet en un acte, de M. Taglioni, musique de M. Gallemberg.

pp. 1-2.

29 April

REVUE MUSICALE.

CONCERTS.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

13 May

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE. Débuts de Mlle Camoin, de M. Riquier. Reprise du Diable à quatre.

p. 1.

17 May

REVUE MUSICALE.

[Gymnase musical. Arrival of Meyerbeer in Paris]

p. 1.

28 May

REVUE MUSICALE.

[Gymnase Musical]

p. 1.

7 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

[Début of Serda]

p. 1.

14 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

GYMNASE MUSICAL.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

20 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.--

1re représentation du Portefaix, opéra-comique en 3 actes, musique de M. Gomis, paroles de M. Scribe.

pp. 1-2.

29 June

REVUE MUSICALE.

FIDELIO A CONVENT-GARDEN.--

GYMNASE MUSICAL.--

p. 1.

12 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.--

Micheline.--Alda.--Concerts Musard.--Cantiques de l'abbé Le Guillou.

pp. 1-2.

19 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--FETES MUSICALES DE TOULOUSE.

p. 1.

27 July

REVUE MUSICALE.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

8 Aug. REVUE MUSICALE.
OPERA-COMIQUE.--Première représentation des Deux Reines, opéra-comique en un acte, musique de M. H. Monpou, paroles de MM. F. Soulié et Arnoud.
pp. 1-2.

16 & 17 Aug. REVUE MUSICALE.
ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.--Première représentation de l'Ile des pirates, ballet en quatre actes, de M. Henry; musique de MM. Carlini et Casimir Gide, décoration de MM. Despleschin [sic], Séchan, Feuchères, Diéterle, Philastre et Cambon.
p. 1.

31 Aug. REVUE MUSICALE.
M. DUPONCHEL, LES CHOEURS DE L'OPERA.
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

6 Sept.

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE.--Reprise de Zampa.

p. 1.

21 Sept.

REVUE MUSICALE.

PUBLICATIONS NOUVELLES--Cours de contrepoint et fugue, par M. Cherubini.

pp. 1-2.

30 Sept.

REVUE MUSICALE.

BELLINI. [Obituary]

p. 1.

5 Oct.

REVUE MUSICALE.

p. 1.

12 Oct.

REVUE MUSICALE ET THEATRALE.

p. 1.

19 Oct.

REVUE MUSICALE.

OPERA-COMIQUE: 1re représentation de Cosimo, opéra-bouffon en deux actes, de MM. Saint-Hilaire et Paul Duport, musique de M. E. Prévost.

p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

27 Oct. REVUE MUSICALE.
OPERA.--THEATRE-ITALIEN.--
OPERA-COMIQUE.--GYMNASE-MUSICAL.
p. 1.

5 Nov. REVUE THEATRALE ET MUSICALE.
OEUVRES POSTHUMES DE VICTOR
LEFEBURE.
p. 2.

3 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE ET THEATRALE.
ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE: Mlle
Flecheux, Mme Baptiste Quiney.
--OPERA-COMIQUE: La Grande
duchesse; Mme Damoreau.--THEATRE
ITALIEN.--Concert de MM. Allard et
Chevillard.
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

Le Rénovateur

23 Dec. REVUE MUSICALE.
OPERA-COMIQUE: Première représentation de l'Eclair, opéra-comique en trois actes, de MM. Planard et Saint-Georges, musique de M. Halevy.
--THEATRE-ITALIEN: Norma.
--ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE: Le Siége [sic] de Corinthe.
p. 1.

1836

Journal Des Débats

17 Jan. OPERA-COMIQUE.--CONCERTS.--LES VIRTUOSES ET LES COMPOSITEURS.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".

24 Feb. PREMIER CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Journal des Débats

1 May — CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE.

La Flûte enchantée et les Mystères d'Isis.--Le correcteur de Mozart

pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."[24]

3 July — ANTOINE REICHA.

pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxxxx."[25]

16 July — BELLINI.

pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."[26]

---

[24] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xvi, and MM, pp. 14-21.

[25] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xiii.

[26] Reproduced in MM, pp. 167-179.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Journal des Débats

23 July

VARIETES MUSICALES

Le Siége [sic] de Corinthe à l'Opéra.--M. Ole-Bull.--M. Labarre et son école de harpe.--La musique des fêtes publiques.--Les Artistes et les Amateurs de Paris. Leur réunion en 1794 pour célébrer la victoire de Fleurus.--Les Dilettanti quêteurs en 1830.--Le choeur colossal de la galerie Colbert.

pp. 1-2. signed "Hxxx".[27]

2 Aug.

ITALIE PITTORESQUE.

pp. 1-3. Signed "Hxxxx".

26 Aug.

CHRONIQUE MUSICALE.

M. Urhan.--Conservatoire de Genève.

pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".

---

[27] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xxix.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Journal des Débats

18 Sept. — DES PROGRES DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT MUSICAL EN FRANCE. M. JOSEPH MAINZER, M. AUBERY DU BOULLEY. pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."

10 Nov. — LES HUGUENOTS. La Partition.--1er Article. pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx."[28]

10 Dec. — LES HUGUENOTS. La Partition.--(Deuxième et dernier Article.) pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".[29]

Revue et Gazette Musicale

31 Jan. — PREMIER CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 38-39.

---

[28] Reproduced in MM, pp. 83-94.

[29] Reproduced in MM, pp. 95-105.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Revue et Gazette Musicale

7 Feb. BELLINI ET ROSSINI.
pp. 43-45.

14 Feb. SECOND CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 54-55.

21 Feb. LE CARNIVAL A ROME ET A PARIS.
Du sentiment de l'art chez les masses,
MATINEES MUSICALES DE MM. TILMANT.
pp. 57-59.

6 March LES HUGENOTS, (Première représentation)
OPERA EN CINQ ACTES, Musique de M. MEYERBEER, paroles de M. SCRIBE, divertissemens de M. TAGLIONI, Décors de MM. SECHAN, FEUCHERES, DIETERLE et DESPLECHIN.
pp. 73-77.

13 March LES HUGUENOTS,
1er 2e 3e actes.
(Deuxième article.)
pp. 81-83.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Revue et Gazette Musicale

20 March	LES HUGUENOTS, 4e et 5e actes. (Troisième article.) pp. 89-91.
27 March	5e CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 97-98.
3 April	CONCERT DE MM. OSBORNE ET BENEDICT. pp. 111-112.
24 April	6e CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 133-135.
8 May	SEPTIEME ET DERNIER CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 151-153.
8 May	A MONSIEUR HOFMEISTER, EDITEUR DE MUSIQUE A LEIPSICK. pp. 154-155.
12 June	LISTZ [sic]. pp. 198-200.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Revue et Gazette Musicale

19 June	CONCOURS ANNUEL DE COMPOSITION MUSICALE A L'INSTITUT. (Delenda est Carthago.) pp. 203-206.[30]
10 July	CONCERT DE Mlle MAZEL A L'HOTEL-DE-VILLE. pp. 243-45.
7 Aug.	GOMIS pp. 275-277.
18 Sept.	DE L'OPERA COMIQUE. pp. 323-325.
9 Oct.	THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE. LE MAUVAIS OEIL, opéra-comique en un acte, paroles de MM. Scribe et Gustave Lemoine, musique de Mlle Loïsa Puget. (Première représentation.) pp. 357-359.

[30] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xxii

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Revue et Gazette Musicale

16 Oct. SEANCE PUBLIQUE DE L'INSTITUT.
DISTRIBUTION DES PRIX.
pp. 362-363.

23 Oct. ENCORE UN MOT SUR LE CONCOURS DE COMPOSITION MUSICALE A L'INSTITUT, EN REPONSE AU DERNIER ARTICLE DE M. GERMANUS LEPIC.
pp. 370-373.

30 Oct. ENCORE UN MOT SUR LE CONCOURS DE COMPOSITION MUSICALE A L'INSTITUT, EN REPONSE AU DERNIER ARTICLE DE M. GERMANUS LEPIC.
(Suite et fin.)
pp. 377-380.

6 Nov. THEATRE ITALIEN.
Reprise du Matrimonio Secreto.
pp. 389-390.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836

Revue et Gazette Musicale

20 Nov.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.
LA ESMERALDA, opéra en 4 actes; paroles de M. Victor Hugo, musique de mademoiselle Louise Bertin, décors de MM. Philastre et Cambon. (Première représentation.)
pp. 409-411.

27 Nov.

REVUE CRITIQUE.
Publications nouvelles pour piano seul, et chant avec piano et violoncelle, de M. Urhan.
LE PELERIN, ballade de M. Emilien Pacini, musique de M. H. Panofka.
--LA MORT DE GOMIS, élégie dédiée à M. Cavé, paroles de M. E. Pacini, musique de M. J. Struntz.
pp. 419-20.

4 Dec.

SOCIETE POLYTECHNIQUE.
DISTRIBUTION DES PRIX.
pp. 428-429.

18 Dec.

CONCERTS DE LA SOCIETE PHILOTHECNIQUE [sic].
pp. 446.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Chronique de Paris

19 March	CHRONIQUE MUSICALE. pp. 191-193. Signed "...z."
7 May	CHRONIQUE MUSICALE. pp. 309-11.
18 June	CHRONIQUE MUSICALE. pp. 402-404.
30 July	CHRONIQUE MUSICALE. pp. 71-73.
10 Sept.	CHRONIQUE MUSICALE. pp. 166-168.
8 Oct.	CHRONIQUE MUSICALE. pp. 223-224.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Journal des Débats

31 Jan. REVUE MUSICALE DE L'ANNEE 1836.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".

5 March THEATRE DE L'OPERA.
Première représentation de Stradella, opéra en cinq actes, paroles de MM. Emile Deschamps et Emilien Paccini, musique de M. Niedermeyer, divertissemens de M. Coraly, décors de MM. Despléchin, Sechan [sic], Feuchères et Diéterle.
pp. 1-2. Signed "Hxxxxx".

12 March SOIREES DE MM. LISZT, BATTA, ET URHAN.
TROIS ET SONATES DE BEETHOVEN.
p. 1. Signed "Hxxxxx."[31]

---

[31] Reproduced in VM I, pp. 359-65, and ACT, pp. 81-85.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Journal des Débats

31 March

THEATRE DE L'OPERA.

Représentation au bénéfice de Levasseur.

p. 1. Signed "Hxxxxx."

5 April

THEATRE DE L'OPERA.

Représentation de retraite de Nourrit.

p. 1. Signed "Hxxxxx".

19 April

THEATRE DE L'OPERA.

Guillaume Tell.--Début de Duprez.

p. 1. Signed "Hxxxxx."

17 May

THEATRE DE L'OPERA

Débuts de Duprez dans les Huguenots.

p. 1. Signed "Hxxxxx."

20 June

DE QUELQUES ANCIENS COMPOSITEURS ITALIENS.

pp. 1-2. [First article signed "H. BERLIOZ" for the JD.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Journal des Débats

28 June

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
1re représentation de 1'An Mil, opéra-comique en un acte, paroles de MM. Paul Foucher et Mélesville, musique de M. Albert Grisar.
p. 1.

4 Aug.

PSAUMES DE BENEDETTO MARCELLO.
p. 1.

6 Aug.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA.
Reprise de la Juive.--Duprez.
pp. 1-2.

13 Aug.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
Première représentation du Remplaçant, opéra-comique en trois actes, paroles de MM. Scribe et Bayard, musique de M. Batton.
p. 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Journal des Débats

27 Aug.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA.

Début de Mme Stoltz dans la Juive.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.

Première représentation de la Double-Echelle, opéra-comique en un acte; paroles de M. Planard, musique de M. Ambroise Thomas.

p. 1.

10 Sept.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.

Première représentation de Guise ou les Etats de Blois, opéra en trois actes, paroles de MM. Planard et de Saint-Georges, musique de M. Georges Onslow.

p. 1.

27 Sept.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA.

Reprise de la Muette de Portici.--Duprez, Mlle Elssler, Mmes A. Dupont et Noblet.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.

Première représentation du Bon Garçon; paroles de MM. Lockroy et Anicet Bourgeois, musique de M. E. Prévost.

pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Journal des Débats

15 Oct. LESUEUR. [Obituary]
pp. 1-2.

2 Nov. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE
Première représentation de Piquillo, opéra en trois actes de M. Alexandre Dumas, musique de M. Monpou.
p. 1.

10 Nov. STRAUSS.
SON ORCHESTRE, SES WALSES.--DE L'AVENIR DU RHYTHME.
pp. 1-2.

10 Dec. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
Première représentation du Domino noir, paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. Auber.
ENSEIGNEMENT MUSICAL.--CONCERTS.
pp. 1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

1 Jan. DE L'IMITATION MUSICALE.
pp. 9-11.

8 Jan. DE L'IMITATION MUSICALE.
(2e et dernier article.)
pp. 15-17.

22 Jan. PREMIER CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 29-31.

5 Feb. QUELQUES MOTS SUR LES ANCIENS COMPOSITEURS, ET SUR GRETRY EN PARTICULIER.
pp. 45-46.

5 Feb. PREMIERE SOIREE MUSICALE DE MM. LISZT, BATTA ET URHAN.
DEUXIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 50-51.

19 Feb. A M. B. [sic] SCHUMANN, DE LEIPSICK.
pp. 61-63.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

19 Feb.	CONCERTS. (Troisième Soirée de MM. Liszt, Urhan, et Batta.) pp. 63-64.
26 Feb.	CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 71-72.[32]
26 Feb.	Rebecca, paroles de M. E. Paccini, musique de Henri Panofka. p. 74.
12 March	CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 88-89.
19 March	REVUE DE LA QUINZAINE. pp. 95-96.
26 March	CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE. pp. 101-103.

[32] Reproduced in part in Mém., chs. i and viii.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

1 April — JEAN-BAPTISTE BUONONCICI.
pp. 114-115. [Signed "B", attrib. to Berlioz in index.]

9 April — CONCERTS DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 121-23.[33]

23 April — SEPTIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
Symphonie pastorale--Motet de Haydn.--Concerto de violon par M. Lafont.--Grande scène d'Alceste.--Ouverture de Feychütz [sic].
pp. 145-147.

30 April — DERNIER CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
p. 152.

21 May — THEATRE DE L'OPERA.
Début de Duprez dans les Huguenots.
pp. 175-176.

---

[33] Reproduced in VM I, 279-88, and ACT, pp. 40-44.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

11 June

REVUE CRITIQUE.
De l'art dans les provinces.--M. Ferdinand LAVAINE.
pp. 203-206.

25 June

ESQUISSES BIOGRAPHIQUES.
pp. 219-221.

2 July

REVUE CRITIQUE.
DERNIERES PENSEES MUSICALES DE MARIE FELICITE GARCIA DE BENIOT.
pp. 228-229. Signed "H. B.....z."

6 Aug.

ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.
Reprise de la Juive. (D'HALEVY.)
p. 369.

20 Aug.

LES CONCERTS DES TUILERIES SOUS L'EMPIRE. SUSCEPTIBILITE SINGULIERE DE NAPOLEON; SA SAGACITE MUSICALE.
pp. 379-380.[34]

---

[34] Reproduced in SO, No. 20, pp. 285-89.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

27 Aug. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE. PREMIERE REPRESENTATION DE LA DOUBLE ECHELLE, Opéra comique en un acte; paroles de M. PLANARD, musique de M. Ambroise THOMAS. pp. 389-90.

27 Aug. NOTICE NECROLOGIQUE. CHARLES EBNER. p. 392. [Signed "H. B.", identified as by Berlioz in index.]

3 Sept. REVUE CRITIQUE. MESSE A TROIS VOIX EGALES, DE M. MASSIMINO. pp. 400-401.

10 Sept. DE LA MUSIQUE EN GENERAL. pp. 405-409.[35]

---

[35] Reproduced in VM I, 241-60, and ATC, pp. 21-34.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

17 Sept. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE. PREMIERE REPRESENTATION DE GUISE, OU LES ETATS DE BLOIS, Opéra en trois actes et en cinq tableaux, paroles de MM. PLANARD et DE SAINT-GEORGES, musique de M. ONSLOW. pp. 414-415.

17 Sept. REVUE CRITIQUE. M. PRINTEMPS. pp. 415-416.

1 Oct. LE PREMIER OPERA. NOUVELLE. Florence, 27 juillet 1555. ALFONSO DELLA VIOLA A BENVENUTO CELLINI. pp. 427-31.[36]

---

[36] Reproduced in VM II, 229-249.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

1 Oct. ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.
REPRISE DE LA MUETTE DE PORTICI.
pp. 431-432.

8 Oct. LE PREMIER OPERA.
NOUVELLE. (Suite et fin.)
BENVENUTO CELLINI A ALFONSO DELLA VIOLA.
Paris, 10 juin 1557.
pp. 435-437.[37]

15 Oct. NECROLOGIE.
JEAN-FRANCOIS LESUEUR.
pp. 443-445.[38]

---

[37] Reproduced in VM II, 251-262, and SO, No. 1.

[38] Reproduced in Mém., ch. xiii, and MM, pp. 68-79.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

22 Oct. ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE. Première représentation de la CHATTE METAMORPHOSEE EN FEMME, Ballet en trois actes, De MM. CHARLES DUVEYRIER et CORALY, musique de M. MONTFORT. pp. 459-460.

29 Oct. CONCERTS DE LA RUE SAINT-HONORE, DIRIGES PAR M. VALENTINO. pp. 470-471.

5 Nov. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE. Première représentation de PIQUILLO, Opéra-comique en trois actes de M. ALEXANDRE DUMAS, musique de M. H. MONPOU. pp. 478-479.

5 Nov. GYMNASE MUSICAL, SOIREE DE VALSES DE STRAUSS. pp. 479-480.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837

Revue et Gazette Musicale

10 Dec.

THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.

Première représentation du DOMINO NOIR, Opéra-Comique en trois actes, de MM. SCRIBE et AUBER.

pp. 541-543.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix B

PROBLEMS OF ATTRIBUTION: SOME UNSIGNED ARTICLES OF BERLIOZ IN THE REVUE ET GAZETTE MUSICALE DE PARIS (1834-1837)[1]

Introduction

Since 1967 the New Berlioz Edition (NBE) has been regularly issuing new editions of Berlioz's music.[2] His music criticism however still remains largely uncollected. This lack is in the process of being remedied by a joint team of French, American, and Canadian researchers who are compiling and publishing Berlioz's complete music criticism in a twelve volume set, including a two volume critical apparatus. This will form part of a new series of reference volumes entitled La vie musicale en France au XIXe Siècle: Etudes et Documents under the general editorship of H. Robert Cohen and Yves Gérard.[3] A complete list of Berlioz's music criticism will also be published in the forthcoming Catalogue of the works of Hector Berlioz by D. Kern Holoman as Volume 24 of the New Berlioz Edition. At the present moment the only Bibliography of Berlioz's music criticism is J.-G. Prod'homme's incomplete and often inaccurate "Bibliographie berliozienne" in the Revue Musicale of 1956.[4]

One of the journals to which Berlioz contributed most during his

---

[1] Paper given at a Post-Graduate Seminar, at Melbourne University Music Faculty, June 1983.

[2] NBE is published by Barenreiter-Verlag under the general editorship of Hugh Macdonald.

[3] To be published by Pendragon Press by arrangement with Les Presses de l'Université Laval under the auspices of the Association Nationale Hector Berlioz. The research group is based at the Université Laval, the University of British Columbia, and the Conservatoire National Supérieur de Musique de Paris.

[4] "Bibliographie Berliozienne", Revue Musicale, 233 (1956), 97-147.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

critical career was the Revue et Gazette Musicale. While engaged in research on Berlioz's music criticism I came across a number of unsigned articles in the Revue et Gazette Musicale of the 1830s that showed striking similarities to signed articles by Berlioz. I gradually became convinced that these unsigned articles were indeed by Berlioz and my aim in this article is to document and justify the reasons for my attributions.

The Revue et Gazette Musicale was a merger of two journals, the Gazette Musicale and the Revue Musicale. The former was founded in 1834 by Maurice Schlesinger, an expatriate German music publisher. Schlesinger's aim in founding the magazine was two-fold: first he wanted a venue through which he could promote his own editions, and second he wanted to create a music journal which appealed to a wider audience than the scholarly Revue Musicale, which had been founded in 1828 by François Joseph Fétis, a Belgian musicologist resident in Paris. In November 1835 the two journals merged and officially became the Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris, although it was commonly referred to as the Gazette Musicale.[5] The Revue et Gazette Musicale provided a good coverage of current musical events alongside serious articles on music, snippets on overseas concerts, and literary fiction with a musical theme.

Berlioz was an active collaborator for the Revue et Gazette Musicale from 1834 until 1859, and he contributed to it most extensively during the second half of the 1830s.[6] He became a member

---

[5] Henceforth, wherever reference is made to the Revue et Gazette Musicale in a general statement such as this one, it is assumed that reference is also being made to the Gazette Musicale, since the journal changed only its name in November 1835 and not its approach or contents.

