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Citer ce compte rendu

The overall value of this book to the literature of manuscript studies cannot be disputed or underestimated. Its distinguished production details (including numerous facsimile reproductions, detailed illustrations, and eight superb colour plates), along with the number of meticulously prepared catalogues and new editions of textual material, make the volume absolutely essential secondary literature on Fauvel. Even more impressive than its individual contributions, however, is the larger effect of the collection, which brings together advanced scholarship in multiple sub-disciplines to an extent rarely seen in a single volume. This approach to the compilation of Fauvel Studies certainly befits and does ample justice to its subject matter, the Gesamtkunstwerk which is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS français 146.

Brian E. Power


Among a host of similar messages in Liszt’s over 8,000 published letters, three samples below reveal the reasons for the great difficulty in accessing the wealth of his exceptionally broad and far-flung correspondence: “You’re a good one, asking how I’m spending my evenings: so you’ve forgotten that I know 30,000 people in Paris and that like it or not I really must put up with a few of them,”¹ wrote Franz Liszt from there on 11 July 1834 to Countess Marie d’Agoult in Touraine. On 20 November 1875 from the Villa d’Este he complained to Baroness Olga von Meyendorff in Weimar:

For the last couple of weeks I have been gloomily writing quantities of letters. I get nearly fifty a week, not counting shipments of manuscripts, pamphlets, books, dedications, and all kinds of music. The time required to peruse them, even casually, deprives me of the time needed to answer them. Up until now it has been impossible for me to concentrate steadily on my musical work because of this too flattering and steady harassment by my correspondents in various countries.²

¹“You êtes bonne de me demander comment je passe mes soirées: vous oubliez donc que je connais 30 000 gens à Paris et que bon gré mal gré il faut bien que j’en endure quelques-uns,” in Franz Liszt—Marie d’Agoult: Correspondance, eds. Gut and Bellas, no. 86. Unless otherwise attributed, translations are my own.

By November 1882, from Weimar, Liszt was appealing for a halt to this unwanted interchange to his friend Otto Lessmann, owner-editor of the influential Allgemeine-Musik-Zeitung in Berlin:

Dear Editor:

Since my work is being utterly disrupted by the receipt of too many scores, other compositions, and written communications, I ask you to let it be known that in future I would be glad not to receive this manner of demand on my time. For many years, I have most humbly refused to contribute to autograph collections.

Respectfully, F. Liszt.³

Despite such complaints, his social and written relations swelled yearly from his youth in parallel with his ever-broadening creative and social prominence. Even on his deathbed, Liszt continued to dictate and sign pressing correspondence with fevered hand and unseeing eyes, all the while receiving a stream of callers.⁴ Systematic finding and publication of unknown autographs will surely reveal that the sum of Liszt’s extant letters easily surpasses Wagner’s estimated 12,000 lifetime pieces.

Why the need to estimate? Despite Liszt’s immense stature in the musical realm, and his imposing presence in social, cultural, religious, and political spheres, unlike other luminous members of his early Paris circle, he has not yet been honored with a critical edition of his complete correspondence, the most comprehensive and impassioned of them all. (For instance, Berlioz, Chopin, Franck, Lamennais, George Sand, Sainte-Beuve, have theirs; Marie d’Agoult’s and Wagner’s are currently in progress). Their sheer number might explain the glaring lack, still felt today by Lisztians and nineteenth-century buffs, of reliable published Liszt letters. The latest proposal in 1986 by a Paris-based international committee of a critical collected edition never got much beyond the planning stage. We shall not see one for decades. Its translation for monolingual readers, such as the recent English anthology by Adrian Williams, is a further step away.