[6] During the 1840s and 1850s he wrote principally for the Journal
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the journal's editorial committee, and such a stalwart one that he was called upon to take over the editorial control when Maurice Schlesinger was absent.[7] It was common in 1834 for articles to remain unsigned; indeed it was only in 1835 that some critics began consistently to sign their reviews. Though there were many unsigned articles in the Gazette Musicale of 1834, the number diminished over the years. Thus the period 1834 to 1837 proved the most fruitful in the search for unsigned articles by Berlioz. Over this same period the Revue et Gazette Musicale also published ninety-one of Berlioz's signed articles.[8]

Two different issues arose in respect to these unsigned reviews. First, it was necessary to establish a workable "method" for identifying which articles were by Berlioz, a method that would raise questions of style, content, and the making of comparisons. Second, questions had to be asked about Berlioz's reasons for writing the articles. Allied to this second issue is the question whether Berlioz wrote unsigned articles for journals other than the Revue et Gazette Musicale.

Before continuing, I must point out that I am not alone in thinking that there are a number of unsigned articles by Berlioz in the Revue et Gazette Musicale. An American scholar, Katherine Kolb Reeve, has also compiled a list of articles that she had uncovered, while engaged in more general research on Berlioz's music criticism.[9]

---

[6](continued)
des Débats.

[7] This happened chiefly in 1837.

[8] He wrote nineteen articles in 1834, eight in 1835, twenty-seven in 1836, and thirty-seven in 1837.

[9] Katherine Kolb Reeve, "The Poetics of the Orchestra in the
(Footnote continued)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I have since spoken to her about her work and we have exchanged lists, which proved to be very similar. I had a few articles that she did not and vice-versa. In my list of unsigned articles from the Revue et Gazette Musicale of 1834 to 1837 (included below, pp. 354-359) I have marked the articles about which we agreed by adding K. R. in square brackets.

Katherine Kolb Reeve has written an article for the Berlioz Society Bulletin in which she proves that three of the unsigned Revue et Gazette Musicale articles are by Berlioz. These are the articles written in 1836 and signed "un vieillard stupide qui n'a presque plus de dents" ("a stupid old man who has almost no teeth left").[10] Berlioz is easily identifiable as the author of these articles since he repeats verbatim material from the first article (signed "un vieillard") in two subsequent signed reviews. Another five of the articles in my list can be shown to be by Berlioz simply by reference to his correspondence, in which he mentions them. That is, he refers to having written them without, however, saying that they were unsigned. These articles and the "un vieillard stupide" articles are included in my list.

The two quite independently compiled lists concur well. However, more evidence is needed to show that the remaining unsigned articles, apart from those identified by K. R., are written by Berlioz. It was for this reason that I have developed the following method of identification.

---

[9] (continued)
Writings of Hector Berlioz", Diss. Yale 1978.

[10] Katherine Kolb Reeve, "A Berliozian Spoof", Parts 1 and 2, Berlioz Society Bulletin, 103 (Spring 1979), 2-8, and 106 (Winter 1979-80), 4-10.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Methodology

The following comparisons have been made in attempting to prove that a number of unsigned articles in the Revue et Gazette Musicale (1834-1837) were written by Berlioz:

1. Comparison with reviews in other journals and newspapers of the time, both literary and political. The aim here is to see if other critics had written on the same subjects as those of the unsigned articles, and if so in what way their articles differed from the unsigned articles. I have consulted the following journals and newspapers for the period 1834 to 1837 for the purpose of comparison with the unsigned articles:

L'ARTISTE

LE CONSTITUTIONNEL

JOURNAL DE PARIS

JOURNAL DES DEBATS[11]

LE MENESTREL

LE MONITEUR UNIVERSEL

LE NATIONAL

LA PRESSE

LA QUOTIDIENNE

LE SIECLE

LE TEMPS

REVUE DE PARIS

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES

REVUE MUSICALE[12]

---

[11] Only for 1834 as Berlioz took over the music criticism in 1835.

[12] From 1834 until its merger with the Gazette Musicale in 1835.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2. Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz on the same subjects as the unsigned articles.

3. Examination of the style of the unsigned articles and comparison with the style of Berlioz's articles in general.

Where points one and two presented convincing proof by themselves, point three was only summarily applied. Point two provided the most convincing evidence in nearly all cases.

I have presented a close examination of almost half the articles, not including the articles mentioned in the correspondence and the "Vieillard" articles, showing why I think them to be written by Berlioz. The remaining articles I have merely listed. Of course the same process of identification could be applied to all articles, but the "method" has shown itself to be sufficiently workable and convincing to render a full elaboration of the proof for each article unnecessary.

Given its brevity, the examination remains fairly general. It aims to note points that will help in the identification of the articles and is not intended in any way as a comprehensive analysis of Berlioz's style. I should however like to make the following remarks about Berlioz's style.

Notable features of Berlioz's literary style are his skill in narration, his frequent use of irony, his panegyrics for certain composers, his unusually extensive and varied vocabulary, and his tendency frequently to repeat certain personal opinions.

Berlioz's skill in narration is most noticeable in his reviews of opera and <u>opéra-comique</u>, where the libretto is adroitly retold with an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

accompanying commentary characterized by a degree of suspense that immediately involves the reader. The majority of his narrations of opéra-comique libretti are highly amusing; he delights in parodying the stereotyped situations and characters and manages to do this at the same time as giving a straight outline of the story.

Berlioz's use of irony has several levels. His ironical comments on the musical tastes of the Parisian bourgeoisie, like his narrations of libretti, can be relatively light-hearted, but his ironical comments on certain Parisian musical authorities often have bitter undertones. For instance, his comments on the arrangers of Beethoven and Weber are sometimes quite savage. Berlioz clearly preferred to express these feelings through a rhetorical use of irony rather than in a straightforward fashion, and his constant use of irony is a very distinctive component of his style.

Berlioz's particular mode of panegyric is distinguished by series of short phrases or even single words that explode in rapid succession for as much as a paragraph, interpolated by numerous exclamation marks. He uses a number of words recurrently, such as "sublime", "poésie", "rêverie", "la vraie musique", "chef-d'oeuvre", "passion", "le beau", "génie". This technique is merely a feature of Berlioz's mode of praise. It occurs frequently and is usually backed up by concrete evidence of why a work deserves praise. The particular mode of panegyric outlined above is usually reserved for a performance of the music of Beethoven, Gluck, or Weber, the writings of Shakespeare, or, to a lesser extent, Virgil, and occasionally for an exceptional performance of the work of another composer.

This mode of panegyric was not uncommon at the time, particularly in reference to Beethoven; it was however not common for other Parisian critics to describe Gluck's or Weber's music in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

same manner.

Berlioz's vocabulary is quite unusually extensive, and J. M. Bailbé gives an excellent analysis of its sources in his book on Berlioz's Mémoires.[13] Bailbé notes the use of archaic scholarly words--medical words, foreign words, latinisms--and points particularly to Berlioz's liking for startling verbal juxtapositons, such as "Mozart a été assassiné par Lachnith",[14] or "un brigand soupçonné d'avoir violé la musique".[15] The vocabulary used in the early feuilletons is perhaps less extensive than that of the Mémoires, though the same principles still apply.

Once Berlioz has evolved a way of describing something or someone he often retains this description, reusing the same phrases. Thus, there are some expressions which become immediately identifiable as having been written by Berlioz.

This leads directly to the next feature of Berlioz's critical style, the repetition, frequently in the same words moreover, of certain opinions. This point is the one I have drawn on most extensively for purposes of identification. While I have also appealed to the other features of Berlioz's style, they are more elusive and therefore more difficult to use as a tool.

Here are some concrete examples of opinions that Berlioz frequently repeated.

---

[13] Berlioz, artiste et écrivain dans les Mémoires (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1972).

[14] Mémoires (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1969), I, 120.

[15] Mémoires II, p. 70.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A. Dislikes

Things that Berlioz disliked are those which most often became formulae:

1. Vocalized "amen". They were usually spoken of as "ces amens vocalisés et fugués" (Journal des Débats, 20 February 1835). Berlioz's most enduring criticism of the "vocalized amen" is of course in the Damnation de Faust, where he has a group of drunken students parodying it.

2. Italian cadence. This is usually referred to as the "plus usée des formules harmoniques, celle de la cadence italienne" (Journal des Débats, 20 February 1835), which seems to be a reference to a repeated IV- V(6/4)- V(5/3)- 1 cadence at the end of a section or composition.

3. Scholastic use of the fugue, particularly in religious music. That is, use of the fugue just for the sake of showing that you know how to write one, not because it is dramatically motivated. For instance, writing on the Cherubini "Dies Ires" (from his Requiem), Berlioz says, "On regrette de trouver au milieu d'une telle partition une fugue" (Journal des Débats, 9 August 1835). Schumann shared Berlioz's prejudice against the non-poetic fugue, saying that the best fugue was one whose mechanics were so concealed that it could be mistaken for a Strauss waltz.[16]

4. Parisian taste for the "romance, galop, contredanse, vaudeville, concerts en plein air, solos de - , opéra-comique en un acte, cavatine italienne, des faiseurs de quadrilles, un air varié de -", etc.

---

[16] Quoted in Reeve's Diss., 306n.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berlioz usually quotes these items in a list. The list is not always the same but would normally include two or three of the above items.

5. "Chanteuses qui brodent" (singers who embroider their parts). Berlioz was by no means the only critic to complain about this phenomenon; his opinion was shared by his contemporary critics Edouard Fétis and Joseph Mainzer. What is distinctive about Berlioz's criticism of the "chanteuses" is his frequent use of the phrase "abominable roulade", written in italics, and best translated perhaps as "abominable vocal ornamentation".

6. Concours for the Prix de Rome. Berlioz particularly disliked both the system of examination--for instance the fact that the score was judged on the piano version--and the choice of Rome as a place for study.

7. Lack of acceptable concert halls in Paris.

8. Over-use of the "bass-drum" amongst contemporary composers. Again this was a common complaint amongst critics. Berlioz began to point to the absence of the grosse-caisse in a work as a sign of merit. In such cases he invariably uses the phrase, "Il n'y a pas de grosse-caisse" (again printed in italics).

B. Eulogies

Berlioz's eulogistic references to Gluck, Weber, Beethoven, and Shakespeare have already been mentioned; they occur continually in all his writings. A large number of critics at the time spoke of both Beethoven and Shakespeare in eulogistic terms. However, no other

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

music critic knew their works in the same depth or had analyzed them to the same degree as had Berlioz. Thus, not only are eulogies on Weber and Gluck more distinctive of Berlioz than of anyone else, but also the depth of his knowledge of Beethoven and Shakespeare distinguishes his articles from those of other critics. These distinctive likes and dislikes of Berlioz were a considerable aid in identifying the unsigned articles.

With each of the following "proofs" more evidence could have been given to further the identification of Berlioz as the author of the articles. Yet in every case I feel I have already provided enough information to render more evidence unnecessary.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UNSIGNED ARTICLES IN THE REVUE ET GAZETTE MUSICALE FROM 1834 TO 1837

1834

1. 6 July — De l'utilité d'un Opéra-Allemand à Paris.
pp. 213-214. [K. R.]

2. 7 Sept. — ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE
La Tempête,
Ballet en 2 actes, précedé d'un Prologue, de M. Coraly, musique de M. Schneitzoeffer, décors de MM. Ciceri, Feuchères, etc.
pp. 301-304. [K. R.]

3. 7 Dec. — THEATRE NAUTIQUE.
La dernière heure d'un Condamné, Scène pantomine tragique de M. Henri, musique de M. Pugni.
pp. 390-392. [Known: attributed to Berlioz in his correspondence, see Correspondance générale II, p. 174.]

4. 21 Dec. — DU MOUVEMENT MUSICAL A PARIS.
pp. 409-412. [K. R.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835

5. 18 Jan. THEATRE ROYAL DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
Première représentation de ROBIN DES BOIS.
p. 24. [K. R.]

6. 8 Feb. CONCERTS.
DEUXIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
pp. 49-50
Revue critique
LE MOINE, paroles de M. Emilien Pacini, musique de M. G. Meyerbeer.
pp. 50-51. [Berlioz mentions this article in his review "CHANTS POUR LE PIANO, de Meyerbeer", Gazette Musicale, 18 October 1835, p. 343.]

7. 22 Feb. TROISIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE.
p. 66. [K. R.]

8. 31 May GYMNASE MUSICAL. OUVERTURE.
pp. 183-185.
[Article identified by Prod'homme,[17] also listed in Correspondance générale II, "Chronologie 1835".]

---

[17] J.-G. Prod'homme, "Bibliographie Berliozienne".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1835 (cont.)

9. 9 Aug. CEREMONIES DES INVALIDES ET DE NOTRE-DAME.
p. 266. [K. R.]

1836

10. 31 Jan. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
ACTEON, opéra-comique en un acte,
de MM. Scribe et Auber.
(Première représentation.)
pp. 35-37.
Signed "UN VIEILLARD STUPIDE, qui n'a presque plus de dents". [proved K. R.]

11. 21 Feb. LES CONCERTS.
pp. 59-60.
Signed Un amateur de bonne musique.

12. 6 March 3e CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE
pp. 79-80.
[Identified in Berlioz's correspondence. See letter to Schlesinger, Correspondance générale II, p. 290, where he says, "Demain je vous apporterai mon article sur la troisième séance du Conservatoire."]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836 (cont.)

13. 10 April — DU CONSERVATOIRE DE MUSIQUE DE GENEVE.
pp. 116-117.
[Identified by Berlioz in his correspondence. See Correspondance générale II, p. 280.]

14. 22 May — DES ARTISTES ETRANGERS A PARIS.
pp. 172-174. [K. R.]

15. 29 May — REVUE CRITIQUE.
La musique simplifiée dans sa théorie et dans son enseignement.
pp. 181-183.
[Identified by Berlioz in his correspondence. See Correspondance générale II, p. 422.]

16. 17 July — CHRONIQUE MUSICALE.
Signed "Deuxième article du VIEILLARD STUPIDE Qui n'a presque plus de dents".
pp. 251-254. [K. R.]

17. 28 Aug. — CHRONIQUE MUSICALE.
NOTRE-DAME DE PARIS.
p. 305. [K. R.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1836 (cont.)

18. 11 Sept. THEATRE DE L'OPERA-COMIQUE.
LE DIADESTE, opéra-comique en deux actes, paroles de MM. Paul et Saint-Hilaire, musique de M. Jules Godfroy [sic].
(Première représentation.)
pp. 319-320. [K. R.]

19. 25 Sept. ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE.
LA FILLE DU DANUBE.
Ballet-pantomine en 2 actes et en 4 tableaux, de M. Taglioni, musique de M. A. Adam, décors de MM. Ciceri, Dieterle, Feuchère [sic] Despléchin et Sechan.
(Première représentation.)
pp. 341-343.
Signed "UN VIEILLARD STUPIDE qui n'a presque plus de dents". [K. R.]

1837

20. 5 March THEATRE DE L'OPERA.
Première représentation de STRADELLA, opéra en cinq actes.
pp. 79-80.
[Identified by Berlioz in his correspondence, see Correspondance générale II, p. 337.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1837 (cont.)

21. 7 May — CONCERT AU BENEFICE DES OUVRIERS LYONNAIS.
pp. 160-161. [K. R.]

22. 9 July — ACADEMIE ROYALE DE MUSIQUE
PREMIERE REPRESENTATION DE LES MOHICANS, Ballet en deux actes de MM. LEON HALEVY et GUERRA, musique de M. Adam.
pp. 236-237. [K. R.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

EXAMINATION OF THE UNSIGNED ARTICLES

1.[18] DE L'UTILITE D'UN OPERA-ALLEMAND A PARIS, 6 JULY 1834

1.1 Comparison with other reviews

Authorization for the performance of German Opera at the Ventadour theatre in July 1834 was not given much coverage by the music critics at the time. The Journal de Paris (5 July 1834) noted, "Le privilège de jouer l'opéra allemand vient d'être accordé au directeur du théâtre Ventadour" ("The licence to perform German opera has just been granted to the director of the Ventadour theatre"), but even a notice as brief as this was rare.

Towards the end of 1834 and at the beginning of 1835 several critics wrote articles on German opera and performers, with reference to the proposed reprise (revival) of Robin des bois (the French version of Der Freischütz) at the Opéra-Comique. An article by A. Delrieu for Le Temps (29 December 1835, p. 2) represents the feeling of suspicion common amongst many people at the time. He comments,

> Pour un public que les récitatifs des compositeurs italiens, si moelleux, si faciles, et si courts, ne séduisent pas déjà trop, on comprend que ces intermèdes dans une langue gutturale et nullement familière, auront très peu d'attrait. Le jeu des artistes allemands s'éloigne d'ailleurs encore plus des habitudes de notre scène que la declamation du Théâtre-Italien.
>
> (For a public that is already not tempted very much by the recitatives so mellow, so simple, and so short, of Italian composers, one realizes that these interludes in a guttural and completely unfamiliar language will hold little attraction. The acting of the German artists is even further removed from the habits of our stage than the declamation of the Théâtre Italien.)

---

[18] Numbers refer to my list of unsigned articles, pp.354-359.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Delrieu dutifully concludes by wishing the venture success. However, he clearly has misgivings about the appeal of German opera to a French audience.

An article in the Revue Musicale (4 January 1835), unsigned but probably by Edouard Fétis, is more critical than Delrieu's article. The article disapproves of the performance of any foreign works at the Opéra-Comique, which he felt should be reserved uniquely for French music.

Berlioz, however, was consistently enthusiastic about the coming of German opera, and particularly about the beneficial effect that the performance of German works could have on the musical education of the public, as is shown for example by his article for Le Rénovateur (2 July 1834). No other critic, at least none for the journals and newspapers examined, wrote on the subject in July 1834. Thus external evidence seems to point to Berlioz as the author of the Gazette Musicale article. Closer examination of the article confirms this impression.

1.2 Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz

A comparison between Berlioz's signed article on the subject and the unsigned Gazette Musicale article shows striking similarities. Compare for example:

> Nous ne pouvions entendre Beethoven et Weber que sept fois par an aux concerts de la rue Bergère; il nous sera désormais loisible d'applaudir journellement ces sublimes conceptions. . . .
>
> (We were only able to hear Beethoven and Weber seven times a year at the concerts at the Rue Bergère; from now on it will be possible to applaud these sublime

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conceptions daily. . . .)
(Le Rénovateur, 2 July 1834)

Les nombreux adorateurs de Beethoven et de Weber sont dans la joie. L'autorisation de jouer l'opéra allemand vient d'être accordée au théâtre Ventadour.

(The numerous worshippers of Beethoven and Weber are in ecstasy. The authorization to perform German opera has just been granted to the Ventadour theatre.)
(Gazette Musicale, 6 July 1834)

Ah, nous allons donc revoir Fidelio avec Mme Schroeder! espérons aussi que la voix frémissante de Haitzinger ne nous fera pas défaut.

(Ah! we are going once again to see Fidelio with Mme Schroeder! Let us also hope that the vibrating voice of Haitzinger will not be missing.)
(Le Rénovateur, 2 July 1834)

Nous espérons revoir Fidelio sous les traits de madame Schroeder, probablement aussi Florestan [sic] Haitzinger, dont la voix merveilleuse a laissé de si profonds souvenirs aux habitués de la salle Favart.

(We hope to see again Fidelio in the person of Madame Schroeder, also, probably [as] Florestan, Haitzinger whose marvellous voice has left such a strong impression on the habitués of the Salle Favart.)
(Gazette Musicale, 6 July 1834)

1.3 Examination of the style of the unsigned article

Two points need to be emphasized. The first is the way in which the articles discuss the Conservatoire concert audience as "[l]es habitués du Conservatoire, les élus de l'intelligence musicale" ("[t]he habitués of the Conservatoire, the elect of musical intelligence"), so typical of the way Berlioz describes the Conservatoire audience. To give just one example: "un public choisi, intelligent et attentif" ("a choice, intelligent, and attentive public") (Le Rénovateur, 25 January 1835). The second point is the list of Parisian addictions listed in the article: "les contredanses,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

les galops, les valses, les vaudevilles etc", a list constantly repeated (with variations) by Berlioz.

2. LA TEMPETE, BALLET EN 2 ACTES, PRECEDE D'UN PROLOGUE, DE M. CORALY, MUSIQUE DE M. SCHNEITZOEFFER, DECORS DE MM. CICERI, FEUCHERES, ETC., 7 SEPTEMBER 1834

2.1 Comparison with other reviews

La Tempête was reviewed in all journals consulted: Journal de Paris (18 September, pp. 1-2, signed A. Duchêne); Le Ménestrel (21 September, p. 4, unsigned); Revue Musicale (21 September, pp. 300-302, signed "F. B."); Revue de Paris (vol. 9, NS, pp. 210-212, signed "L. G."); Le Constitutionnel, (17 September, pp. 1-2, signed "xxx"); La Quotidienne (20 September, pp. 1-2, signed "J. T."); Le National (17 September, pp. 1-2, signed "x"); L'Artiste (Vol. 8, No. 8, pp. 90-91, unsigned).

The première of a new ballet was always considered worthy of review, even by the political newspapers, and particularly if one of the star ballerinas, such as Fanny Elssler, was performing.

In one of his letters cited in Correspondance générale II (1834, 196) Berlioz states, "Je n'en suis pour rien dans le ballet de la Tempête" ("I have no hand in the ballet The Tempest"). He does however make a few favourable comments, mainly on the mise-en-scène and the décor, in his review of the ballet for Le Rénovateur (21 September 1834).

Nearly every review of La Tempête concentrates on retelling the story in a humorous way. The reviews vary considerably in detail, though some incidents are recounted in all. Virtually no-one, Berlioz

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

included, could resist commenting on the fact that Ferdinand, one of the main characters, emerges from a shipwreck impeccably dressed. Mlle Elssler is uniformly praised, as are the mise-en-scène and décor.

The reviews in La Quotidienne, Revue de Paris, Le Constitutionnel, and L'Artiste barely mention the music, but dwell on the details of the mise-en-scène and the décor.

The reviews for Le National, Revue de Paris, and Le Ménestrel mention the score briefly but only in order to condemn it. For instance the critic for Le National writes, "Je ne sais rien de plus bête que ce ballet" ("I know nothing more stupid than this ballet") (Le National, 17 September 1834, p. 2). Thus, apart from the obvious resemblances between all the articles in the retelling of the story, it is only the review in the Revue Musicale that bears any resemblance to the unsigned article in the Gazette Musicale.

2.2 Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz

Although the Revue Musicale article (signed "F. B.") expresses similar views to the unsigned article on the music of La Tempête, the similarities between Berlioz's Le Rénovateur article and the unsigned Gazette Musicale article are so strong as to make Berlioz's authorship of the unsigned article indisputable:

> La musique de La Tempête offre plusieurs parties remarquables, elle est généralement vive, énergique, habilement quoique trop rudement instrumentée. On dit que M. Schneitzoeffer a été obligé de refaire plusieurs fois divers morceaux à cause des exigeances chorégraphiques. Si le fait est vrai, il n'en a que plus de mérite à nos yeux, car nulle part on ne peut remarquer la négligence d'un auteur tourmenté qui avait hâte de finir.
>
> (The music of the Tempest offers several remarkable sections; it is generally lively, energetic, skilfully, although too severely, orchestrated. It is said that M. Schneitzoeffer was obliged several times to redo various

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pieces because of the demands of the choreography. If this is true it adds only more merit in our eyes, for nowhere can one notice the negligence caused by a tormented author in a hurry to finish.)

(Le Rénovateur, 21 September 1834)

La musique de M. Schneitzoeffer nous a semblé remarquable par tout où le compositeur a pu jouir d'un peu de liberté; nous lui reprocherons cependant de n'avoir pas assez varié les moyens violens que le sujet l'obligeait à employer si fréquemment. Mais savons-nous bien s'il lui a été loisible d'en agir autrement? Il n'y a pas de tâche plus pénible et plus ingrate à la fois que celle imposée nécessairement au compositeur d'une musique de ballet. Quand il a fini, on le fait recommencer. Est-il content d'un morceau, dont il a sagement ménagé la conduite et le développement, le maître chorégraphe arrive, il faut couper ceci, allonger cela, supprimer entièrement une période ou même refaire le morceau.

(M. Schneitzoeffer's music seemed to us remarkable, wherever the composer was able to enjoy a little liberty; we do reproach him however for not having sufficiently varied the violent means that the subject matter obliged him to employ so frequently. But do we indeed know if he was free to do otherwise? There is no job more irksome and more thankless at the same time than that necessarily imposed on the ballet composer. When he has finished, he has to start again. If he is happy with a section, of which he has carefully organized the direction and the development, the master choreographer arrives: this has to be cut, that lengthened, an entire phrase or even a whole section redone.)

(Gazette Musicale, 7 September 1834)

Les costumes sont magnifiques comme à l'ordinaire; l'imagination de M. Duponchel est d'une richesse inépuisable. Les décors, également fort beaux, . . . ne pouvait [sic] manquer d'avoir les plus heureux résultats. Nous citerons, comme de superbes tableaux, la forêt vierge. . . . L'imitation de la mer en fureur est aussi d'une vérité surprenante qu'on n'avait pas encore pu obtenir jusqu'ici.

(The costumes are as usual magnificent; M. Duponchel's imagination is of an inexhaustable richness. The décor, equally very beautiful, . . . could not but produce the most happy results. We cite, as superb scenes, the virgin forest. . . . The imitation of the turbulent sea is also surprisingly true to life, and whose like has not been seen before.)

(Le Rénovateur, 21 September 1834)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Le luxe de la mise en scène est vraiment royal; plusieurs effets, entre autres celui de la mer agitée, dont les flots viennent se briser avec fracas sur la grève qu'ils couvrent de flocons d'écume . . . ont paru aussi nouveaux qu'ingénieusement rendus . . . [C]hacun a reconnu, dans le choix des costumes, le goût parfait qui caractérise les dessins de M. Duponchel.
>
> (The luxury of the mise-en-scène is truly royal; several effects, amongst others that of the turbulent sea whose waves break with a crash on the shore, covering it with flecks of foam . . . appeared both new and ingeniously rendered . . . [E]veryone recognised in the choice of costumes the perfect taste that characterizes the work of Duponchel.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 7 September 1834)

There is also a striking comparison with another signed article by Berlioz, "I'Ile des Pirates", Le Rénovateur, 16 and 17 August 1835:

> Le langage des signes . . . n'a jamais été pour moi fort intelligible et de toutes les pantomines, la plus expressive m'a toujours paru celle de cet homme qui, dans le ballet de la Belle au bois dormant, apporte au milieu de la scène un grand écriteau où sont tracés les mots suivans en lettres énormes: Elle dormira cent ans. Alors seulement mon intelligence commence a s'ouvrir, et grâce à ce procédé mimique incomparable, je comprends parfaitement que la belle dormira cent ans.
>
> (Sign language . . . has never been very intelligible to me, and of all the pantomimes, the most expressive one has always been that of the man who in the ballet of Sleeping Beauty carts onto the middle of the stage a large placard bearing the following words in enormous letters: She will sleep for a hundred years. Only now my intelligence begins to work, and thanks to this incomparable mimetic procedure I understand perfectly that Beauty will sleep for a hundred years.)
>
> (Le Rénovateur, 16-17 August 1835)

> [T]outes les fois qu'il s'agit d'une idée d'où l'intelligence générale de la pièce dépend, on se voit forcé de l'écrire en toutes lettres sur quelque tableau placé bien en évidence, où les spectateurs peuvent lire, comme dans la Belle au Bois, dormant: Elle dormira cent ans.
>
> ([E]very time that it involves an idea on which the intelligence of the piece depends, one seems obliged to write it in big letters on a well-placed placard, where all the spectators can read, as in Sleeping Beauty: She will sleep for a hundred years.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 7 September 1834)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2.3 Examination of the style of the unsigned article

The ironical tone of the Gazette Musicale article is very similar to that used by Berlioz in many of his articles. The introduction of another character into the review besides the narrator is also a device used by Berlioz (and indeed by many other writers of the time such as Schumann, E. T. A. Hoffmann, and Jules Janin). The Gazette Musicale author's demonstrated acquaintance with the music of Spontini, Méhul, Grétry, and Mozart suggests someone with as broad a musical knowledge as Berlioz.

In any case, the close similarity between certain sections of the Gazette Musicale article and the signed articles of Berlioz is sufficient proof that Berlioz is the author of the Gazette Musicale article.

4. DU MOUVEMENT MUSICALE A PARIS, 21 DECEMBER 1834

4.1 Comparison with other reviews

This article is a summary of recent musical events rather than a review of a specific concert and therefore calls for slightly different treatment. The Gazette Musicale article deals mainly with three issues, the construction of the Gymnase Musical (a new concert hall), the state of the Opéra and the Opéra-Comique, and the débuts of several singers, which I shall examine in turn to see how they correspond to articles by Berlioz and other critics.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I Gymnase Musical

A large part of the article concentrates on the Gymnase Musical, on which Berlioz certainly wrote more articles than any other critic of the time. Before the opening of the Gymnase Musical he wrote about its potential (Le Rénovateur, 17 May 1834), then later reviewed dress rehearsals (Le Rénovateur, 28 May 1834). He also reviewed the opening (Gazette Musicale, 31 May 1834) and many subsequent performances.[19]

The section on the Gymnase Musical in the unsigned Gazette Musicale article corresponds, in its description of the building, with the description that Berlioz gives in his article Le Rénovateur (17 May 1835), the only difference being that by May 1835 the apprehensions about finding a suitable orchestra and choir had been resolved. Both articles comment on the interdiction of the contredance: "la contredanse et le galop sont exclus" ("the contredance and the galop will be excluded") (Le Rénovateur), and "la contredanse n'y figurera point" ("the contredance will not be on the programme at all") (Gazette Musicale).

None of the journals consulted discuss the formation of the Gymnase Musical at any length. An article in Le Temps (30 December 1834), which was unsigned but probably written by d'Ortigue, has two paragraphs on the formation of the Gymnase. But these are copied directly, and acknowledged as such, from the unsigned Gazette Musicale article: "Il est question, depuis quelques temps, de la formation d'un Gymnase musical. La Gazette Musicale donne des détails curieux à ce sujet" ("There has been a question for some time now of the formation

---

[19] Le Rénovateur, 14 June 1834, 29 June 1834, 27 October 1834, and Journal des Débats, 23 June 1834.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of a Gymnase Musical. The Gazette Musicale gives some curious information on this subject").

Le Ménestrel regularly followed the progress of the Gymnase, but mostly by snippets inserted in the Nouvelles (Notes) section; there were no full length articles on the Gymnase.

II Opéra

None of the other critics consulted commented on the negligence of the performance at the Opéra of isolated acts from Guillaume Tell and La Vestale. They were more concerned with reviewing the ballets that these acts accompanied.

On the other hand, the similarity between the Gazette Musicale article and a review by Berlioz in Le Rénovateur (14 December 1834), in which he does mention the careless performance of the second act of Guillaume Tell at the Opéra, is striking:

> Je ne parlerai pas de l'exécution musicale [du deuxième acte]; c'est au machiniste que je m'adresse. Est-ce qu'il méprise Rossini au point de ne pas s'occuper des décors de ses ouvrages? C'est peu croyable. Cependant, à la fin de la magnifique scène du Grutli, au moment où les bois, les eaux et les montagnes doivent être innondés de torrens de lumière, le soleil n'a point paru, la toile du fond au lieu de se lever peu à peu est restée immobile, et le cri de guerre des Suisses a retenti dans l'obscurité.
>
> (I shall not speak of the musical execution [of the second act]; I want to address myself to the stagehand. Does he despise Rossini to the point of not being concerned at all about the decor for his works? It is hardly believable. However, at the end of the magnificent Grutli scene, at the moment where the woods, the waters, and the mountains must be inundated with floods of light, the sun did not appear; the canvas at the back, instead of rising little by little, stayed immobile, and the war-cry of the Swiss echoed into the obscurity.)
>
> (Le Rénovateur, 23 December 1834)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> [Dans] le second acte de Guillaume Tell . . . tout y était exécuté avec un laisser-aller si dédaigneux, que le machiniste lui-même n'a pas cru nécessaire de rester à son poste, de sorte qu'à la fin de la scène sur le Grutli, quand Arnold s'écrie: "Voici le jour!" la toile du fond est demeurée immobile et le soleil n'a pas paru.
>
> ([In] the second act of Guillaume Tell . . . everything was performed with such a contemptuous slovenliness that even the stagehand did not think it necessary to stay at his post, so that at the end of the scene on the Grutli, when Arnold cries, "Here is the day!", the canvas at the back remained stationary and the sun did not appear.)
> (Gazette Musicale, 21 December 1834)

III Débuts of singers

Other critics do refer to the débuts of singers. For instance the début of Mademoiselle Lebrun is commented on in the Revue Musicale (14 December 1834, p. 399, unsigned) and in Le Ménestrel (7 December 1834, p. 1, unsigned). These two reviews however do not show the same resemblance to the Gazette Musicale article as does an article by Berlioz in Le Rénovateur, (14 December 1834):

> On voit qu'elle a beaucoup étudié le genre léger et fort peu le style large. . . . Sa voix est fort belle; c'est un contralto plein de caractère dans les cordes graves et de douceur dans les sons aigus. Si j'étais son maître, je lui ferais faire des gammes adagio sostenuto pendant long-temps, long-temps, long-temps, et je lui défendrais expressément des rôles comme celui dans lequel elle a débuté; ils exigent des qualités que Mlle Lebrun n'a pas et empêchent le développement de celles qu'elle possède.
>
> (One sees that she has studied the light genre a great deal and the broader style very little. . . . Her voice is very beautiful; it is a contralto, full of character in the lower notes and sweetness in the higher notes. If I were her teacher I would make her do scales adagio sostenuto for a long, long, long time, and I would expressly forbid her roles such as that in which she has just made her début; they demand qualities that Mlle. Lebrun does not have and prevent the development of those that she does have.)
> (Le Rénovateur, 14 December 1834)

Mademoiselle Lebrun possède un fort beau contralto

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> qu'elle a beaucoup exercé dans les traits, fort peu dans le chant soutenu, et qui ne trouvera pas de quelque temps l'occassion de paraître avec avantage à l'Opéra-Comique, puisqu'il n'y a pas un véritable rôle de contralto dans tout le répertoire. D'ailleurs, malgré sa belle voix et sa jolie figure, nous nous croyons en conscience obligés de lui donner le même conseil que le Signor Astuccio lui adresse dans le Concert à la Cour, celui de travailler encore deux ou trois ans avant de s'aventurer encore dans un rôle important.
>
> (Mademoiselle Lebrun possesses a very fine contralto voice that she has used a lot in brilliant passages, but very little in sustained singing, and who for some time will not have the opportunity to appear at the Opéra-Comique because there is no real contralto role in all their repertoire. Besides, in spite of her beautiful voice and her pretty face, we feel in all conscience obliged to give her the same advice as Signor Astuccio gives her in the Concert at the Court, which is to work for two or three years longer before taking on an important role.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 21 December 1834)

5. PREMIERE REPRESENTATION DE ROBIN DES BOIS, 18 JANUARY 1835

5.1 Comparison with other reviews

All newspapers consulted had a review of Robin des bois: Journal des Debats (19 January, p. 2, signed J. Janin); Le Constitutionnel (19 January, pp. 1-2, signed "A."); Journal de Paris (18 January, pp. 1-2, signed "ZZ."); Le Ménestrel (18 January, p. 4, unsigned); Revue Musicale (18 January, p. 20-21, unsigned); Le Moniteur Universel (19 January, p. 136, signed "P."); La Quotidienne (19 January, pp. 1-2, signed "J. T."); Le Temps (23 January, pp. 1-2, signed "L. V."). Berlioz himself wrote a review for Le Rénovateur (18 January 1835).

The merits of Castil-Blaze's version of Der Freischütz (Robin des bois), are commented on by three of the journals, all of which give the impression that they felt Castil-Blaze had been unjustly criticized. Compare the following:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Il faut savoir gré à M. Castil-Blaze de deux choses: d'abord d'avoir fait connaître cette belle partition, ensuite de s'être tiré assez habilement du rôle difficile de traducteur et d'arrangeur.
>
> (One must be grateful to M. Castil-Blaze for two things: for having made known this beautiful score, and for having aquitted himself so skilfully of the difficult role of translator and arranger.)
> (Journal de Paris, 18 January 1835)

> [E]n 1834, il prit fantaisie à un de nos vaudevillistes de traduire, tant bien que mal, ce poème auquel on ne comprit rien.
>
> ([I]n 1834 one of our vaudevillists took it into his head to translate, doing a fair job, this libretto of which nothing was understood.)
> (Le Moniteur Universel, 19 January 1835)

> Il nous semble que M. Castil-Blaze n'a pas tant mérité l'anathème que lui lancent les fanatiques de l'école allemande.
>
> (It seems to us that M. Castil-Blaze scarely merits the antagonism thrown at him by the fanatics of the German school.)
> (Revue Musicale, 18 January 1834)

5.2 Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz

The Gazette Musicale article refers to the Castil-Blaze arrangement as the "monstre de l'Odéon", and although begrudgingly accepting the reason for the arrangement, the author complains trenchantly of the mutilations and corrections that still remain in the score.

Berlioz's bitter attacks on Castil-Blaze's arrangements are well-known, as is the fact that Berlioz himself later resurrected the score for a performance in 1841, restoring it to what he felt was as close as possible to Weber's original. The comments in the Gazette Musicale article on the faults still remaining in the score--something

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that no other critic had remarked upon--suggest that the article is by Berlioz.

In fact most things about the article suggest Berlioz. The ecstatic enthusiasm for Weber is very typical, as can be seen by the similarity between the following extracts, one from the Gazette Musicale article and one from a signed article by Berlioz:

> Quelles inventions! Quelles recherches ingénieuses! Quels trésors qu'une inspiration soudaine fit découvrir! . . . Il n'y a rien de pareil! c'est l'art divin! c'est la poésie! C'est l'amour même!
>
> (What invention! What ingenious work! What treasures has this startling inpiration made us discover! . . . There is nothing like it! It is divine art! It is poetry! It is love itself!)
>
> (Journal des Débats, 16 June 1841)

> [Weber me réduit] à écrier à chaque morceau, à chaque page, beau, sublime, prodigieux, stupéfiant, incroyable de force, d'originalité, de grâce, de passion, de rêverie, de poésie, débordant d'inspiration.
>
> ([Weber reduces me] to cry out at each section, at each page, beautiful, sublime, prodigious, stupifying, incredible in its force, in its originality, in its grace, in its passion, in its reverie, in its poetry, brimming over with inspiration).
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 18 January 1835)

Though some of the other critics, in particular the reviewers for Le Temps and L'Artiste, were strong supporters of Weber, none was as extravagant in his praise as Berlioz. Fétis wrote a long article for Le Temps (1 February 1835, p. 2) entitled "Considérations sur la musique de Weber". The difference between his slightly considered, pedantic tone and the flamboyance of that of Berlioz is well demonstrated by the following quotation from Fétis's article:

> Au résumé, bien qu'il soit facile de signaler quelques défauts assez graves dans le style de Weber, on ne peut nier qu'il a trouvé beaucoup de choses nouvelles, et qu'il était doué au génie dramatique.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(To sum up, though it is possible to point out several serious faults in Weber's style, one cannnot deny that he has found many new things and that he was gifted with a dramatic genius.)

5.3 Examination of the style of the unsigned article

A closer examination of the Gazette Musicale article reveals the following two points. First, whereas all the reviews commented enthusiastically on the German choir, except the critic for Le Moniteur Universel who felt that the choir lacked elevation in the religious passages, the author of the Gazette Musicale article had a quite specific complaint to make about the choir. It is surely significant that Berlioz makes the same complaint in his review for Le Rénovateur:

> La troupe des choristes allemands . . . formait un choeur formidable, dont les études malheureusement n'ont pas été dirigées de manière à en tirer parti. . . . [L]'absence de sentiment musical se faisait remarquer partout, et certains passages que je croyais devoir amener un succès pour le choeur, ont passé inaperçus. Il me paraît évident que les traditions n'étaient pas connues des personnes qui ont dirigé les études. . . .
>
> (The troupe of German singers . . . formed a formidable choir, whose studies unfortunately had not been directed in such a manner as to get the best out of them. . . . [T]he absence of musical feeling is noticeable everywhere, and certain passages that I thought would lead to a great success for the choir passed unnoticed. It seemed obvious that the people organizing the choir's studies did not know the traditions. . . .)
>
> (Le Rénovateur, 18 January 1835)

> Les choeurs . . . ont exécuté quelques morceaux avec beaucoup de tact; mais, dans plusieurs autres, nous les avons trouvés à cent lieues en dessous de l'effet qu'on avait droit d'attendre d'un aussi grand nombre de voix. La raison doit en être attribuée uniquement à l'absence totale de sentiment musical dans l'enseignement et la direction des choristes.
>
> (The choir . . . performed several pieces with a lot of tact; but in several others we found them a hundred

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> leagues below what one has the right to expect from such a large number of voices. The reason must be attributed uniquely to the total lack of musical feeling in the conducting of the choir.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 18 January 1835)

The second point is that a similarly striking comparison can be drawn between the two articles' descriptions of the quality of the acting, a facet that is not discussed in any of the other articles:

> Mais les acteurs ont montré qu'ils étaient plus capables qu'on ne voulait le croire de chanter la véritable musique dramatique.
>
> (But the actors showed that they were more capable of singing truly dramatic music than people had wanted to believe.)
>
> (Le Rénovateur, 18 January 1835)

> Les acteurs au contraire . . . se sont montrés fort supérieurs à ce qu'on attendait d'eux.
>
> (The actors on the other hand . . . showed themselves to be greatly superior to what they were expected to be.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 18 January 1835)

6. DEUXIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE, 8 FEBRUARY 1835

6.1 Comparison with other reviews

The Conservatoire concerts were clearly not considered to be of universal interest as was, for example, the première of a new ballet. Of the fourteen journals and newpapers consulted only four had reviews of the Conservatoire concerts: Journal de Paris (27 February, p. 2, signed "A. D."); Le Temps (7 February, pp. 1-2, unsigned); Revue Musicale (8 February, pp. 46-47, unsigned); and L'Artiste (Vol. 9, No. 3, unsigned).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The views expressed in these four newspapers are, with the exception of the Journal de Paris, surprisingly similar to one another, to the Gazette Musicale article, and to Berlioz's two signed articles on the concert for Le Rénovateur (8 February 1835) and Journal des Débats (12 February 1835).