Liszt’s letters contain his autobiographical account of what it was like to be Liszt in his milieu, told in the heat of the moment, with no chance for later forgetfulness or self-protective revisions. His raw revelations were intact in addressee’s hands. Nonetheless, their piecemeal and eclectic publication over


⁴His last known letter, dated 17 July 1886, is to Olga von Meyendorff. According to Lina Schmalhausen, as late as 23 July, a week before his death, Liszt had dictated to August Göllerich a reply, unknown today, to Ferenc Varga, physician and friend in Budapest. He had telegraphed Lina in Carlsbad on 20 July. See The Death of Franz Liszt: Based on the Unpublished Diary of His Pupil Lina Schmalhausen," introduced, annotated, and edited by Alan Walker (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 70–71 n42, 18.
more than a century has distorted the bulk of his self-disclosures. Charles Suttoni's 1989 catalogue of Liszt's published letters inventories 6,500 pieces, to 1,000 individuals, from 700 books and articles, by 400 different editors of "widely varying interests, methods, and levels of competence." By 1999, his supplement had added another 1,500 translations and radically re-edited or hitherto unknown letters from 136 new publications, revealing a further forty-seven unknown correspondents among their eighty-two addressees; fifty-seven new Liszt scholars had joined known editors of Liszt's communications. 5

Most of Suttoni's listed correspondence is out-of-print. The books are rare, the ephemera even rarer. Reading access to Liszt's published letters also requires idiomatic fluency in German and French, since most have appeared only in their original languages (c. 80% French, c. 15% German, often intermingled in the same letter). The remnant has bypassed Liszt's own words, translated into a third language (as in the English extract above from the edition of 407 letters to Baroness Meyendorff).

Practically all of the correspondence published is disfigured if not downright bowdlerized. Until recent times, editors blithely corrected Liszt's grammar, punctuation, spelling, and vocabulary. They reworded, abridged, even expanded, mostly without indication of the nature of their interventions. Close reading of autographs in archives reveals in addition significant omissions of letters to key figures in the so-called "complete correspondences"—remedied all too rarely by the publication of such re-editions as the two reviewed below. Other defects include incomplete or wrong dates, frequent misreadings of autographs. A good third of his extant correspondence to key figures remains largely unpublished: to name but two, the cross correspondence with his son Daniel (mainly in the Richard-Wagner-Stiftung Archives in Bayreuth), the one to his Lieder singer and short-term lover Emilie Genast (mainly in the Goethe-und-Schiller Archives in Weimar). The volume of letters in private hands or remote collections is guesswork. Regular advertisement of hitherto unknown autographs, in dealers' catalogues and on auction websites, signals hidden hoards. Current prices exceed the means of most public archives.

Since Suttoni's supplement's recent appearance, more new or re-edited letters have seen print. Liszt's star has risen rapidly following the centenary of his death; many more autographs will see publication as 2011, the bicentenary of his birth, approaches. The imminent celebrations of 1986 spurred a trend towards scholarly books pitched at the level of a general but highly cultured readership. Some altruistic, polyglot Liszt scholars have translated representative highlights from his correspondence into their native tongues to enable their music loving but monolingual compatriots to enjoy the pleasure of hearing how the composer himself spoke of his multifaceted life and times.  

* * *

Adrian Williams's *Franz Liszt. Selected Letters*, is the latest such anthology to appear and the first new one in English for more than a century to provide a

---

panorama of Liszt in his letters in every climate and every season of his life. Despite her dated English and less than perfect rendering of the exact sense of many phrases, Constance Bache's flawed English anthology of 1894 was reprinted without revision in 1972. Works on nineteenth-century music often cite passages today; proof enough of the current need, even in scholarly circles, for reliable new English translations.

Williams's anthology offers 946 whole letters or extracted passages interesting to modern Anglophone readers. It opens with Liszt's stirring declaration of 2 May 1832 to former pupil Pierre Wolff in Geneva of his fierce will to be an artist. (Its beautifully printed music example heralds the quality of those to follow.) It ends on 6 July 1886 with "umilissimo Slavissimo’s" laconically cautious news of Bayreuth and Colpach to second official mistress Princess Carolyne von Sayn-Wittgenstein in Rome. Following paragraphs point to Liszt's later letters and visitors in his last days. In between, we read, year-by-year, sensitive, fluent, entirely reliable translations of Liszt's letters to over 100 people and institutions, selected from earlier publications in French, German, or occasionally Italian.