All the articles complain of the programming, point to the different expectations of the audience that attended the Conservatoire concerts, and underline the importance of performing works of consistently high quality.

All reviews uniformly praise Beethoven.

6.2 Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz

Comparisons made between the vocabulary of the author of the Gazette Musicale article and by Berlioz in his two articles on the concert show striking similarities:

L'Ouverture de Fesca

> L'Ouverture de Fesca . . . a paru fort dépourvue d'idées véritables. . . .
>
> (The Fesca overture . . . seemed devoid of any real ideas. . . .)
>
> (Le Rénovateur, 8 February 1835)

> [Il y a eu a]bsence complète de mélodie et même de dessins mélodiques, harmonie ordinaire, instrumentation commune . . . en un mot éclipse totale d'idées. . . .
>
> ([There was a] complete lack of melody and even of melodic patterns, ordinary harmony, commonplace instrumentation . . . in a word, total lack of ideas. . . .)
>
> (Journal des Débats, 12 February 1835)

> L'Ouverture de Fesca a paru complètement dépourvue d'idées. L'instrumentation en est commune, la mélodie nulle, et la longeur démesurée.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(The Fesca overture seemed completely devoid of ideas. The instrumentation was commonplace, the melody nil, and the length inordinate.)
(Gazette Musicale, 8 February 1835)

Chorus by Clapisson

[U]ne harmonie pure, relevée par plusieurs modulations d'une heureuse originalité. . . .

([A] pure harmony enhanced by several modulations of a pleasing originality. . . .)
(Le Rénovateur, 8 February 1835)

[Il y a eu] plusieurs effets d'harmonie fort distingués, et une modulation piquante qui se reproduit deux fois avec bonheur.

([There were] several very distinguished harmonic effects and a felicitous piquant modulation that occurs twice.)
(Gazette Musicale, 8 February 1835)

The author of the Gazette Musicale article felt that the Beethoven symphony produced more effect in this concert than in previous years. Berlioz expressed the same opinion in his article for Le Rénovateur.

6.3 Examination of the style of the unsigned article

To give just one example, the opinion expressed and the vocabulary used in the description of Weber's Oberon overture are strikingly suggestive of Berlioz: "Weber n'a rien écrit de plus délicieusement [sic] rêveur, de plus tendre. . . ." ("Weber has never written anything that is more deliciously dreamy, more tender. . . ").

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

7. TROISIEME CONCERT DU CONSERVATOIRE, 22 FEBRUARY 1835

7.1 Comparison with other reviews

The third Conservatoire concert was reviewed by the Journal de Paris (27 February, pp. 2-3, "A. D."); Le Temps (22 February, pp. 1-3, unsigned but probably by d'Ortigue); l'Artiste (Vol. 9, No. 6, p. 70, signed "R"); and by E. Fétis for the Revue Musicale (22 February 1835, pp. 60-61).

One of the most important features of these reviews is the expression of their attitude towards Haydn and Beethoven. It was undoubtedly fashionable at the time to find the symphonies of Haydn insipid in comparison with those of Beethoven. Mendelssohn, in a letter to Carl Zelter, commented disparagingly on this fashion, saying that the French denigration of Haydn showed a lack of understanding of Beethoven: "If they really appreciate what Beethoven had in mind, they must also know what Haydn was, and feel very small."[20]

Berlioz's early music criticism is strongly antagonistic towards Haydn, though he attempts to give a semblance of balance to his arguments, pointing out sections that he likes--for instance an unexpected modulation--and almost always holds the Creation to be a work of art.

The four reviews of the Conservatoire concert listed above represent a cross-section of typical attitudes towards Haydn. "A. D." for the Journal de Paris, though to a slight extent adopting the patronizing tone common at the time when writing on Haydn, clearly

---

[20] Felix Mendelssohn, Letters (15 February 1832), ed. and trans. G. Selden-Coth (1945; rpt. New York: Vienna House, 1973), 192.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

enjoyed the Haydn much more than the Beethoven, which he found complicated and disappointing. He comments,

> La symphonie de Hayden [sic], qui commençait le 3e concert, a été fort goûtée, et malheureusement la limpidité de cette oeuvre d'honnête homme, ces mélodies si faciles, d'une coquetterie si naïve, avaient mal disposé l'auditoire à la fougue et aux hardiesses de Beethoven.
>
> (The Haydn symphony that began the third concert was very much enjoyed, and unfortunately the limpidity of this honest man's work, his simple and naively attractive melodies, ill-prepared the audience for the fire and severity of Beethoven.)

The critic for L'Artiste, "R.", reviews the third and fourth concerts together, concentrating on the fourth concert. One in fact gets the impression that he had not attended the third concert since his review of it centres on an exposition of the current opinions of Haydn and indeed could very easily have been adapted from one of Berlioz's reviews of the concert:

> [L]a musique de ce grand homme n'a pas la puissance de nous émouvoir, de parler à notre intelligence et à notre coeur; les formes, le rhythme et la couleur ont vieilli. La symphonie que nous avons entendue nous rappelait ces airs antiques que nos grands-pères nous chantent avec admiration et qui nous font sourire pour leur allure surannée. La symphonie de Haydn nous avait presque endormi, quand Beethoven est venu nous ranimer par la vivacité, la fraîcheur de ses accords.
>
> ([T]he music of this great man has not the power to move us, to speak to our intelligence and to our heart; the forms, the rhythm, and the colour have aged. The symphony that we heard reminded us of the old-fashioned airs that our grand-fathers sang to us with admiration and that with their outmoded allure, we smiled at. The Haydn symphony had almost sent us to sleep, when Beethoven came to reanimate us with the liveliness and freshness of his harmonies.)

This facile summary is followed by an impressionistic reverie inspired by the Beethoven symphony, which bears little direct relationship to the actual music.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The critics for Le Temps and the Revue Musicale both appear to be reacting against the prevailing idolatory of Beethoven, though at the same time neither wishes to deny Beethoven's greatness.

The Le Temps critic (22 February 1835, p. 2) comments on the Haydn:

> Cela ne vous émeut, ni ne vous transporte, ni ne vous ébranle comme la symphonie de Beethoven; mais cela vous intéresse, vous enchante et vous ravit encore. . . . Pourquoi vouloir faire des ennemis de deux artistes du premier ordre, uniquement, au fond, parce qu'ils appartiennent à deux époques distinctes?
>
> (This does not move you, nor transport you, nor involve you like the Beethoven symphony, but it interests you, it enchants you and delights you again. . . . Why make enemies of two first-rate artists just because, in the end, they belong to two different periods?)

The author expands on this point at some length, commenting also on the division in the audience between "romantics" and "classicists".

Edouard Fétis, writing for the Revue Musicale, comments mildly that the Conservatoire audience are unjust towards Haydn and Mozart "depuis que la foule de leurs auditeurs s'est éprise, fort justement en verité, mais avec trop de partialité d'une admiration fanatique pour Beethoven" ("ever since the crowd of listeners has been taken up, quite justly to tell the truth, but with too much partiality, with fanatical admiration for Beethoven") (Revue Musicale, 22 February 1835, p. 60). He concludes by stating that he found this particular Beethoven symphony--it was the eighth symphony--not as interesting as the Haydn.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

7.2 Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz

Thus the Gazette Musicale article's scorn for the Haydn's supposed prosaicness and lack of passion, though very typical of Berlioz, is certainly not unique to him, but a common sentiment among certain artists of the time. A comparison between the section on Haydn in the Gazette Musicale article and corresponding sections in Berlioz's two reviews of this concert does show, however, very strong similarities of vocabulary and phrasing:

> [C]'est en vain qu'on cherche dans ces mélodies si habilement tissues, une pensée poétique un peu élevée ou un sentiment de quelque profondeur; il n'y a rien de tout cela. La musique instrumentale n'était encore alors qu'un agréable délassement, pour les sens ou l'esprit, dans lequel ni le coeur ni l'imagination n'avaient point de part.
>
> ([I]t is in vain that one searches in these skilfully woven melodies for a poetic thought a little elevated or a sentiment of any depth; there is nothing like that. Instrumental music was still at that stage only an agreeable relaxation for the senses or the spirit, in which neither the heart nor the imagination played any part.)
>
> (Le Rénovateur, 17 February 1835)

> [La musique] n'est ni triste, ni gaie, ni passionnée, ni rêveuse, ni mystique . . . [mais] exprime la tranquillité d'âme, une satisfaction douce et bienveillante. . . . [J]e ne fais qu'exprimer l'impression produite sur moi et sur l'immense majorité des spectateurs, par ce style toujours content, toujours heureux.
>
> ([The music] is neither sad nor gay, passionate, nor dreamy, nor mystical . . . [but] expresses the tranquillity of the soul, a gentle and benevolent satisfaction. . . . [I] am only expressing the impression produced on me and on the immense majority of the spectators by this style, always content, always happy).
>
> (Journal des Débats, 20 February 1835)

> Nous ne nous contentons plus aujourd'hui de musique seulement, nous cherchons dans toute production de quelque étendue, une pensée poétique, un sentiment plus ou moins dramatique, que l'art musical colore à sa manière, et dont il double la puissance. Malheur-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

eusement, il faut bien le reconnaître, il n'y a rien de pareil dans l'oeuvre de l'illustre auteur de la création. Sa symphonie ne consiste qu'en un tissu ingénieux de douces mélodies un peu gaies, un peu tristes, un peu lentes, ou un peu animées, ne s'échauffant jamais jusqu'à la passion et dont le calme ne s'élève jamais non plus jusqu'à la contemplation ou la rêverie. Ce mezzo termine continuel peut satisfaire encore certaines organisations, mais franchement, nous avons la conviction qu'elles sont en très-petit nombre.

(We are no longer satisfied today with music alone, in all productions of any length we look for a poetic thought, a feeling that is more or less dramatic, that the musical art colours in its own way, and that doubles its power. Unfortunately it has to be recognized that there is nothing like this in the work of the illustrious author of the Creation. His symphony only consists of an ingenious tissue of gentle melodies, a little gay, a little sad, a little slow, or a little animated, that never warm up to passion and whose calmness never reaches the level of contemplation or of reverie. This continual mezzo termine might still satisfy certain dispositions, but frankly we are of the opinion that they are few.)

(Gazette Musicale, 22 February 1835)

7.3 Examination of the style of the unsigned article

To make some other comparisons between the three articles, see the description, in all three, of two of Berlioz's "bêtes noires", the "Italian cadence" and the "vocalized amen".

An "Italian cadence" appeared in the finale of the Andante Scherzando of the Beethoven symphony. Here are the corresponding sections describing it from each article:

L'Andante scherzando surtout est d'une naïveté ravissante; sa forme, toute neuve, saisit de prime abord par son originalité; malheureusement cet admirable morceau est un peu écourté . . . et la fin (chose incroyable) n'est autre que la cadence italienne. . . .

(The Andante Scherzando especially is of a ravishing naivety; its form, completely new, seizes us immediately by its originality. Unfortunately this admirable piece is a little shortened . . . and the end, astonishingly, is none other than the Italian cadence. . . .)

(Le Rénovateur, 17 February 1835)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> L'Andante scherzando [est]. . . doux, ingénu et d'une indolence toute gracieuse. . . . Croirait-on que cette ravissante idylle finit par celui de tous les lieux communs pour lequel Beethoven avait le plus d'horreur, par la cadence italienne!
>
> (The Andante Scherzando [is]. . . gentle, ingenious, and of a graceful indolence. . . . Could one believe that this ravishing idyll finishes with that of which, of all that is commonplace, Beethoven had the most horror, the Italian cadence!)
>
> (Journal des Débats, 20 February 1835)

> L'andante scherzando, où les violons sont accompagnés d'une façon si piquante par les instrumens à vent, serait un des chefs d'oeuvre de son auteur, si la fin n'en était aussi écourtée; en outre, les deux dernières mesures se composent de la plus usée des formules harmoniques, celle de la cadence italienne, dont Beethoven s'était gardé de faire usage jusqu'alors, et qu'on ne trouve qu'avec un étonnement profond à la fin d'une conception si poétique et si neuve.
>
> (The Andante Scherzando, where the violins are accompanied in such a piquant manner by the woodwind, would be one of the author's masterpieces if the end were not so curtailed. Besides, the two last measures compose one of the most hackneyed harmonic forms, the Italian cadence, which Beethoven had been careful not to use up until this point and which one finds with but profound astonishment at the end of such a poetic and new conception.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 22 February 1835)

One other critic does mention the Italian cadence, but in such a way that it is clearly meant as a criticism of Berlioz. The critic for Le Temps comments,

> [I]l est certains artistes qui ne pardonnent pas à Beethoven d'avoir employé le style badin dans cet andante, et surtout de l'avoir terminé par une formule à l'italienne. Tout est permis au génie à la condition de faire de l'effet. Nous n'avons qu'une chose à dire aux dénigrateurs: Faites-en autant. Et leur impuissance prouvera qu'il n'est pas plus aisé d'imiter le génie dans les petites choses que dans les grandes.
>
> ([T]here are certain artists who will not forgive Beethoven for having employed a playful style in this andante, and especially for having finished with an Italian cadence. Everything is permitted to the genius on the condition that he does it with effect. We have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> only one thing to say to the denigrators: Do as much yourselves. And their powerlessness will prove that it is no easier to imitate genius in the small things than in the great.)
>
> - (Le Temps, 22 February 1835)

No other review comments on the "vocalized amen" at the end of the Beethoven Gloria. One doubts even if Edouard Fétis stayed until the end of the concert since he mistakenly states that the Credo was performed.

Berlioz's dislike of the "vocalized amen" is repeated so many times as to become wearisome. In his Journal des Débats article he comments,

> D'ailleurs ce choeur finit, Dieu me pardonne de le dire, par un de ces amen vocalisés et fugués que j'ai déjà signalés maintes fois chez d'autres compositeurs comme un contresens barbare.
>
> (Furthermore, this chorus finishes, God forgive me for saying it, with one of those fugal and vocalized amens, which I have already pointed out many times in other composers as a meaningless barbarity.)

The Gazette Musicale article reads:

> Le Gloria de Beethoven, qui terminait le concert, est un grand et beau morceau jusqu'à l'amen; mais alors commence une de ces vocalisations fuguées auxquelles nous avouons ne trouver aucun intérêt musical, et qui nous paraîssent en opposition évidente avec le sentiment d'espoir religieux et de saint receuillement qu'exprime cette parole mystique.
>
> (The Beethoven Gloria, which ended the concert, is a great and beautiful piece until the amen; but then one of those fugal vocalizations begins in which, we confess, we find no musical interest. They seem to us to be in evident opposition to the feeling of religious hope and sacred recollection that this mystic word expresses.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

9. CEREMONIES DES INVALIDES ET DE NOTRE-DAME, 9 AUGUST 1835

9.1 Comparison with other reviews

Only one of the journals consulted, L'Artiste (Vol. 10, No. 2, 1835, pp. 9-10), reviewed this concert. The political journals recounted the ceremony and Le Moniteur Universel mentioned that music would be performed, however there was clearly too much political reportage to be covered for them also to spend time on the music.

The only detailed review of the music is by Berlioz for the Journal des Débats (9 August 1835). This newspaper had two separate accounts of the ceremony, one devoted entirely to the music.

The article in L'Artiste is written by P. Edouard Barré. His interest in the music performed is more in the way in which the music heightened the emotional impact of the occasion than in the actual music itself. His commentary is meagre. Barré's opinion on the draperies hung in the church is opposed to the opinion expressed in the Gazette Musicale article (see quotation below).

9.2 Comparison with signed articles by Berlioz

Comparisons made between the Gazette Musicale article and Berlioz's signed Journal des Débats article are revealing. Compare, for example:

> Je veux parler des draperies dont l'église était tendue. En toute occasion cet appareil funèbre est fatal à la musique; les sons sont étouffés aussitôt qu'émis; le noir vêtement des murs produit alors sur l'orchestre et les voix l'effet du crêpe sur les tambours.
>
> (I want to talk of the draperies with which the church was hung. On every occassion this funereal pomp is fatal to the music; the sounds are no sooner uttered than

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> stifled; the black cloth on the walls produces the effect of crepe on drums on the orchestra and voices.)
>
> (Journal des Débats, 9 August 1835)

> Malheureusement les conditions, imposées de toute nécessité par le sujet de la cérémonie, n'ont pas permis à l'immense assemblée qui remplissait l'église des Invalides de recevoir d'aussi profondes impressions. Le local d'abord était beaucoup trop vaste pour un pareil nombre de concertans; puis les tentures noires qui couvraient les colonnes et les murs, en amortissant les sons, rendaient la résonnance incomparablement plus faible qu'elle ne l'eût été dans l'état ordinaire du monument.
>
> (Unfortunately, the conditions, necessarily imposed by the nature of the ceremony, did not allow the immense audience that filled the Invalides church to receive a very profound impression. In the first place the venue was far too big for the number of performers; then the black hangings that covered the columns and the walls in stifling the sound made the resonance incomparably weaker than it would ordinarily have been in the monument.)
>
> (Gazette Musicale, 9 August 1835)

P. Edmond Barré (L'Artiste, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1835) commented on the draperies,

> Tout le monde peut voir encore les dispositions faites dans l'église des Invalides pour recevoir dignement les nouveaux hôtes qui viennent jouir du repos sous la garde des restes mutilés de tous nos champs de bataille; tout le monde peut admirer ces sombres tentures où se tordent et se déroulent dix milles mètres de drap noir. . . .
>
> (Everyone could once again see the arrangements made in the Invalides church for receiving with dignity the new guests who come to peaceful rest guarded by the mutilated remains of all our fields of battle; everyone could admire the sombre hangings where ten thousand metres of black cloth twisted and unfolded. . . .)

We can also compare this remark on the Te Deum of Le Sueur:

> [C]'est précisément cette simplicité, ou si l'on veut, cette grossièreté dans les formes, qui les rend perceptibles dans l'éloignement; c'est au soin que prend M. Lesueur de ne jamais donner à un accord moins d'une mesure entière de durée, de ne distinguer les nuances du piano et du forte, que par le silence ou l'emploi des instrumens à vent; c'est grâce à l'observance difficile

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

de ces règles qu'il s'est imposé pour la musique sacrée, que M. Lesueur a moins qu'un autre à redouter la mesquinerie de nos moyens d'exécution et les dimensions de nos monuments. Sa musique est essentiellement une musique de cathédale.

([I]t is precisely this simplicity, or if you like this grossness of forms, that makes them perceptible from a distance; it is because of the care that M. Lesueur takes never to give a chord less than a whole bar's length, and to distinguish only between the nuances of piano and forte by silence or by the use of woodwind instruments; it is thanks to the difficult observance of these rules he has imposed on sacred music that M. Lesueur has less to fear than others from the sloppiness of our means of execution, and the dimensions of our monuments. His music is essentially cathedral music.)
(Journal des Débats, 9 August 1835)

Le Te Deum de M. Lesueur est conçu dans un tout autre système, et mieux approprié aux temples immenses où il doit retentir; les harmonies en sont excessivement larges; il est rare qu'une mesure contienne plus d'un accord; les voix sont toujours employées dans leurs cordes les plus puissantes; les nuances ne vont que du forte au mezzo forte; encore ne sont-elles produites que par le contraste des entrées et du silence des instrumens à vent, tout le reste de l'orchestre jouant constamment fort. Cette méthode, en restreignant les moyens du compositeur rend sa tâche, il est vrai, plus difficile, mais il faut bien reconnaître qu'elle est advantageuse, ou, pour mieux dire, qu'elle est la seule bonne lorsqu'il s'agit, comme pour ce te Deum, d'être entendu dans une cathédrale.

(The Te Deum of M. Lesueur is conceived in quite a different system, and better suited to the immense churches where it would resound; the harmonies are excessively large; it is rare that a bar contains more than one chord; the voices are always used in their most powerful registers; the nuances go only from forte to mezzo forte; and again they are produced only by the contrast of entries and the silence of the woodwind instruments, all the rest of the orchestra playing continually loudly. This method, in restraining the means of the composer, makes his task, it is true, more difficult, but it is good to take note of its advantages, or, to put it in a better way, it is the only good one to use, when it is something, like this Te Deum, to be heard in a cathedral.)
(Gazette Musicale, 9 August 1835)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

9.3 Examination of the style of the unsigned article

Berlioz's interest in reviewing this ceremony is obvious. First, he was interested in works of large proportion, designed for ceremonial occasion, and the problems involved in their performance. Second, he admired the works of his teacher, Le Sueur, and discussed them wherever possible.

No other critic of the time apart from Berlioz has the same interest in these subjects. This Gazette Musicale article is clearly his.

Conclusion

I shall now return to the two questions raised at the beginning of this paper: why did Berlioz write these unsigned articles, and did he write unsigned articles for any other journal or newspaper?

To discuss the second question first, as far as I can tell Berlioz did not write any unsigned articles for other journals or newspapers, except for two articles that he wrote for his friend d'Ortigue, who signed them in his own name. These articles were written for La Bagatelle and the Revue de Paris and are known to be by Berlioz, since their autograph manuscripts are in the Bibliothèque Nationale. They are written on the subject of Berlioz's own life and music.

The political newspapers had only sporadic music criticism at the beginning of the 1830s. As the decade progressed their music criticism became more regular, but also tended to be written by the one critic or perhaps shared by two critics, who signed or initialled their articles or occasionally still left them anonymous. The same is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

true of the majority of the literary journals. The only journal that continued to have a large number of unsigned articles was one called L'Artiste, which was primarily concerned with literature and the visual arts. Presumably, to insert an unsigned article in one of these newspapers or journals Berlioz would have had to have been at least acquainted with their editors. There is no evidence in his correspondence of this being the case, but this does not exclude the possibility. There might well be some unsigned articles written by Berlioz which I have missed, scattered in other journals such as L'Artiste. However, I do not think it likely.

The major Parisian music journals of the time, apart from the Gazette Musicale, were Le Ménestrel, and until November 1835 the Revue Musicale. At this time Le Ménestrel rarely had full length articles on music; it was not a scholarly journal but catered chiefly for the devotees of the popular musical forms such as the "romance" and the opéra-comique. Berlioz's relationship with Fétis (editor of the Revue Musicale) was not friendly, and Fétis would not have welcomed any articles from Berlioz, signed or unsigned. Thus the Revue et Gazette Musicale stands out as the most convenient magazine in which to insert anonymous articles on music.

As I stated at the beginning, Berlioz was on good terms with the editor of the Revue et Gazette Musicale, Maurice Schlesinger. Berlioz would not have written the unsigned articles for the Revue et Gazette Musicale for nothing, as he was too desperately in need of money, so Schlesinger must have been party to having Berlioz write them. I can think of two reasons why Berlioz might have wanted these articles to remain unsigned.

First, many of them, as I have shown, were on subjects about which he had already written, and they thus repeated ideas from other

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

articles. Berlioz might have wished the articles to remain unsigned to avoid being accused of having duplicated material. Second, several of the articles, for instance the article "Du mouvement musical" of 1835, are provocative and strongly attack the musical establishment. Berlioz might have wished to remain anonymous in these cases, or alternatively Schlesinger might have thought it more appropriate that such articles remain unsigned. It is interesting that the article "Du mouvement musical" has an editorial note on the bottom that reads: "Sans être tout-à-fait du meme avis sur tous les points avec notre spirituel collaborateur, nous nous faisons un devoir d'insérer cet article" ("Without completely sharing the opinion on every issue of our spirited collaborator, we have made it our duty to insert this article"). Schlesinger was clearly aware how provocative these articles were.

Berlioz seems to have had more freedom in his choice of subject matter with the Revue et Gazette Musicale than with any of the other papers or journals to which he contributed. It would thus have been easier for him to write an article for this journal on something he wished to review than to review for example an opéra-comique for the Journal des Débats. As mentioned earlier, he wrote a very large number of articles for the Revue et Gazette Musicale during the 1830s. Perhaps Schlesinger felt that his readers would object to too many articles signed 'H. Berlioz', and consequently left some of them unsigned.

These three points are all reasonable explanations of the unsigned articles. It is a great pity that in his correspondence Berlioz does not mention leaving these articles unsigned and that there are no surviving autographs for any of them. Unfortunately the archives for the Revue et Gazette Musicale, which perhaps house some

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the journal's paybooks, are at the moment legally tied in such a way that only a direct descendant of the Schlesinger family can have access to them.

The quality of Berlioz's writing, combined with the extent of his knowledge of music, make his criticism superior to that of his contemporary Parisian music critics. It is dangerous however to view his criticism in isolation from the work of his contemporaries. My study of these unsigned articles has shown that although Berlioz was often individualistic in his opinions he still shared many of his fellow critic's views. The very posing of the question, "Is this article by Berlioz?" shows that there was a body of music criticism forming during the 1830s with which Berlioz's criticism could be identified.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix C

Béatrice et Bénédict

Why Did Berlioz Write an Opéra-Comique?

Berlioz first thought of Béatrice et Bénédict in 1833. He discusses the work in letters to d'Ortigue: "[J]e vais faire un opéra italien fort gai, sur la comédie de Shakespeare" ("I am going to write a very gay Italian opera based on Shakespeare's comedy"), to his sister Adèle: "Je débuterai par le Théâtre Italien. Je suis fort bien vu à cette administration, et comme on n'y joue que des ouvrages déjà connus en Italie, je suis seul à écrire du nouveau pour elle" ("I will make my début with the Théâtre Italien. I am very well thought of by that administration, and since they play only works there that are already known in Italy, I am the only one to write something new for them"), and to his father: "J'ai signé aujourd'hui un engagement avec le théâtre italien pour un opéra. . . ." ("I signed an engagement today with the Théâtre Italien for an opera . . ."). [1] It is interesting that he does not call Béatrice et Bénédict an opéra-comique at this stage, but an "Italian" opera, a term which seems for Berlioz to refer to a light-hearted comedy, or, more concretely, simply to something designed to be performed at the Théâtre Italien. His letter to Adèle elaborates on how the Théâtre Italien would arrange for his libretto to be translated into Italian by a poet. Berlioz obviously was not seriously involved with the work in 1833, which was fortunate since nothing was to come of his contract. He appears to have viewed the project more as a stepping

---

[1] CG II, 1833, 68 (d'Ortigue), 69 (Adèle), 72 (father).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

stone to other engagements. As he remarked optimistically to his father: "Cette porte en fera ouvrir bien d'autres" ("This door will open many others").[2]

A scenario entitled Bénédict et Béatrix exists in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale collection of Berlioz autographs.[3] Hugh Macdonald in his notes for the NBE of Béatrice et Bénédict has dated this scenario 1852, through a study of the names of the singers listed by Berlioz under "Personnages".[4] A note in Legouvé's hand on the front page states that Berlioz had asked him to turn the scenario into a libretto. Once again this appears to have been an abortive project.

In 1858, for the opening of his new theatre in 1860, Bénazet, the manager of the Casino at Baden-Baden, commissioned a work from Berlioz which was to be based on a libretto by Plouvier. Berlioz had trouble starting composition; he wrote to the Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein, "Je ne saurais vous dire le chagrin que je ressens d'avoir été forcé de souscrire cet engagement avec M. Bénazet...peut-être m'abusé-je! peut-être le feu s'allumera-t-il en composant..." ("I cannot tell you how upset I am to have been forced to sign an engagement contract with M. Bénazet...perhaps I am mistaken! Perhaps the fire will light up while I am composing...").[5]

---

[2] CG II, 1833, 72.

[3] Fonds du Conservatoire, Berlioz, Papiers divers, No. 44.

[4] Hugh Macdonald notes, "[O]n the 'Personnages' page Berlioz has pencilled the names of suggested singers. All were engaged at the Opéra-Comique, and the only period when all five singers were there was between December 1851 and the summer of 1853, dates when the tenor Dufresne respectively joined and left the company. The reference to Mendelssohn's Symphony in A on the last page suggests that the scenario was in Berlioz's hands shortly before 28 May 1852, the date on which he conducted the Italian Symphony in London" (Appendix I, NBE, Béatrice et Bénédict, p. 299).

[5] SW, 10 March 1859, p. 88.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bénazet's new theatre was not ready by 1860, so Berlioz was not obliged to fulfil his contract. Bénazet was not willing, however, to let the contract drop. To quote Berlioz: "Bénazet n'a jamais voulu me rendre ma parole; il veut son opéra, lors même que le projet du nouveau théâtre ne se réaliserait pas, il en court les chances, et garde notre traité" ("M. Bénazet never wanted to give me back my bond; he wants his opera, even if the project for the new theatre doesn't come off, he will take his chances and keep our contract").[6] Finding the Plouvier manuscript unmanageable,[7] Berlioz asked Bénazet if he could exchange the libretto for that of Béatrice et Bénédict, Berlioz's own adaptation of Shakespeare's Much Ado about Nothing. Bénazet agreed and it was thus that Béatrice et Bénédict was performed for the opening of the theatre, which finally took place in 1862.

Berlioz worked on Béatrice et Bénédict over the period 1860 to 1862. In his correspondence for these years Béatrice et Bénédict is now unequi cally referred to as an opéra-comique. Berlioz complains incessantly of the difficulty in finding time to work on it, but the work seems to have progressed at a steady rate. In October 1861 he wrote to Louis,

> J'ai travaillé hier pendant sept heures à un petit ouvrage en un acte que j'ai entrepris. . . . C'est très joli, mais très difficile à bien traiter. J'aurai encore longtemps à travailler au poème; il m'arrive si rarement de pouvoir y songer avec suite. Puis la musique aura son tour.
>
> (I worked for seven hours yesterday on a little one act work that I have undertaken. . . . It is very pretty but very difficult to do well. I will still have a lot more

---

[6] SW, 20 June 1859, p. 98.

[7] The libretto was passed on to Henry Litolff (1818-91), whose opera Le Chevalier Nahel ou La Gageure du diable was produced at Baden-Baden, 10 Aug. 1863 (see H. Macdonald, Foreword, NBE, Béatrice et Bénédict, viii).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> work to do to the libretto; I so rarely have time to think about it consistently. Then it will be the music's turn.)[8]

He must have worked remarkably quickly over the next few months for he wrote to Marc Suat on 7 December 1861 that he had just finished a two-act opera destined for the new theatre at Baden-Baden:

> [J]e travaille beaucoup, je viens de finir l'opéra en deux actes destiné au nouveau théâtre de Bade. Il me reste à faire l'ouverture; mais les feuilletons vont m'empêcher de m'en occuper.
>
> (I am working a lot, I have just finished a two-act opera designed for the new theatre at Baden-Baden. I have only the overture to do; but the feuilletons are going to stop me working on it.)[9]

By March 1862 Berlioz was already involved with rehearsals, culminating in a big dress rehearsal of the singers on 12 July at the Paris Opéra-Comique. Berlioz went to Baden-Baden to rehearse the orchestra.

In all his dealings with Berlioz, Bénazet was extraordinarily accommodating, making sure that everything needed for a performance was provided regardless of expense. Berlioz was always appreciative of such generosity, but the fact that he was assured of the singers and orchestral players he wanted did not mean that he relaxed in his rehearsals. The preparations for Béatrice et Bénédict were particularly meticulous, and in his correspondence Berlioz often remarked on the difficulty of obtaining the necessary finesse in performance. For instance he writes in his summary of Béatrice et Bénédict in a letter to the Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein, "[U]n caprice

---

[8] Corr. Inéd., 21 Oct. 1861, p. 283.

[9] Letter to Marc Suat, 7 Dec. 1861, shown to me by Thérèse Husson, secretary of the Berlioz Association.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

écrit avec la pointe d'une aiguille et qui exige une excessive délicatesse d'exécution" ("[A] caprice written with the point of a needle and requires the utmost delicacy of execution"),[10] and in another, later comment to the Princess, "En somme, à mon sens, ce petit ouvrage est beaucoup plus difficile d'exécution musicale que les Troyens, parce qu'il y a l'humour. . . ." ("In fact, in my opinion, this little work is much more difficult to perform musically than Les Troyens, since it has humour . . ").[11]

The first performance of Béatrice et Bénédict at Baden-Baden on 9 August was a great success, and Berlioz wrote contented letters to his friends recounting his triumph and noting the widespread praise from the press in France, Belgium, and Germany.[12] To an extent, Jacques Barzun misrepresents the French press's reaction to Béatrice et Bénédict when he says, "[T]he French critics at Baden were rather baffled by the score. They felt that around the obviously fine blooms lay 'a good deal of underbrush'. They added that Berlioz' sense of humor in dialogue was often crude, not up to the original, and they quoted as proof passages from the book which turned out to be direct translations from Shakespeare."[13] Barzun's account comes almost entirely from Berlioz's Mémoires, except for an important omission, or substitution, in the opening sentence. In his Mémoires Berlioz wrote, "Les critiques venus de Paris à cette occasion, louèrent chaudement la

---

[10] SW, 22 July 1862, p. 123. Translation by Hugh Macdonald, Foreward NBE, Béatrice et Bénédict, ix.

[11] SW, 21 Sept. 1862, p. 126.

[12] See for instance a letter to Humbert Ferrand, 21 Aug. 1862, published in Lettres intimes, preface by Charles Gounod (Paris: C. Lévy, 1882), pp. 237-239.

[13] Barzun, Berlioz and the Romantic Century II, 219.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

musique, l'air et le duo surtout. Quelques-uns trouvèrent qu'il y avait dans le reste de la partition beaucoup de broussailles, et que le dialogue parlé manquait d'esprit. Ce dialogue est presque en entier copié dans Shakespeare" ("The critics who had come from Paris to hear the work praised the music enthusiastically, the aria and the duet in particular. One or two of them, however, decided that there was a good deal of scrub and dead wood in the rest of the score, and that the spoken dialogue was dull. This dialogue is taken almost word for word from Shakespeare.")[14]

A survey of the reviews shows that the critics were in general extremely laudatory. To look first at the musical press, Marius Escudier in the France Musicale (17 August 1862) wrote a lengthy review recounting Berlioz's success, the critic in Le Ménestrel (17 August 1862, signed "x") commented that the fact that Berlioz had waited a long time to launch into battle only made the victory all the more striking, and the Revue et Gazette Musicale (18 August 1862, signed "Z") also had a long, highly favourable review of the work.

The non-musical press was also generally favourable. Fiorentino (using his pseudonym, A. de Rovray) writes a glowing appreciation:

> Amis et ennemis, admirateurs et détracteurs, tout le monde avoue qu'il vient d'obtenir un très grand et très légitime succès . . . [L'auteur] a deployé une grande science harmonique; il a eu des inspirations d'un bonheur inouï. Il y a dans ces deux actes des fantaisies d'une extrême originalité, d'une rare hardiesse, et des morceaux empreints d'une véritable grandeur, des airs et des récits qui rappellent le beau style et le souffle puissant de Gluck.
>
> (Friends and enemies, admirers and detractors, everyone admits that he has just had a very great and legitimate success . . . [The author] deployed great harmonic science; he had unheard-of successful inspirations. In

---

[14] Mém. II, Postface, 348. English translation comes from David Cairns translation of the Memoirs, p. 608.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> those two acts there are fantasias of an extreme originality, of a rare strength, and sections imprinted with true grandeur, airs and recitatives that recall the beautiful style and powerful air of Gluck.)[15]

Nestor Roqueplan, critic for Le Constitutionnel, had not attended the performance in Baden, so apart from several aggressive remarks on the inadvisability of the composer writing his own libretto merely reports secondhand the "applaudissemens et rappels".[16] One of the few reviews that is not entirely favourable is that of B. Jouvin in Figaro. Jouvin's review is obviously one of the reviews referred to by Berlioz (and Barzun), for it criticizes the libretto, saying essentially that Shakespearean pleasantries cannot be translated into French, and that the work had only two numbers that were truly inspired:

> [L]es autres morceaux de la partition de Béatrice et Bénédict relèvent non de l'inspiration, mais du système du compositeur. Ils portent le cachet de sa manière fiévreuse, tourmentée et divaguante. J'ai fait à toutes les époques une guerre acharnée à ce système, tout en restant profondément sympathique à l'homme intelligent et convaincu qui use sa vie et son talent à le populariser. . . . Hector Berlioz n'a pas fait un opéra, mais il peut s'en consoler puisqu'il a écrit deux chefs-d'oeuvre.
>
> ([T]he other sections of the score of Béatrice et Bénédict reveal not the inspiration but the system of the composer. They impart the essence of his feverish, tormented, and rambling manner. At all times I have waged a stubborn war against this system, at the same time remaining very sympathetic to this intelligent and sincere man who wastes his life and his talent in popularizing it. . . . Hector Berlioz has not written an opera, but he can console himself, since he has written two masterpieces.)[17]

---

[15] "Revue Musicale. Théâtres lyriques [Béatrice et Bénédict]", Le Moniteur Universel, 24 Aug. 1862, p. 1.

[16] Nestor Roqueplan, "Théâtres", Le Constitutionnel, 18 Aug. 1862, p. 2.

[17] B. Jouvin, "Théâtre de Bade", Figaro, 17 Aug. 1862, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As has been demonstrated, however, views such as Jouvin's were not predominant, and so Barzun is wrong to describe all the French critics as baffled--even Berlioz himself grants that the majority were enthusiastic.

Berlioz was clearly pleased by the success of Béatrice et Bénédict, but at the same time did not think it indicated a major change in his position as a composer in Paris. He remarks wryly in a letter to Ferrand,

> Vous ririez si vous pouviez lire les sots éloges que la critique me donne. On découvre que j'ai de la mélodie, que je puis être joyeux et même comique. L'histoire des étonnements causés par L'Enfance du Christ recommence. Ils se sont aperçu que je ne faisais pas de bruit, en voyant que les instruments brutaux n'étaient pas dans l'orchestre. Quelle patience il faudrait avoir si je n'étais pas aussi indifférent!
>
> (You would laugh if you could read the stupid praise that the critics give me. They discover that I have melody, that I can be joyful and even comical. The astonishing story caused by L'Enfance du Christ begins again. They have realized, in seeing that there were no rowdy instruments in the orchestra, that I am not noisy. What patience I would need if I were not so indifferent!)18

He similarly remarks in a letter to the Princess, "Il y a eu un tas de Tartuffes d'enthousiasme qui m'ont obsédés de leur démonstrations dont je connaissais parfaitement la sincérité...Il m'a fallu prendre l'air nias et avoir l'air de croire...." ("There were a heap of enthusiastic hypocrites who importuned me with their demonstrations, the sincerity of which I know perfectly well...I have to adopt a stupid air and look as if I believe..."). [19] The success at Baden did not of course entail immediate reception in Paris. In the Autumn

---

[18] Lettres intimes, 21 Aug. 1862, p. 238.

[19] SW, 21 Sept. 1862, p. 125.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

after the first performance Berlioz added two extra numbers to the score, a trio and a duo. As pointed out by Hugh Macdonald,[20] the addition of a trio for three women had been suggested by Felix Morrand in his review of the opera in L'Illustration de Bade (18 August 1863): "Un trio de femmes correspondant à celui des trois hommes n'êut pas été de trop peut-être pour expliquer la subite passion de la belle et réfractaire Béatrice" ("A trio of women corresponding to that of the three men would perhaps not have been out of place in order to explain the sudden passion of the beautiful and refractory Béatrice"). Morrand continues, "M. Berlioz réparera nécessairement cette omission si, comme cela semble infaillible, son opéra nouveau est repris cet hiver et representé à Paris" ("M. Berlioz will necessarily repair this omission if, as seems certain, his new opera is taken up again this winter and performed in Paris"). A performance was suggested at the Opéra-Comique, and Berlioz commented to the Princess, "A présent, nous cherchons avec le directeur de l'Opéra-comique les moyens de reproduire cela à Paris" ("With the director of the Opéra-Comique we are looking at present for the means of reproducing this in Paris"),[21] but the lack of a suitable Béatrice was more than enough reason for the Opéra-Comique administration to prevaricate.

Berlioz was bitter about the departure of his wonderful Béatrice, Mme Charton-Demeur. As he commented to the Princess: "Mme Charton-Demeur y a été ravissante, et la voilà partie pour la Havane. On n'a pas voulu faire une place pour elle à Paris. Liszt a raison, il n'y a que les médiocres qui trouvent les portes ouvertes" ("Mme Charton-Demeur was ravishing in it, and now she's left for Havana.

---

[20] Béatrice et Bénédict, NBE, Notes.