Each year's section starts with a biographical chronology, the focus of which is Liszt's concerts and music. Lists of his main compositions (with Searle numbers) and of his writings of that year complete it. Deliberately sparse footnotes offer real illumination light-handedly, their rarity compensated deftly by over 150 appended biographical sketches of more than 200 people mentioned or addressed, all delightful to read, surreptitiously erudite. Clear tables list all letters included and the source of each. A bibliography and a separate index of Liszt's works, featuring his own short titles used in letters, complete the apparatus. Between pages 536 and 537 lies a well-balanced selection for general readers of twenty-three glossy plates showing places, portraits of Liszt, and some members of his circle. Lisztians will recognize all but Valentine de Cessiat, Lamartine's niece, who refused Liszt's marriage proposal in 1845; Alexander von Humboldt, famous naturalist, explorer, writer, and Prussian court chamberlain, whom Liszt joined in Berlin in mutual admiration for long years; Carmen Sylva, pseudonym of the literary Queen Elisabeth of Romania, who composed a poem inspired by Liszt's Waldesrauschen; a group portrait of "the mighty handful" in Saint Petersburg; at the piano, Liszt's champion Balakirev, who kept Liszt's portrait on his desk. They never met, Liszt's projected Russian trip of spring 1886 having been cancelled.

In the main, Williams offers a hitherto unknown set of Liszt letters in English. His edition does not mirror nor retranslate La Mara’s first two volumes. Although Williams selects some departure texts from those volumes, never from Bache, he has chosen to reflect Liszt’s human relations rather than the career aspects cautiously presented by his first editor in 1893. He has borrowed heavily from La Mara’s later volumes. Long out of print and defective as they might be, they are still the only published collected source of Liszt’s letters to Princess Carolyne, for instance, to whose emotional need for frequent news during his absences he responded with over 2,000 letters. (In her hefty volumes of the latter, numbered IV–VII, La Mara omitted about one third of them, cutting and “improving” the others). Williams’s sample of 450 of them is proportionate with Carolyne’s share of his time and confidences from 1847 onwards. Earlier Marie d’Agoult had been his main confidant. Here Ollivier’s edition, the only available published source until 2001, was pressed into service. Wagner holds third place proportionally (translations here based on Kloss’s more reliable German edition). Williams’s ratios accurately reflect Liszt’s personal attachments. Letters to almost 100 others fill the rest of the volume, some translated from La Mara’s further volumes, others from rare sources. The latter include the biography of opera tenor, fellow Schubert enthusiast, and humanitarian Adolphe Nourrit, whose suicide in 1839 in Naples distressed Liszt so; his Hungarian friend in later years, the one-armed pianist Count Geza Zichy’s autobiography; Manfred Gravina’s obscure publication of some of his great-grandfather’s letters. While signaling to readers their current availability in English translation, Williams omitted Liszt’s letters to Olga von Meyendorff and to Princess Marie von Sayn-Wittgenstein, presumably judging them trustworthy. (Alas, when compared to the French autographs the latter proves radically unreliable, despite a reprint in 1971, much quoted still in scholarly works). The Selected Letters weighs almost four pounds, yet pages and music examples look clear and well spaced. Other correspondents, other letters might have been selected, of course. In the end, such an edition’s physical limits on inclusion and its publisher’s and editor’s aims must be treated with respect in any judgment of it.