[21] SW, 21 Sept. 1862, pp. 125-126.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

They didn't want to find a place for her in Paris. Liszt is right, only mediocrities find doors open".)[22]

Berlioz's opinion of Mme Charton-Demeur was shared by a large number of other writers. Critics were unanimous in their praise of her début at the Théâtre Italien (12 March 1862) as Desdemona in Rossini's Otello,[23] and all observed that she should be engaged by the Paris Opéra. Paul Smith remarked in the Revue et Gazette Musicale that Mme Charton-Demeur wished only to remain in France but was forced to look elsewhere for a position because of lack of interest in her work.[24]

The nocturne from Béatrice et Bénédict was performed at the Société des concerts (24 March 1863), to an extremely enthusiastic audience,[25] but this success did not engender a performance of the entire work. The next performance was at Weimar, where the Duchess of Weimar commanded a performance for her birthday. Two performances were given, 8 and 10 April 1863, both using Richard Pohl's German translation. Once again the work met with acclaim.

How then can we reconcile Berlioz's own opéra-comique, Béatrice

---

[22] SW, 21 Sept. 1862, p. 126.

[23] See reviews by M. Escudier, France Musicale, 16 March 1862, pp. 81-82, Ralph, L'Art Musicale, 20 March 1862, pp. 126-128, J. Lovy, Le Ménestrel, 16 March 1862, pp. 123-124, and "P. S.", RGM, 16 March 1862, pp. 87-88.

[24] See the article listed in the above footnote signed "P. S.". Even the daily press showed concern at the loss of Mme Charton-Demeur. B. Jouvin commented, perhaps a little ironically, in Le Figaro, "Le Théâtre-Italien n'a pas su la retenir; l'Opéra n'a pas songé à se l'attacher; l'Amérique, mieux avisée, lui envoie un vaisseau chargé de 16,000 piastres" (The Théâtre Italien didn't know how to keep her; the Opéra couldn't think how to attach her; America, better advised, sent her a ship loaded with 16,000 piastres") (17 Aug. 1862, p. 2).

[25] This concert is reviewed by G. Chouquet, L'Art Musicale, 26 March 1863, p. 132, E. Viel, Le Ménestrel, 29 March 1863, p. 133, and Léon Durocher, RGM, 29 March 1863, pp. 99-100.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

et Bénédict, with the body of his criticism of the average opéra-comique of the time?

First, it must be pointed out that Béatrice et Bénédict was not the first opéra-comique that Berlioz had aspired to writing. As early as 1826 Berlioz was involved in plans for an opéra-comique called Richard en Palestine in conjunction with his friend Léon Compaignon. The choice of the opéra-comique genre in this case seems to have been merely opportunist, that is, it was the most likely form in which to have a work performed. Berlioz writes to Compaignon, who was clearly worried about Berlioz's interpretation of the opéra-comique genre,

> Ne craignez pas l'excès opposé au genre de l'opéra-comique, figurez-vous bien que notre sujet est tout à fait du grand opéra, d'ailleurs Pixérécourt aime beaucoup mieux le genre grandiose, j'en suis bien informé. . . . Gardez-vous bien de me faire ni ballade ni romance, ni quoi que ce soit de léger pour Blondel . . . [F]aites-lui une espèce d'inspiration Ossianique en style rêveur et sauvage.
>
> (Do not be afraid of the excess opposed to the genre of the opéra-comique, realize that our subject is completely that of grand opera; besides I am well informed that Pixérécourt likes the grandiose genre very much. . . . Make sure not to write me a ballad nor romance, nor anything at all light for Blondel . . . [W]rite for him a sort of Ossianic inspiration in a dreamy and wild style.)[26]

Benvenuto Cellini, too, was originally intended for the Opéra-Comique but not accepted. As Berlioz commented: "On me regarde à l'opéra-comique comme un sapeur, un bouleverseur du genre national, et on ne veut pas de moi" ("I am regarded at the Opéra-Comique as an underminer, an upsetter of the national genre, and they do not want me").[27] Though Béatrice et Bénédict is written within the tradition

---

[26] CG I, 1826, 123.

[27] CG II, 1838, 197.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the French opéra-comique, Berlioz has to an extent divorced himself ideologically from the type of opéra-comique that he had been and still was reviling in his criticism. It is odd that in his correspondence of 1860 to 1862 he makes no direct reference to these opéra-comiques--he does not even attempt to differentiate Béatrice et Bénédict from, for instance, the opéra-comique of Adam. Yet perhaps this serves as further evidence of his alienation from the form as it was used by the majority of composers of the time.

Berlioz saw himself as composing a comedy, with a well written libretto and interesting score. Originally, this comedy was meant to be an "Italian" opera, but instead it became an opéra-comique. As said before, Berlioz did not object to the genre of opéra-comique as such. It is interesting that some of the first reviews of Béatrice et Bénédict comment on the presence of early opéra-comique traits. M Escudier, for instance, remarks in his article for La France Musicale on "[l]a cabalette, dans le style du vieil opéra-comique" ("[t]he cabalette in the style of the old opéra-comique"), and how the accompaniment to the Duo "fait penser à Grétry" ("reminds one of Grétry").[28]

Berlioz's conception of the opéra-comique form was thus not a rigid one, and he remarked in a general article on the opéra-comique, "[E]st-il rigoureusement nécessaire de supposer à l'Opéra-Comique un genre exclusif, circonscrit dans certaines limites?" ("[I]s it really necessary to take the opéra-comique as an exclusive genre, circumscribed within certain limits?")[29] He proceeds in this article

---

[28] Marius Escudier, "Théâtre de Bade. Bénédict et Béatrice", La France Musicale, 17 Aug. 1862, p. 259.

[29] RGM, 18 Sept. 1836, p. 323.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to query why the theatre of the Opéra-Comique could not be called the "second théâtre d'Opéra", saying that even if they forbade the performance of works that were entirely sung, there would still be a large repertoire,

> [c]ar un véritable opéra ne perd guère de son prix et ne descend point au-dessous du rang que son mérite lui assigne, par cela seul qu'il n'est pas chanté d'un bout à l'autre, et qu'on substitue au récitatif courant quelques lignes de dialogue. Fidelio et le Freyschütz en sont d'illustres preuves"
>
> [f]or a real opera loses hardly any of its value, nor does it descend below the rank assigned by its merit, simply because it's not sung from end to end, and because one substitutes for the running recitative a few lines of dialogue. Fidelio and Der Freischütz are illustrious proofs of this.)[30]

Thus Berlioz's overall perspective of the opéra-comique form was flexible and comprehensive.

If however Berlioz does not refer to other opéra-comiques in his correspondence between 1860 and 1862, he does so in Béatrice et Bénédict itself, both directly and indirectly.

The care Berlioz took with his libretto and with the performance of his work points indirectly to two faults he deplored in the contemporary opéra-comique. First, with his simple well-written libretto based on Shakespeare, Berlioz demonstrates the value he placed on a good libretto, a characteristic he felt was neglected by the majority of opéra-comique composers. Second the scrupulous care Berlioz took with the performance of his work points to his criticism of the standard of performance of most opéra-comiques; as he said in his correspondence, he felt a comedy demanded even more precision and delicacy in playing than a Grand Opera, for instance.

---

[30] RGM, 18 Sept. 1836, p. 324.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In the libretto of Béatrice et Bénédict itself, Berlioz refers mockingly to the predictable rhyming schemes of the typical opéra-comique.[31] In Act I, Scene iv, Béatrice remarks sarcastically,

> Assez! assez! aurez-vous bientôt fini de nous chanter: Gloire et victoire, Guerriers et lauriers? Quelles rimes! Voilà les suites de la guerre!
>
> (Enough! Enough! Won't you soon stop singing to us, Glory and victory, Warriors and laurel wreaths? What rhymes! That's the aftermath of the war!)[32]

And in Act II, Scene iv, a dialogue between Béatrice et Bénédict runs:

> Bénédict
> Si...je pouvais trouver en vous quelque indulgence... jamais un coeur...
> Béatrice
> Allez!...Allez donc! La rime est: constance. Décochez-moi un madrigal! vous en êtes capable, vous êtes poète! Ah! ah! ah!
>
> (Bénédict
> If...I could have your indulgence...never a heart...
> Béatrice
> Go on...Go on then! The rhyme is constance. Let fly a madrigal at me! You're capable of it, you're a poet! Ah! Ah! Ah!)[33]

Apart from its deliberate comedy, Somarone's inspired song is surely also an ironical criticism of the average opéra-comique drinking song: "De notre île/ De Sicile/ Vive ce fameux vin/ Si fin! /Mais la plus noble flamme/ Douce à l'âme/ Comme au coeur/ Du buveur/ C'est la vermeille liqueur/ De la treille/ Des coteaux de Marsala/ Qui l'a!" ("From our island/ Of Sicily/ Long live this famous wine/ So fine/ But the most noble flame/ Sweet to the soul/ As to the heart/ Of

---

[31] Libretto, Béatrice et Bénédict, opéra-comique en 2 actes. Paroles et musique d'Hector Berlioz (1906; Paris: Rolland, 1976).

[32] Béatrice et Bénédict, Act I, Scene iv, p. 9.

[33] Béatrice et Bénédict, Act II, Scene iv, p. 60.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the drinker/ Is the ruby liqueur/ Of the grape/ Of the vines of Marsala/ That has it!").[34]

Berlioz makes an interesting comment on Béatrice et Bénédict in a letter to M. and Mlle Massart (19 April 1863): "[L]'orchestre de concert est un roi placé sur un trône. Et puis ces grandes passions des symphonies me retournent le coeur un peu plus brutalement que les sentiments d'un opéra de demi-caractère comme Béatrice" ("[T]he concert orchestra is a king placed on a throne. But then these great symphonic passions turn my heart a bit more brutally than the sentiments of a demi-caractère opera like Béatrice.")[35] This quotation refers to a concert Berlioz was giving of his own works for the Prince Hohenzollern-Hechingen at Löwenberg.

Before any conclusions can be drawn here, the term "demi-caractère" has to be defined.

Castil-Blaze in his Dictionaire de Musique Moderne gives a rather confusing definition under the entry caractère:

> De ces caractères, les uns sont généraux, étant rélatifs 1. à nos affections, 2. au degré dans lequel nous les ressentons, 3. au ton sur lequel nous les exprimons. Le premier donne le caractère gai ou triste; le second, la vivacité ou la douceur; le troisième, la sublimité ou la simplicité. Chacun de ces trois états a un caractère moyen. En les combinant on aura un grand nombre de caractères mixtes dont voici les principaux: 1. Le caractère du style tragique, qui réunit la tristesse avec la force et la sublimité; 2. le bouffon, qui réunit la gaîté avec la vivacité et la familiarité; 3. enfin le demi-caractère, qui réunit les situations moyennes.
>
> (Of these characters, some are general, being relative 1. to our affections, 2. to the degree to which we feel

---

[34] Libretto, Béatrice et Bénédict, Act II, Scene i, p. 49.

[35] This letter was shown to me by Thérèse Husson. Barzun translates this last sentence as "these great symphonic passions upset me a great deal more than the 'make-believe' sentiments of Béatrice" (Barzun, II, 235). As I shall demonstrate, "make-believe" is not really the correct translation for demi-caractère.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> them, 3. to the tone in which we express them. The first gives a gay or sad style; the second, vivacity or sweetness; the third, sublimity or simplicity. Each of these three states has a middle [mean] character. In combining them one has a great number of mixed styles of which the principal ones are: 1. The character of the tragic style, that unites sadness with grandeur and sublimity; 2. The buffoon, that unites gaiety with vivacity and familiarity; 3. Finally the demi-caractère that unites all the middle [mean] situations).[36]

In uniting all the "situations moyennes", demi-caractère would thus be a mixed genre, combining the "means" of gaiety and sadness, vivaciousness and gentleness, sublimity and simplicity--a very fluid definition, and capable in fact of encompassing an enormous variety of works.

To return to the original quotation, two points need to be made. First, the fact that Berlioz refers here to Béatrice et Bénédict as an opera of "demi-caractère" shows that he did in fact distinguish it as something other than a straightforward opéra-comique. Second, without drawing any derogatory connotations from the term "demi-caractère" itself, Berlioz does nevertheless suggest here that his symphonic music meant more to him than a work such as Béatrice et Bénédict.

It was a challenge for Berlioz to see what he could do with a comedy, and with the opéra-comique form; a challenge that he obviously felt he had well met, as he commented in the Postface to the Mémoires: "A mon sens, c'est une des plus vives et des plus originales [choses] que j'aie produites" ("To my mind it is one of the liveliest and most original things I have done").[37] He was very well paid by Bénazet. To quote again from the Postface to the Mémoires: "M. Bénazet, avec sa

---

[36] Castil-Blaze, Dictionnaire de Musique Moderne, rvd. 3rd ed. (Bruxelles: Cantaerts, 1828), p. 36.

[37] Mém. II, 348. English trans., Cairns, p. 608.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

générosité ordinaire, me la paya deux mille francs par acte, pour les paroles, et autant pour la musique, c'est-à-dire, huit mille francs en tout. De plus, il me donna encore mille francs pour en venir diriger la représentation l'année suivante" ("Bénazet, with his usual generosity, paid me at the rate of two thousand francs for the words of each act and the same for the music--eight thousand francs in all--and a further thousand to go back and conduct it the following year").[38] Maybe Berlioz once again cherished the hope that the success of Béatrice et Bénédict might render Les Troyens more acceptable to the Opéra. Béatrice et Bénédict however could never have been as emotionally significant to him as Les Troyens.

---

[38] Mém. II, 348. English trans., Cairns, p. 608.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

I. Writings of Berlioz

Les Années romantiques, 1819-1842. Correspondance. Ed. Julien Tiersot. Paris, 1904.

Béatrice et Bénédict, opéra-comique en 2 acts. 1906; Paris: Rolland, 1976.

Briefe von Hector Berlioz an die Fürstin Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein. Ed. La Mara. Leipzig, 1903.

Correspondance générale I, 1803-1832. Ed. Pierre Citron. Paris: Flammarion, 1972.

Correspondance générale II, 1832-1842. Ed. Frédéric Robert. Paris: Flammarion, 1975.

Correspondance générale III, 1842-1850. Ed. Pierre Citron. Paris: Flammarion, 1978.

Correspondance générale IV, 1850-1855. Ed. Pierre Citron, Yves Gérard, and Hugh Macdonald. Paris: Flammarion, 1983.

Correspondance inédite de Hector Berlioz 1819-1868. Ed. Daniel Bernard. Paris: C. Lévy, 1879.

Evenings with the Orchestra. Transl. and ed. Jacques Barzun. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1969.

Les Grotesques de la musique. Ed. Léon Guichard. Pref. by Henri Sauget. 1859; Paris: Gründ, 1969.

Lettres inédites de Berlioz à Thomas Gounot. Ed. L. Michould and G. Allix. Grenoble, 1903.

Lettres intimes. 2nd ed. Pref. by Charles Gounod. Paris: C. Lévy, 1882.

Mémoires. 2 vols. Ed. Pierre Citron. 1870; Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1969.

The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz. Tr. and ed. David Cairns. 1969; London: Panther Books, 1974.

Au Milieu du chemin, 1852-1855. Correspondance. Ed. Julien Tiersot. Paris, 1930.

Le Musicien errant, 1842-1852. Correspondance. Ed. Julien Tiersot. Paris, 1919.

Les Musiciens et la musique. Ed. with an introduction by André Hallays. Paris, n. d. [1903. Articles published in the Journal des Débats.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

New Letters of Berlioz 1830-1868. Ed. by Jacques Barzun. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1954.

Le Retour à la vie, mélologue, faisant suite à la symphonie fantastique intitulée: Episode de la vie d'un artiste, paroles et musique de M. Hector Berlioz. (Montagnes d'Italie. Juin 1831). Paris: Schlesinger, 1832.

Les Soirées de l'orchestre. Ed. Léon Guichard. Preface by Henry Barraud. 1852; Paris: Gründ, 1968.

Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration. Nouvelle édition suivie de l'Art du chef d'orchestre. Paris and Bruxelles: Henri Lemoine et Co., n. d. (Gregg International Reprint, 1970).

A Travers Chants. Ed. Léon Guichard. Pref. by Jacques Chailley. 1862; Paris: Gründ, 1971.

Voyage musical en Allemagne et en Italie, études sur Beethoven, Gluck, et Weber. Mélanges et nouvelles. 2 vols. Paris: J. Labitte, 1844.

II. Books and Articles

Adam, Adolphe. Souvenirs d'un musicien. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1857.

Balzac, Honoré de. Le chef-d'oeuvre inconnu. Gambara. Massimilla Doni. Introd. and notes Marc Eigeldinger and Max Milner. Paris: Flammarion, 1981.

----------. Illusions perdues. Introd. and notes Antoine Adam. 1855; Paris: Garnier, 1961.

----------. Monographie de la presse parisienne. Pref. Guy Hocquenghem. "Minigraphie de la presse parisienne". 1842; Paris: J.-E Hallier/Albin Michel, 1981.

----------. Traité de la vie élégante. Paris: Librairie nouvelle, 1853.

Barbier, Auguste. Souvenirs personnels et silhouettes contemporaines. Paris: Dentu, 1883.

Barrault, Emile. Aux Artistes: Du passé et de l'avenir des beaux-arts. (Doctrine de Saint-Simon). Paris: A. Mesnier, 1830.

"Beaux-Arts. Paganini". Le Globe, 29 April 1831, p. 482.

"Beaux-Arts. Théâtre-Italien. Tancredi". Le Globe, 26 September 1831, p. 1075.

Blanchard, Henri. "Des acteurs dramatiques et lyriques". Revue et Gazette Musicale, 14 July 1839, pp. 235-237.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

----------. (Signed J. J. J. Diaz.) "Théâtre de L'Opéra-Comique. Les Chaperons Blancs, opéra-comique en trois actes, musique de M. Auber, libretto de M. Scribe. Revue et Gazette Musicale, 17 April 1836, pp. 124-126.

---------- "Théâtre de l'Opéra-Comique. Rock le barbu, libretto en un acte, paroles de MM. Paul Duport et Deforges, musique de M. Gomis". Revue et Gazette Musicale, 22 May 1836, pp. 174-175.

Boigne, Charles de. Petits mémoires de l'Opéra. Paris: Libraire nouvelle, 1857.

Briffault, Eugène. "L'Opéra". Extrait du livre des cents et un. Paris: Ladrocat, 1834.

"Bulletin [Stradella]". Revue de Paris, 39, NS (1837), 73-79.

Buloz, François. "Revue. Chronique. Théâtres". Revue des Deux Mondes, 4th series, 1 (1835), 595.

Bury, Henri Blaze de. "De l'ésprit du temps: A propos de musique. M. Meyerbeer". Revue des Deux Mondes, 23 (Oct. 1859), 645-673.

----------. (Signed Hans Werner.) "De la musique des femmes". RDM, 8, 4th series (1836), 611-625.

----------. Meyerbeer et son temps. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1856.

----------. Musiciens contemporains. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1856.

----------. (Signed Henry Blaze.) "Poètes et musiciens de l'Allemagne. M. Meyerbeer". Revue des Deux Mondes, 5 (March 1836), 678-711.

----------. (Signed "H. W".) "Revue Musicale. [Stradella]". Revue des Deux Mondes, 9 (March 1837), 760-772.

Castil-Blaze, François. Chronique musicale du Journal des Débats. Paris: Publ. by the author, 1830.

----------. Dictionnaire de musique moderne. Rvd. 3rd edition. Bruxelles: Cantaerts, 1828.

----------. "Les Huguenots". France Musicale, 13 May 1838, pp. 1-2, 20 May 1838, pp. 1-2, 27 May 1838, pp. 1-3, 10 June 1838, pp. 1-3.

----------. De l'Opéra en France. 2 vols. Paris: Janet et Cotelle, 1820.

----------. "Lulli", Parts 1 and 2. Revue de Paris, 8 (Aug. 1845), pp. 73-98 and pp. 145-169.

----------. Mémorial du Grand-Opéra. Paris: Publ. by author, 1847.

----------. Théâtres lyriques de Paris. L'Opéra-italien, de 1548 à 1856. Paris: Publ. by the author, 1856.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Castille, Hippolyte. Les Journaux et les journalistes sous le règne de Louis-Philippe. Paris: F. Sartorius, 1858.

Cler, Albert. Physiologie du musicien. Paris: Aubert and Co., 1841.

Delacroix, Eugène. Journal. New revised ed. Notes and introd. A. Joubin. Avant-propos by Jean-Louis Vaudoyer. Vol. I (1822-1852). Paris: Plon, 1960.

Deschamps, Emile. "Lettres sur la musique françaises (1835)". In Oeuvres complètes. Prose IV. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1873.

Desnoyers, Louis. (Signed "L. D".) "Théâtre Italien. Récapitulation des premiers travaux de la saison. Considérations sur la critique musicale actuelle". Le National, 7 November 1834, pp. 1-3.

----------. "Théâtre de l'Opéra. Les Huguenots". Le National, 3 March 1836, pp. 1-3, and 16 March 1836, pp. 1-3.

----------. "Académie de Musique. La Juive". Le National, 27 Feb. 1835, pp. 1-3, and 7 March 1835, pp. 1-2.

----------. De l'Opéra en 1847: A propos de Robert Bruce. Paris, E.-B. Delanchy, 1847.

"Despotisme du Journal des Débats". La Mode, No. 8 (1836), pp. 215-216.

Diaz, J. J. J. [See Blanchard, Henri.]

Dufort, Ch[arles]. "Concerts du Conservatoire. Concert Historique". Revue Encylopédique, No. 54 (1832), 246-250.

Duprez, Gilbert. Souvenirs d'un chanteur. Paris: C. Lévy, n. d.

Escudier, Léon and Marie. Dictionnaire de musique théorique et historique. 5th ed. Pref. de M. F. Halévy. Paris: E. Dentu, 1872.

Escudier, Marie. (Signed Marius.) "Théâtre de Bade. Béatrice et Bénédict". La France Musicale, 17 August 1862, pp. 257-259.

Fétis, François. Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique. 8 vols. 2nd ed. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1860-65. Supplément et complément ed. Authur Pougin. 2 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1881.

----------. La Musique mise à la portée de tout le monde. 3rd ed. Paris: Brandus, 1847.

Fiorentino, Pier. (Signed Rovray, A. de.) "Revue Musicale. Théâtres lyriques [Béatrice et Bénédict]". Le Moniteur Universel, 24 August 1862, p. 1.

Forster, Charles de. Paris et les parisiens ou quinze ans à Paris (1832-1848). 2 vols. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1848-1849.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fortoul, Hippolyte. "Bulletin dramatique". Revue Encyclopédique, No. 58 (1833), 586-602.

Gail, Jean François. Réflexions sur le goût musical en France. Paris: Paulin, 1832.

Gautier, Théophile. Histoire de l'art dramatique en France depuis vingt-cinq ans. Vols. I and II. Leipzig: Hetzel, 1858.

----------. Histoire du romantisme suivie de notice romantique et d'une étude sur la poésie française, 1830-1868. Paris: G. Charpentier and Co., 1874.

----------. La Musique. Paris: E. Fasquelle, 1911.

----------. Mademoiselle de Maupin. Paris: Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1927.

Gay, Delphine. (Signed Ch. L[aunay].) "Société des Concerts. Symphonies de Beethoven". Le Temps, 27 February 1834, pp. 1-3.

----------. (Signed Launay, Vicomte Charles de.) "Courrier de Paris". La Presse, 24 November 1836, pp. 1-2.

Halévy, Jacques François Fromental. Souvenirs et portaits, études sur les beaux-arts. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1861.

Heine, Henri [Heinrich]. De tout un peu. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1890.

----------. Lutèce. Lettres sur la vie politique, artistique et sociale de la France. 5th ed. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1859.

Hogarth, George. Memoirs of the Opera in Italy, France, Germany, and England. Vol. II. London: 1851; rpt, New York: Da Capo, 1972.

Houssaye, Arsène. Les Confessions, souvenirs d'un demi-siècle. 4 vols, 1830-1880. Paris: E. Dentu, 1885.

Janin, Jules. Le Gâteau des rois: Symphonie fantastique. Introd. and notes J. M. Bailbé. 1847; Paris: Lettres modernes, 1972.

----------. Les Symphonies de l'hiver. Paris: Morizot, 1858.

----------. (Signed "J. J".) Théâtre de L'Opéra. Première représentation de la Juive, opéra en cinq actes. Paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. Halévy, décorations de MM. Filastre, Cambon, Séchan, Diéterle, Despléchin et Feuchères. Journal des Débats, 25 February 1835, pp. 1-2.

----------. "Théâtre de l'Opéra-Comique. Rock le barbu, opéra-comique en un acte, paroles de MM. Paul Duport et Deforge, musique de M. Gomis. Journal des Débats, 16 May 1836, pp. 1-2.

Jouvin, B. "Théâtre de Bade [Béatrice et Bénédict]". Le Figaro, 17 August 1862, pp. 1-2.

La Rochefoucauld, Sosthène de. Mémoires. Vol. VIII. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1862.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Ch. L[aunay.]" [See Delphine Gay.]

"Ed. L.". "Théâtre. Académie Royale de Musique. Première représentation des Huguenots". Nouvelle Minerve, 4 (1836), pp. 323-328.

Launay, Vicomte Charles de. [See Delphine Gay.]

Legouvé, Ernest. Soixante ans de souvenirs. 2 vols. Paris: J. Hetzel and Co., 1886-1887.

Liszt, Franz. (Acknowledged as being by Marie d'Agoult) "Revue musicale de l'année 1836". Le Monde, 8 January 1837, pp. 1-3

----------. Pages romantiques. Ed. and introduced by Jean Chantavoine. Paris: Alcan, 1912.

Mainzer, Joseph. "M. Berlioz". Chronique Musicale de Paris, No. 1 (1838), pp. 1-95.

----------. "Education musicale. Concert des jeunes aveugles". Le National, 29 April 1837, pp. 1-3.

----------. "Début de M. Duprez dans Les Huguenots. Ecole chorale à Nantes". Le National, 19 May 1837, p. 1.

----------. "Académie Royale de Musique. Première représentation. Les Huguenots, opéra en cinq actes de MM. Scribe et Meyerbeer". Parts 1 and 2. Le Monde Dramatique, II (March 1835) [1836], pp. 234-238 and 247-253.

Maurice, Charles. Histoire anecdotique du théâtre, de la littérature et de diverses impressions contemporaines. Tirée du coffre d'un journaliste avec sa vie à tort et à travers. 2 vols. Paris: H. Plon, 1856.

----------. Epaves. Théâtre, histoire, anecdotes, mots. Paris: Alcan-Lévy, 1865.

Mendelssohn, Felix. Letters. Ed. and trans. G. Selden-Goth. 1945; rpt. New York: Vienna House, 1973.

Meyerbeer, Giacomo. Giacomo Meyerbeer, Briefwechsel und Tagebücher. Ed. Heinz Becker. 3 vols. Berlin: Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1960-1975.

Monnais, Edouard. (Signed Paul Smith.) "Littérature musicale: A Travers Chants, par Hector Berlioz". Revue et Gazette Musicale, 21 September 1862, pp. 307-308.

----------. (Signed Paul Smith.) Esquisses de la vie d'artiste. 2 vols. Paris: J. Labitte, 1844.

Musset, Alfred de. "Mélanges de littérature et de critique". Vol. X of Oeuvres complètes. Paris: Bibliothèque-Charpentier, 1907.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

N** [Naumann?]. "Les Deux Reines, musique de M. Monpou, paroles de MM. Soulié et Arnoud". Revue et Gazette Musicale, 9 August 1835, p. 265.

Naumann. "Théâtre Royal de l'Opéra-Comique. Le Revenant, opéra-fantastique en deux actes et en cinq tableaux; paroles de M. Calvimont, musique de M. Gomis". Parts 1 and 2. Gazette Musicale, 12 January 1834, pp. 14-16, 19 January 1834, pp. 24-25.

Nettement, Alfred. Histoire politique, anecdotique et littéraire du Journal des Débats. Paris: Aux bureaux de l'Echo de France, 1838.

----------. Histoire du Journal des Débats. Paris: Dentu, 1842.

"Opéra-Comique". Le Ménestral, 28 June 1835, p. 1.

d'Ortigue, Joseph. Aperçu sommaire de la littérature et de la bibliographie musicale en France. Paris: Dubuisson, 1855.

----------. Le Balcon de l'Opéra. Paris: E. Renduel, 1833.

----------. "De la critique musicale. Dans ses rapports avec l'état actuel de l'art". Revue et Gazette Musicale, 18 September 1836, pp. 326-328, 25 September 1836, pp. 338-341.

----------. La Musique à l'église. Paris: Didier, 1861.

----------. "Nécrologie-Meyerbeer". Le Ménestral, 8 May 1864, pp. 177-178 and 188-190.

----------. La Sainte-Baume. 2 vols. Paris: E. Renduel, 1834.

----------. Du Théâtre Italien et de son influence sur le goût musical français. Paris: Au Depôt central des meilleurs productions de la presse, 1840.

"P.". "Spectacles. Académie Royale de Musique. La Juive, opéra en cinq actes, paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. Halévy". Le Moniteur Universel, 28 February 1835, p. 458.

Palianti, Louis. Collection de mises en scène de grands opéras et d'opéra-comiques. Représentées pour la première fois à Paris. Paris: Chez l'Auteur et chez MM. les correspondants des Théâtres, n. d.

Planche, Gustave. "Du role de la critique". L'Artiste, 10, No. 15 (1835), pp. 166-168.

----------. Etudes sur les arts. 2 vols. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1855.

----------. "Théâtres. Académie Royale de Musique: Première représentation des Huguenots". Chronique de Paris, NS, 3 March 1836, pp. 250-253 and 6 March 1836, pp. 261-264.

"Robert le Diable, grand opéra de M. Meyerbeer". Le Globe, 27 November 1831, p. 1325.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Roqueplan, Nestor. "Théâtres [Béatrice et Bénédict]". Le Constitutionnel, 18 August 1862, pp. 1-2.

Rovray, A. de. [See Fiorentino, Pier.]

Sainte-Beuve, Charles-A. Mes poisons: Cahiers intimes inédits. 2nd ed. Introd. and notes Victor Giraud. Paris: Les Oeuvres représentatives, 1926.

----------. Nouveaux lundis. 2nd ed. Vol. II. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1866.

Saint-Saëns, Camille. Ecole buissonnière. Notes et souvenirs. Paris: Pierre Lafitte and Co., 1913.

Sand, George. "A Meyerbeer. La Musique, Les Huguenots". Lettres d'un voyageur. 1863; rpt. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1969, pp. 313-335.

Schumann, Robert. The Musical World of Robert Schumann: A Selection from his Writings. Trans. and ed. Henry Pleasants. London: Victor Gollancz, 1965.

----------. Sur les musiciens. Trans. Henri de Curzon. Preface and notes Rémi Jacobs. 1894; Paris: Stock, 1979.

Scribe, Eugène. Les Huguenots. Opéra en cinq acts. Paris: C. Lévy, 1898.

Scudo, Paul. Critique et littérature musicales. Paris: Amyot, 1850.

Séchan, Charles. Souvenirs d'un homme de théâtre 1831-1855. Ed. Adolphe Badin. Paris: C. Lévy, 1883.

Second, Albéric. Les Petits mystères de l'Opéra. Paris: G. Kugelmann, 1844.

"Société des concerts du Conservatoire de musique". L'Artiste, 7, No. 3 (1834), pp. 26-27.

"Société des concerts du Conservatoire de musique". L'Artiste, 7, No. 1 (1834), pp. 5-6.

Smith, Paul. [See Edouard Monnais.]

Solomé. Indications générales et observations pour la mise en scène de la Muette de Portici, Grand Opéra en cinq actes, paroles de MM. Scribe et G. Delavigne, musique de M. Auber. Paris: E. Duverger, 1828.

Soulié Frédéric. "Théâtres. Opéra [La Esmeralda]". La Presse, 14 November 1836, pp. 1-3.

----------. "Théâtres. Opéra [La Esmeralda]". La Presse, 21 November 1836, pp. 1-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Spectacles: Opéra-Comique". Le Moniteur Universel, 13 January 1834, p. 90.

"Spectacles. Académie Royale de Musique. La Juive, opéra en cinq actes, paroles de M. Scribe, musique de M. Halévy". Le Moniteur Universel, 28 February 1835, p. 458.

Stoepel, Franz. "Académie Royale de Musique. La Juive". Revue et Gazette Musicale, 1 March 1835, pp. 72-75.

Trollope, Frances. Paris and the Parisians in 1835. 2 vols. Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1836.

Véron, Louis. Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris. Vol. III. Paris: G. de Goret, 1854.

----------. Paris en 1860. Les Théâtres de Paris depuis 1806 jusqu'en 1860. Paris: A. Bourdilliat, 1860.

Weber, Johannes. Meyerbeer, notes et souvenirs d'un de ses secrétaires. Paris: Fischbacher, 1898.

Werner, Hans. [See Blaze de Bury, Henri.]

Secondary Sources

Abraham, Gerald. "Weber as Novelist and Critic". Musical Quarterly, 20 (January 1934), 27-28.

Allevy, Marie Antoinette. La Mise en Scène en France dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle. Paris: E. Droz, 1938.

d'Alméras, Henri. La Vie parisienne sous le règne de Louis-Phillipe. Paris: A. Michel, 1911.

d'Ariste, Paul. La Vie et le monde de boulevard (1830-1870): Un dandy: Nestor Roqueplan. Paris: Jules Tallandier, 1930.

Aubin, Léon. Histoire de la musique dramatique en France. Le Drame lyrique. Tours: P. Salmon, 1908.

Avenel, Henri. Histoire de la presse française depuis 1789 jusqu'à nos jours. Paris: Flammarion, 1900.

Bailbé, Joseph Marc. Berlioz: artiste et écrivain dans les Mémoires. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1972.

----------. Berlioz et l'art lyrique: essai d'interprétation à l'usage de notre temps. Berne: P. Lang, 1981.

----------. "Le Bourgeois et la musique au XIXe siècle". Romantisme, Nos. 17-18 (1977), pp. 123-136.

----------. "Le Sens de l'espace dans les textes littéraires de Berlioz". Romantisme, 12 (1976), 35-42.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

----------. Jules Janin: 1804-1874, une sensibilité littéraire et artistique. Paris: Lettres modernes, 1974.

----------. Le Roman et la musique en France sous la monarchie de juillet. Paris: Lettres modernes (Minard), 1969.

Baldensperger, Fernand. Sensibilité musicale et romantisme. Paris: Les Presses françaises, 1925.

Barraud, Henry. Hector Berlioz. Paris: Fayard, 1979.

Barricelli, Jean-Pierre. "Romantic Writers and Music: The Case of Mazzini." Studies in Romanticism, 14 (1975), 95-117.

Bartlett, Elizabeth. "Archival Sources for the Opéra-Comique and its Registres at the Bibliothèque de l'Opera". 19th-Century Music, 7 (Fall 1983), 119-129.

Barzun, Jacques. "Berlioz, a Hundred Years After". Musical Quarterly, 56 (Jan. 1970), 1-13.

----------. Berlioz and the Romantic Century. 3rd ed. 2 vols. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1969.

----------. Classic, Romantic, and Modern. 3rd ed. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1975.

----------. Critical Questions. On Music and Letters. Culture and Biography 1940-1980. Ed. and introd. Bea Friedland. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1982.

Becker, Heinz. Der Fall Heine-Meyerbeer. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1958.

----------. "Die historische Bedeutung der Grand Opéra". In Beiträge zur Geschichte der Musikanschauung im 19. Jahrhundert. Regensburg: Verlag Gustave Bosse, 1965, pp. 151-159.

Becq de Fouquières, L. L'Art de la mise en scène, essai d'esthétique théâtrale, Paris: G. Charpentier and Co., 1884.

Bellanger, Claude et al., eds. Histoire générale de la presse françaises. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1969.

Bénichou, Paul. Le Temps des prophètes. Paris: Gallimard, 1977.

Besnier, Patrick. "Berlioz et Meyerbeer". Revue de Musicologie, 63 Nos. 1-2 (1977), pp. 35-40.

Bloom, Peter A. "Berlioz and the Prix de Rome of 1830". Journal of the American Musicological Association, 34 (Summer 81), 279-297.

----------, and D. Kern Holoman. "Berlioz's Music for L'Europe littéraire". The Music Review, 39 (May 1978), 100-109.

----------. "François-Joseph Fétis and the Revue Musicale , (1827-1835)". Diss. Pennsylvania 1972.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

----------. "Friends and Admirers: Meyerbeer and Fétis". Revue Belge de Musicologie, 32-33 (1978-1979), 174-187.

----------. "Orpheus' Lyre Resurrected: A Tableau Musical by Berlioz". Musical Quarterly, 61 (April 1975), 189-211.

Boschot, Adolphe. La Jeunesse d'un romantique: Hector Berlioz 1803-1831. Paris: Plon, 1906.

----------. Un Romantique sous Louis-Philippe: Hector Berlioz 1831-1842. Paris: Plon, 1908.

----------. Le Crépuscule d'un romantique: Hector Berlioz, 1842-1869. Paris: Plon, 1913.

----------. Une Vie romantique. Hector Berlioz. Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1919.

----------. "Hector Berlioz, critique musicale". Bulletin de la Classe des Beaux-Arts, Bruxelles, 20 (1938), 34-42.

Bouyer, Raymond. "Critiques musicaux de jadis où de naguère". Le Ménestral, August-December 1909, January-April, 1910.

Brisson, Jules and Felix Ribeyre, eds. Les Grands journaux de France. Paris: Marlé, 1863.

Brunetière, Ferdinand. L'Evolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature. 3rd ed. Vol. I, Paris: Hachette, 1898.

Cairns, David. "Berlioz and Criticism: Some Surviving Dodos". Musical Times, 104 (1963), 548-551.

----------. "Berlioz and Virgil: A Consideration of Les Troyens as a Virgilian Opéra". Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association, 95 (1969), 97-110.

Carlson, Marvin. A. The French Stage in the Nineteenth Century. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1972.

Cauchie, Maurice. "The High Lights of French Opéra-Comique". Musical Quarterly, 25 (1939), 306-312.

Charnacé. Guy de. Musique et musiciens. 2 vols. Paris: Pottier de Lalaine, 1873.

Clark, T. J. The Absolute Bourgeois: Artists and Politics in France 1848-1852. 2nd ed. Princeton, New Jersey: Univ. of Princeton, 1982.

Claudon, Francis. "L'idée et l'influence de la musique chez quelques romantiques français et plus particulièrement Stendhal". Diss. Université de Paris IV 1977.

----------. "G. Meyerbeer et V. Hugo: Dramaturgie comparée". In Regards sur l'Opéra. Du Ballet Comique de la Reine à l'Opéra de Pékin. Publication of the University of Rouen. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1976, pp. 101-111.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Cohen, Howard Robert. "Berlioz on the Opéra (1829-1849): A Study in Music Criticism". Diss. New York University 1973.

----------. "La Conservation de la tradition scénique sur la scène lyrique en France du dix-neuvième siècle: les livrets de mise-en-scène et la Bibliothèque de l'Association de la Régie Théâtrale". Revue de Musicologie, 64 (1978), 254-267.

----------. "The Nineteenth-Century French Press and the Music Historian: Archival Sources and Bibliographical Resources". 19th-Century Music, 7 (Fall 1983), 136-142.

Collins, Irene. The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1888. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959.

----------. "The Government and the Newspaper Press During the Reign of Louis-Philippe". English Historical Review, 69 (April 1954), 262-282.

Collins, Irene, ed. Government and Society in France, 1814-1848. Great Britain: Edward Arnold, 1970.

Cooper, Martin. "Giacomo Meyerbeer, 1791-1864". Proceedings of the Royal Music Association, No. 90 (April 1964), pp. 97-129.

----------. Opéra Comique. London: M. Parrish, 1949.

Combarieu, Jules and René Dumesnil. Histoire de la musique. Vol. III. New ed. Paris: Armand Colin, 1955.

Conrad, Peter. Romantic Opera and Literary Form. 2nd ed. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1981.

Condé, Gérard, ed. Hector Berlioz: Cauchemars et passions. Paris: J. C. Lattès, 1981.

Cordey, Jean. La Société des concerts du Conservatoire. Paris: Au siège de la Société, 1941.

Coudroy, Marie-Hélène. "Les Créations de Robert le Diable et des Huguenots de Meyerbeer face à la critique". Diss. Conservatoire Supérieur de Musique de Paris 1979.

----------. "La Critique parisienne face aux créations du Prophète et de l'Africaine de Meyerbeer", Diss. Université de Paris IV 1982.

Crosten, William Loren. French Grand Opera: An Art and a Business. 1948; rpt. New York: Da Capo, 1972.

Curzon, Henri de. "Les Débuts de Berlioz dans la critique". Guide Musical, 49 (29 Nov. 1903), 28-31.

Dandelot, Arthur. La Société des concerts du Conservatoire de 1828 à 1897. 2nd ed. Paris: G. Havard Fils, 1898.

Dauriac, Lionel. La Psychologie dans l'opéra français (Auber, Rossini, Meyerbeer). Paris: F. Alcan, 1897.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

David, Jules. Berlioz, Souvenirs intimes et personnels. Paris: Delattre-Lenoël, 1887.

Demarquez, Suzanne. Hector Berlioz, l'homme et son oeuvre. Paris: Seghers, 1969.

Demogeot, Jacques. La Critique et les critiques en France au XIXe siècle. Paris: Hachette, 1857.

Descotes, Maurice. Le Public de théâtre et son histoire. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1964.