In the non-fiction field, the name of Oxford University Press evokes images of prestigious erudite volumes alongside scholarly yet popular dictionaries, companions, and anthologies in many fields. His publisher’s academic reputation should not promote the delusion that William’s edition aims at a public of research scholars and musicologists. Such specialists would surely not have the gall to embark on Liszt studies in any depth without the ability to weigh precisely for themselves the sense of the composer’s correspondence in its original languages (which include quite a sprinkling of Latin, Italian, Hungarian, and Spanish too), and without consultation of the autographs. What benefit could they derive from translated selections from time-hallowed printed cor-

respondence in the Liszt literature except a highly pleasurable read, which might well spark research ideas? His edition is obviously another Oxford Anthology intended to enlighten while entertaining that majority of music lovers and nineteenth-century enthusiasts who, finding Liszt’s music exciting and his name occurring so frequently in histories, literature, biographies about so many others, want to know more about him. They will seek and acquire from this volume a reasonable idea of the contents of his letters. (Anyone needing absolutely complete and accurate letter dates, Liszt’s exact even if awkward wording and punctuation rather than a smoother rendering of his message, the boringly trivial passages in full, would know to seek them elsewhere.) The targeted readership is impatient with such pedantry, but their delighted discoveries here might well encourage them to investigate Liszt further.

The whole translation is a page-turner for the non-specialist mind, written by an erudite, polyglot specialist. It takes its readers far into Liszt’s charismatic and complex personality, his cultural milieu, and his immense circle of social relations, the latter with deceptively unscholarly help from Williams. (A great deal of reliable “hard” information underpins unobtrusively the supporting apparatus, a mine for scholarly researchers).

Rarely do general readers enjoy free, easy access to interlibrary lending services or archives. Most original sources of these letters cannot be found today outside a few large national, municipal, or university libraries. Perhaps a handful of copies exist in a whole country. Oxford’s Clarendon Press and Williams have done Liszt an immense service by bringing his mind into contact in their own language with that of a lively minded public (under which category I include undergraduate students in most fields), and by presenting scholarly information so engagingly.

***

Another welcome new phenomenon is the publication of several reliable critical editions, based on Liszt’s extant autograph correspondence with one other person. The dream has vanished of some thirty-odd, 1,000 page long volumes that interweave over Liszt’s long lifespan to reveal all the threads of his addressees to reveal the comparative importance of each, while Liszt’s repetitious statements, varied or tellingly omitted for each individual, would also unveil his immediate or long-term preoccupations. As feasible alternative, there is a strong case for focusing on his progressive one-on-one relations, in editions whose space allows both correspondents to speak. The sheer bulk of letters extant proves the addressee’s compelling influence on Liszt, and vice versa. Two such radical revisions and completions appear below in their publication order.9

***

9Models behind Hamburger’s and the Gut/Bellas re-editions were surely the earlier rare examples of scholarly and reliable editions of Franz Liszt’s letters transcribed in their original languages, written to a wide group of correspondents, based on holdings in local archives, by Margit Prahács for Hungarian sources: Briefe aus ungarischen Sammlungen, 1835–1886 (Bärenreiter: Munich, 1966); by Dezső Legány for Viennese sources: Presse und Briefe aus Wien, 1822–1883 (Budapest: Corvina Kiadó, 1984); by László Eösze for Roman sources, 119 Római Dokumentum (Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1980).
Klára Hamburger’s critical re-edition of the bulk of the correspondence between Liszt and his mother Anna has long been needed. Opening with the anguished adolescent’s gentle possible warning from Boulogne-sur-mer, 24 August 1827, to Krems, Austria, of his father’s sudden dangerous illness, it ends on 14 January 1866 at the Vatican, two weeks before Anna’s unexpected death in Paris prevented their reunion, with the abbé’s cheering tease: “The bad news in what I have to tell you today is that I shall soon have the joy to seeing you again in Paris.”

La Mara published in German translation her censored, sanitized version of Liszt’s side of the exchange, processed from autographs in three archives, letters often written in French, after his mother’s exasperated protests about his illegible German, we now learn. Jacques Vier later published in their original French Liszt’s twenty-eight autographs held in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. Incomplete dating, misreadings, retouching, and faulty notes mar them. (Only five lending copies of Vier’s book exist in North America.) In a remarkable article with comparative table, Mária Eckhardt later emended by autograph studies in the Paris, Budapest, and Bayreuth archives all dates from both parties’ letters. Hamburger has acknowledged her scholarly contribution when dating and repositioning these letters.