Destranges, Etienne. L'Oeuvre théâtrale de Meyerbeer, étude critique. Paris: Fischbacher, 1893.

Des Granges, Charles-Marc. La Presse littéraire sous la Restauration, 1815-1830. Paris: Société du Mercure de France, 1907.

Devriès, Anik. "Un éditeur de musique 'à la tête ardente' Maurice Schlesinger". Fontes Artis Musicae, 27 (July-Dec. 1980), 125-136.

Dickinson, A. E. F. "Berlioz's Bleeding Nun". Musical Times, 107 (July 1966), 584-588.

Dictionnaire de la langue française de Emile Littré. 7 vols. Revised edition. Paris: Gallimard/Hachette, Paris, 1961.

Didier, Béatrice. "Berlioz: conteur et écrivain". Revue de Paris, No. 77 (Feb. 1970), pp. 88-93.

----------. "Hector Berlioz & l'art de la nouvelle". Romantisme, No. 12 (1976), pp. 19-25.

Dieran, Bernard Van. Down Among the Dead Men. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1935.

Dowling, John. José Melchor Gomis: Compositor Romántico. Madrid: Castalia, 1973.

Dresch, Joseph. Heine à Paris d'après sa correspondance et les témoignages de ses contemporains, 1831-1856. Paris: M. Didier. 1956.

Duckles, Vincent. "Patterns in the Historiography of 19th-Century Music". Acta Musicologica, 42 (1970), 75-82.

Dumesnil, René. La Musique romantique française. Lille: Aubier, 1944.

Eckart-Bäcker, Ursula. Frankreichs Musik zwischen Romantik und Moderne, die Zeit im Spiegel der Kritik. Regensburg: G. Bosse Verlag, 1965.

Egbert, D. D. Social Radicalism and the Arts. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ehrhard, Auguste. "L'Opéra sous la direction Véron (1831-1835)". Extrait de la Revue Musicale de Lyon, (1907), pp. 1-49.

Elwart, Antoine. Histoire de la Société des concerts. Paris: S. Castel, 1860.

Encyclopédie de la musique et dictionnaire du Conservatoire impérial de musique. Ed. Albert Lavignac and Lionel de la Laurencie. Two parts in 11 vols. Paris: C. Delagrave 1913-1931.

Faguet, Emile. "La Critique de 1820 à 1850". In vol. VII of Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française. Ed. Petit de Julleville. Paris: Armand Colin, 1899, pp. 646-700.

Fouque, Octave. Histoire du Théâtre-Ventadour 1829-1879--Opéra-Comique, Théâtre de la Renaissance. Paris: G. Fischbacher, 1881.

----------. Les Révolutionnaires de la musique: Lesueur, Berlioz, Beethoven, Richard Wagner, la musique russe. Paris: C. Lévy, 1882.

Fulcher, Jane. "Music and the Communal Order: The Vision of Utopian Socialism in France". Current Musicology, No. 27 (1979), pp. 27-35.

----------. "Meyerbeer and the Music of Society", Musical Quarterly, 67 (1981), 213-229.

Furst, Lilian. Romanticism in Perspective. 2nd revised ed. London: Macmillan, 1979.

Gide, André. Incidences. Paris: Gallimard, 1924.

Girard, Henri. Emile Deschamps--Dilettante. Paris: Libraire Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1921.

Giraudeau, Fernand. La Presse périodique de 1789 à 1869. Paris: E. Dentu, 1867.

Golbeck, Fred. "Défense et illustration de Berlioz". La Revue Musicale, No. 297 (1977), pp. 1-11.

Gourret, Jean. Histoire de l'Opéra-Comique. Paris: Les Publications universitaires, 1978.

Guex, Jules. Le Théâtre et la société française de 1815 à 1848. Paris: Fischbacher, 1900.

Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle, ed. Pierre Larousse. 17 vols. Paris, 1865-18[90?].

Grand Larousse Encyclopédique. 20 vols. Paris, 1971-1976. 1 vol supplement, 1981.

Grand Dictionnaire Encyclopédique Larousse. 5 vols. Paris, 1982-1983.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Grégoir, Edouard. G. J. Littérature musicale: Documents historiques relatifs à l'art musical et aux artistes musiciens. Bruxelles: Schott, 1876.

----------. Recherches historiques concernant les journaux de musique depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours. Antwerp: L. Legris, 1872.

Grout, Donald J. A Short History of Opera. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1966.

Guérin, Eugénie de. Journal (1834-1835). Paris: J. Gabalda, 1934.

Guichard, Léon. "Berlioz et Heine". Revue de Littérature Comparée, 41 (Jan.-March 1967), 5-23.

----------. "Liszt et la littérature française". Revue de Musicologie, No. 56 (1970), pp. 1-34.

----------. La Musique et les lettres au temps du romantisme. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1955.

Guiomar, Michel. Le masque et le fantasme. Paris: José Corti, 1970.

Hagan, Dorothy Veinus. "French Music Criticism Between the Revolutions (1830-1848)". Diss. Illinois 1965.

Hallays, André. "L"Esthétique de Berlioz". Guide Musical, 49 (June 1903), 483-486.

----------. "Hector Berlioz, critique musicale". Revue de Paris, 10 (1 April 1903), 560-595.

Hanslick, Edouard. The Beautiful in Music. 7th German ed. Tr. Gustav Cohen. Ed. Morris Weitz. New York: Bobbs-Merril, 1957.

Harazsti, Emile. "Franz Listz--Author Despite Himself: The History of a Mystification". Musical Quarterly, 33 (1947), 490-516.

Hatin, Eugène. Bibliographie historique et critique de la presse périodique française ou Catalogue systématique et raissonné de tous les écrits périodiques de quelque valeur publiés ou ayant circulé en France depuis l'origine du Journal jusqu'à nos jours, avec extraits, notes historiques, critiques et morales, indications des prix, . . etc, précédé d'un Essai historique et statistique sur la naissance et les progrès de la presse périodique dans les deux mondes. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1866.

----------. Histoire du journal en France. 2nd ed. Paris: P. Jannet, 1853.

----------. Histoire politique et littéraire de la presse en France avec une introduction historique sur les origines du journal et la bibliographie générale des journaux depuis leur origine. Vol. VIII. Paris: Poulet-Malassis et de Broise, 1861.

Hippeau, Edmond. Berlioz et son temps. Paris: P. Ollendorff, 1890.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

----------. Berlioz intime. Paris: E. Dentu, 1889.

Holoman, D. Kern. The Creative Process in the Autograph Musical Documents of Hector Berlioz, c. 1818-1840. Studies in Musicology No. 7. Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1975.

----------. "The Present State of Berlioz Research". Acta Musicologica, 47 (1975), 30-67.

Hopkinson, Cecil. A Bibliography of the Musical and Literary Works of Hector Berlioz: 1803-1869, with Histories of the French Music Publishers Concerned. 2nd revised ed. by Richard Macnutt. Kent: Richard Macnutt, 1980.

Imbert, Hughes. "Hector Berlioz: Initiateur de la haute culture musicale". Le Guide Musical, No. 49 (29 Nov. 1903), pp. 8-20.

Istel, Edgar. "Act IV of Les Huguenots". Musical Quarterly, 22 (1936), 87-97.

Lajeune-Vilar, André. Les Coulisses de la presse, moeurs et chantages du journalisme. Paris: A. Charles, 1895.

Join-Dieterle, Catherine. "Les décors à l'Opéra de Paris". Revue internationale de musique Française, No. 4 (Jan. 1981), pp. 57-72.

----------. "L'Opéra et son public à l'époque romantique". L'Oeil, Nos. 288-289 (July-Aug. 1979), pp. 30-37.

----------. "Robert le Diable: premier opéra romantique". Romantisme, Nos. 28-29 (1980), pp. 147-166.

Jules Janin et son temps: Un moment du romantisme. University of Rouen, Colloque Eureux, June 1974. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974.

Jullien, Adolphe. Paris dilettante au commencement du siècle. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1884.

----------. "La critique de Berlioz". Revue d'art dramatique, 31 (Aug. 1893), 193-206.

----------. Hector Berlioz, sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris: Allison and Co., 1888.

Klein, John W. "Berlioz's Personality". Music and Letters, 50 (Jan. 1969), 15-24.

----------. "Jacques Fromental Halévy (1799-1862)". Music Review, 23 (1962), 13-19.

Lacombe, Paul. Bibliographie parisienne, Tableaux de moeurs (1600-1800). Paris: Rouquette, 1887.

Laforêt, Claude. "Hector Berlioz parmi les romantiques". La Revue Musicale, No. 233 (1956), pp. 45-54.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

----------. La Vie musicale au temps romantique. Preface by Henri Malo. Paris: J. Peyronnet, 1929.

Lantelme, Louis, ed. Le Livre d'or du centenaire de Berlioz. Paris: G. Petit, 1907.

La Laurencie, Lionel de. Le Goût musical en France. Paris: A. Joanin and Co., 1905.

Laloy, Louis. "Berlioz critique et écrivain, à propos de deux publications récentes". La Revue Musicale, 3 (1903), 438-443.

Larousse du XXe siècle. 6 vols. Paris, 1928-1933.

Ledré, Charles. La Presse à l'assault de la monarchie: 1815-1848. Kiosque series. Paris: Colin, 1960.

Legouvé, Ernst. Eugène Scribe. Paris: Didier, 1874.

Lesure, François, avant-propos. Catalogue d'Exposition: Hector Berlioz. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1969.

Livois, René. de. Histoire de la presse française. 2 vols. Paris: Société française du livre, 1965.

Locke, Ralph. P. "Berlioz et les Saint-Simoniens". Revue de Musicologie, 63, No. 1-2 (1977), pp. 55-77, and 64, No. 1 (1978), p. 287.

----------. "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure". 19th-Century Music, 4 (Spring 1981), 209-227.

----------. "Music and the Saint-Simonians: The Involvement of Félicien David and Other Musicians in a Utopian Socialist Movement". Diss. Chicago 1980.

----------. "New Letters of Berlioz". 19th-Century Music, 1 (1977), 71-84.

Loesser, Arthur. Men, Women and Pianos: A Social History. Pref. by Jacques Barzun. London: Victor Gollancz, 1955.

Loewenberg, Alfred. Annals of Opera 1597-1940. 2nd ed. revised and corrected. 2 vols. Geneva: Societas Bibliographica, 1955.

Longyear, Rey Morgan. "Daniel-François-Esprit Auber: A Chapter in French Opéra-Comique". Diss. Cornell 1957.

Macdonald, Hugh. Berlioz. London: J. M. Dent, 1981.

----------. "Berlioz's Self-Borrowings". Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association, 92 (1965), 27-44.

----------. "Hector Berlioz 1969--a Centenary Assessment". Adam, 34, Nos. 331-33 (1969), 35-47.

----------. ed. NBE Béatrice et Bénédict. London, Basel: Barenreiter Kassel, 1980.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Machabey, Armand. Traité de la critique musicale. Paris: Richard-Masse, 1947.

Main, Alexander. "Music and the Social Conscience". 19th-Century Music, 4 (Spring 1981), 228-243.

Marix-Spire, Thérèse. "Du piano à l'action sociale: Franz Liszt et George Sand, militante socialiste". New York: Renaissance Extract, Vol. 2 and 3 (1944-1945), pp. 187-216.

----------. Les Romantiques et la musique. Le cas George Sand 1804-1838. Paris: Nouvelles éditions latines, 1954.

Matoré, George. Le Vocabulaire et la société sous Louis-Philippe. Geneva: Droz, 1951.

Merlin, Oliver. Quand le bel canto régnait sur le boulevard. Paris: Fayard, 1978.

Milner, Max. Le Diable dans la littérature française, de Cazotte à Baudelaire 1772-1861. 2 vols. Paris: José Corti, 1960.

Mirecourt, Eugène de. Meyerbeer. 3rd ed. Paris: G. Havard, 1856.

Mongrédien, Jean. Jean-François Le Sueur: Contribution à l'étude d'un demi-siècle de musique française (1780-1830). 2 vols. Berne: P. Lang, 1980.

Musical Times, 110 (March 1969) [Berlioz centenary issue].

New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Ed. Stanley Sadie. 20 vols. London: Macmillan, 1980.

Newman, Ernest. Berlioz, Romantic and Classic: Writings by Ernest Newman. Ed. by Peter Heyworth. London: Gollancz, 1972.

Niedermeyer, Louis-Alfred. Vie d'un compositeur moderne 1802-1861: Louis Niedermeyer. Introd. Camille Saint-Saëns. Paris: Fischbacher, 1893.

Noske, Frits. French Song from Berlioz to Duparc. 2nd ed. Trans. Rita Benson from the French "La Mélodie française de Berlioz à Duparc: Essai de critique historique". Paris, 1954; New York: Dover, 1970.

d'Ollone, Max. Le Théâtre lyrique et le public. Paris: La Palatine, 1955.

Ozanam, Yves. "Recherches sur l'Académie Royale de Musique (Opéra Français) sous la seconde restauration 1815-1830". Diss. Ecole Nationale des Chartes (Paris) 1981.

Pailleron, Marie-Louise. François Buloz et ses amis: La vie littéraire sous Louis-Philippe. Paris: C. Lévy, 1919.

Pendle, Karin. "Eugène Scribe and the French Opera of the Nineteenth Century". Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1979.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

----------. "The Tranformation of a Libretto: Goethe's 'Jery und Bately'". Music and Letters, 55 (Jan. 1974), 77-78.

Perris, Arnold. "Music in France During the Reign of Louis-Philippe: Art as 'A Substitute for the Heroic Experience'". Diss. Northwestern 1967.

Pereire, Alfred. Le Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires 1814-1914. Paris: Librairie ancienne Edouard Champion, 1924.

Pierre, Constant. Le Conservatoire national de musique et de déclamation, documents historiques et administratifs recueillis ou reconstitués. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1900.

Plantinga, Leon B. Schumann as Critic. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1967.

Porter, Cecilia Hopkins. "The New Public and the Reordering of the Musical Establishment: The Lower Rhine Music Festivals, 1818-67". 19th-Century Music, 3 (March 1980), 211-224.

Pougin, Arthur. De la littérature musicale en France. Paris: Alfred Ikelmer and Co., 1867.

----------. "D'Ortigue". Dossier des correspondants: Note de M. Arthur Pougin. Autograph MS letters, Bibliothèque de l'Opéra (Paris).

----------. "Notes sur la presse musicale en France". In Encylopédie de la musique et dictionnaire du Conservatoire impérial de musique. Ed. Albert Lavingac and Lionel de la Laurencie. 2nd part. Vol. 6. Paris: 1931, pp. 3841-3859.

Pourtales, Guy de. Berlioz et l'Europe romantique. Paris: Gallimard, 1979.

Primmer, Brain. The Berlioz Style. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973.

----------. "Berlioz and a Romantic Image". The Berlioz Society Bulletin, No. 83 (April 1974), pp. 4-13.

Prod'homme, Jacques Gabriel. "Bibliographie berliozienne". Revue Musicale, No. 233 (1956), pp. 97-147.

----------. "Hector Berlioz jugé par Adolphe Adam". Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft, 5th year (1903-1904), pp. 475-482.

----------. Hector Berlioz, (1803-1869), sa vie et ses oeuvres. Pref. Alfred Bruneau. Paris: C. Delagrave, 1904.

----------. "Nouvelles lettres de Hector Berlioz". Rivista Musicale Italiana, 12 (1905), 339-382.

Radar, Daniel. The Journalists and the July Revolution in France. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reclus, Maurice. E. de Girardin, le créateur de la presse moderne. Paris: Hachette, 1934.

Reeve, Katherine Kolb. "Berlioz critique ou les embarras de l'analyse". Biographie et Autographie. Proceedings of a Colloque run by the Berlioz Festival, Lyon 1980, pp. 56-59.

----------. "A Berliozian Spoof. Three Anonymous Feuilletons of 1836." Parts 1 and 2. Berlioz Society Bulletin, 103 (Spring 1979), 2-8, 106 (Winter 1979-80), 4-10.

----------. "The Poetics of the Orchestra in the Writings of Hector Berlioz". Diss. Yale 1978.

Regard, Maurice. Gustave Planche, 1808-1857. Paris: Nouvelles éditions Latines, 1956.

Revue Musicale. No. 19 (1 Oct. 1904) [Issue devoted to Meyerbeer].

Reyer, Ernest. "La critique musicale". In Le Livre du centenaire du Journal des Débats 1789-1889. Paris: Plon, 1889, pp. 427-440.

----------. Notes de musique. Paris: Charpentier, 1875.

----------. Quarante ans de musique. Pref. and notes Emile Henriot. Paris: C. Lévy, 1910.

Robert, W. Wright. "Berlioz the critic". Parts 1 and 2. Music and Letters, 7 (Jan. 1926), pp. 63-72, and 7 (April 1926), pp. 133-142.

Rolland, Romain. Musiciens d'aujourd'hui. 19th ed. Paris: Hachette, 1949.

----------. Les Origines du théâtre lyrique moderne. Paris: Hachette, 1895.

Rosen, Charles. "Romantic Documents". New York Review of Books, 15 May 1975, pp. 15-20.

Sablière, Françoise de la. "Quel père fut Berlioz?" Revue de Paris, No. 77 (Feb. 1970), pp. 94-103.

Samuel, Claude. "Les écrits du compositeur". In Hector Berlioz: Collection Génies et Réalites. Paris: Hachette, 1973, pp. 197-209.

Shroder, M. Icarus: The Image of the Artist in French Romanticism. Camb., Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1961

Silex [Berlioz issue.] No. 18 (Dec. 1980), Grenoble.

Sirven, Alfred. Journaux et journalistes. Le Journal des Débats. Paris: F. Cournol, 1865.

Smith, Patrick. The Tenth Muse: A Historical Study of the Opera Libretto. New York: Alfred. A. Knopf, 1970.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Stuart, Charles. "Did Berlioz really like Meyerbeer?" Opera, 3 (Dec. 1952), 719-725.

Strunk, Oliver. Source Readings in Music History. New York: Norton, 1950.

Texier, Edmond. Histoire des journaux. Biographie des journalistes, contenant l'histoire politique, littéraire, industrielle, pittoresque et anecdotique de chaque journal publié à Paris et la biographie de ses rédacteurs. Paris: Pagnerre, 1850.

Thibert, Marguerite. Le Rôle social de l'art d'après les Saint-Simoniens. Paris: M. Rivière, 1926.

Thoumin, Jean-Adrien. "Esquisses historique sur la presse musicale en France". La Chronique Musicale, 1 (July 1873).

Tieghem, Philippe Van, with collaboration of Pierre Josserance. Dictionnaire des littérateurs. 3 vols. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1968.

Tiersot, Julien. "Berlioziana: La Nonne Sanglante". Le Ménestral; 14 Oct. 1906, pp. 319-320, and 21 Oct. 1906, pp. 327-328.

----------. Hector Berlioz et la société de son temps. Paris: Hachette, 1904.

----------, ed. Lettres de musiciens écrites en français du XVe au XXe siècle. 2 vols. Turin: Bocca, 1924.

----------. La Musique au temps romantique. Paris: Alcan, 1930.

Trésor de la langue française. Ed. Paul Imbs. 9 vols. Paris: CNRS, 1971-1981.

Turner, W. J. Berlioz the Man and his Work. London: 1934; New York: Vienna House, 1974.

Vapereau, Gustave. Dictionnaire universel des contemporains. 6th ed. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1893.

Vyborny, Zdenek. "Paganini as Music Critic". Musical Quarterly, 46 (Oct. 1960), 468-481.

Walker, Alan, ed. Franz Liszt: The Man and his Music. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1976.

Waters, E. N. "Sur la piste de Liszt". Notes, 27 (1970-71), 665-670.

Weber, William. Music and the Middle Class: The Social Structure of Concert Life in London, Paris and Vienna between 1830-1848. London: Croom Helm, 1975.

----------. "The Muddle of the Middle Classes". 19th-Century Music, 3 (Nov. 1979), 175-185.

Weill, Georges. La France sous la monarchie constitutionnelle (1814-1848). Paris: Félix Alcan, 1912.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Wellek, René. A History of Modern Criticism 1750-1950. Vol. III. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1965.

Werth, Kent. "Berlioz's Damnation of Faust: A Manuscript Study". Diss. Berkeley 1979.

Wilcox, John. "The Beginnings of l'Art pour l'Art". Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 11 (1953), 360-377.

Wild, Nicole. "Un demi-siècle de décors à l'Opéra de Paris, salle Le Peletier (1822-1873)". In Regards sur l'Opéra. Du Ballet Comique de la Reine à l'Opéra de Pékin. Publication of the University of Rouen. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1976, pp. 11-22.

----------. "La Recherche de la précision historique chez les décorateurs de l'Opéra de Paris au XIXème siècle". Report of the Twelfth Congress of the International Musicological Society, held at Berkeley, California, 1977, pp. 453-463.

Wotton, Tom S. Hector Berlioz. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.