After having published for many years, in shorter forms, research on relations between Anna Liszt and her celebrated son, incorporated here, Hamburger was chosen to produce this handsome edition, printed on coated heavy-stock paper. Its publication was funded to celebrate the tenth anniversary of cultural partnership between Bayreuth, Liszt’s burial place, and the Austrian Burgenland, site of his formerly Hungarian birthplace, both holders of invaluable Liszt archives. Gratitude is owed to all involved, especially to Dr. Gerhard Winkler who oversaw the edition, for such an apt choice of festive offering.

The nationalities of the partnership dictated the editorial mandate: the volume is restricted to autographs held in German archives (some autographs belong to Weimar); all prefaces, notes, and end matter are in German. Nonetheless, we can at last read complete transcriptions of these autographs: Liszt’s 121 letters to his mother, in his own German (twenty-five letters) or French wording (ninety-six letters), together with seventy letters from Anna, in her faulty colloquial Austrian speech patterns, sprinkled with mangled French phrases reproduced by ear. An appendix contains her eleven letters to Princess Carolyne, one to Liszt’s impresario Belloni, and one to a Mr. Fotès. An ingenious system of varied typefaces indicates switches by both writers in language and in German

10“Le malheur de ce que j'ai à vous dire aujourd'hui c'est que bientôt j'aurai la joie de vous revoir.” (F 121). La Mara changed “Le malheur” to “Das Beste” [The best thing], in her Franz Liszts Briefe an seine Mutter (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Hartel, 1918), no. 102.

11 For La Mara’s edition see n. 10 above. Suttoni counts in Vier’s edition 27 letters including an incomplete one in the introduction; Hamburger and Eckhardt table 28 letters, sign of shuffled autograph pages, their order followed trustingly by Vier. For Vier’s edition see n. 12 below.

script style, often within the same letter. Each letter is followed by a new German translation of its French text: the reverse has not been attempted.

The edition’s apparatus includes Hamburger’s perceptive twenty-four-page preface, a correlation of the cross correspondence, skillfully cross-referenced notes following each letter, a bibliography, and an index. Meticulous editing includes for each letter an accurate complete date, salutation, signature, archive source with shelf number, paper size, number of sides written and end of each. Time gaps often hinder a semblance of continuity in the exchange (only one letter from Anna exists between 1838 and 1846, for instance). In consecutive sections, Liszt’s letters come first (F numbers); his mother’s follow (A numbers), then hers to Carolyne (AW numbers), then hers to two others (AS numbers). Ten plates from Bayreuth and Burgenland archives, nicely printed on appropriate pages, with cross-references, are often familiar (after all, only three portraits of Anna are extant). Facsimiles of two Liszt letters [Geneva, March 1836], with music example and blot or tear, from Sexard [Szekszárd], 22 October 1846, and one from Anna, Paris, 7 October 1846, illustrate their contrasting characters. Anna’s has neat alignment and Gothic style lettering, dating, layout, and chaotic grammar and spelling; Liszt’s scrawls in all directions, his dating is slapdash but his expressions are careful even at his most colloquial. Facsimiles of Anna’s mailing of printed programs of Paris concerts, by Liszt’s friends and pupils (Anton Rubinstein, Hans von Bronsart) in April 1857, supply new complementary documents.

A mandate is a mandate; such scarce opportunities for publication of critical editions of autographs must be seized; yet, Liszt’s twenty-eight autographs in Paris archives make their absence felt here. Well aware of their dates and contents, Hamburger has done her utmost to fill this vacuum with a table of the missing autographs sited within the span of letters presented here, and by references to their contents in notes. I urge Dr. Hamburger to continue her excellent work of reconstitution of this particular relationship in letters (to which other composer’s mother do we possess a correspondence?), by publishing whenever another opportunity arises, the Paris autographs together with any other stray autographs or published letters from one to the other that might still languish in other archives and hands. Her sympathetic insights and editorial competence here demand it.

Present in abundance, on the contrary, for the first time, are candid verbal snapshots from the family album. While the messages in La Mara’s translations are superficially valid (and we know them already), her systematic omission of all of Anna’s letters and many of Liszt’s nuances and less than saintly ideas conceals much of their flavor and all information that might have shocked her German bourgeois contemporaries. I shall focus on these aspects, starting with their frequent, informative mentions of money.

---

13 Such as, the letter of 25 July 1845 from Anna, I.L.C Quarterly 5 (November 1973): 11–12, then held in a British private collection (Mr. Albi Rosenthal is thanked there for permission to publish); the one from Liszt [Lyon, April 1836?], in Prahács, Briefe aus ungarischen Sammlungen, no. 2, autograph held in the National Széchényi Library, Budapest; the facsimile of Liszt’s letter [1835?], in Theodor Balan, Franz Liszt (Bucharest: Editura Muzicala, 1963).
Liszt supported his mother lifelong since their move to Vienna in his eleventh year. In Paris she proved a shrewd manager and investor, but as generous to others as he was. Both had big hearts and were soft touches. Liszt occasionally asserted himself roughly, reproaching his mother for harbouring hangers-on, described in fluently salty French slang—words she did not flinch from using herself. When she felt deeply about his and his children’s welfare (after all, she had been father and mother to the latter as well as grandmother), she spoke frankly, from an exceptionally honest and empathic heart. So, she protested his refusal to send Blandine her allowance in Paris after her return there in summer 1856 as long as she lived with her grandmother, a place Liszt deemed unsuitable for a girl in a marriageable situation. Earlier, Anna had pleaded movingly for the girls when he removed them from her home and school to live with elderly, despotic governesses, after they had secretly visited their mother. She pleaded even more forcibly when he deceitfully whisked them out of her orbit to Berlin in 1855. During the latter incident, she even reported reproachfully Princess Carolyne’s offhand, unfeeling remarks about it.

Liszt wanted his mother to behave not like a middle class woman but like a true lady: he insisted on new furnishings for her apartment, to be chosen by someone else with taste. Was the intent to make her apartment fit to receive the endless procession of wellborn, well-educated people that she welcomed endlessly in Paris for him? He forbade her to be seen trotting to collect her income in person from Rothschilds’ bank, “like some woman with investments from the Marais”; he insisted she subscribe to the classiest newspaper, the *Journal des débats*, and use only sober seals on her letters. It was her laughing, vital nature, common sense, and big warm heart however that enchanted them all. Chopin escorted her to the theatre; princesses and generals invited her to dinner; Minna Wagner wept on her shoulder. Liszt slipped her little sums to buy the ice cream and cakes she adored (sometimes prescribing the café or store though), and laughed with her over her faulty French pronunciation and her old epithets for him in his harum-scarum youth. He always paid for maids—attributes of a lady, yet a necessity given her child-care duties and errand-running for him, and her later ill-health. Sometimes he sent friendly messages to these maids after his mother wrote their news, hardly aristocratic behaviour on his side.

Once, after a clear-eyed report from Anna on adolescent Daniel’s flirtation in her home with the maid Nathalie, hired from Weimar, he did intervene firmly. Doting grandmother, but shrewd about boys, she had years earlier reported Daniel’s running wild, overexcitement at play, need for a man in charge at a boarding school. Liszt followed her advice. She had conventional notions about arranged marriages for her granddaughters, at first deploring Blandine’s turning down a proposal from a Monsieur Popelin in 1855, a refusal that advanced thinker Liszt had understood. Both mother and son shared a frank acceptance of male sexual adventures, though Anna felt strongly about responsibilities. When a German woman, Madame F., tried to fleece Anna in Paris by claiming in September 1848 to be pregnant by her son, she was ready to

14 "comme une rentière du Marais" (F 77, 21 February 1851).
pay, not to suppress rumour of his affair, but to prevent that of his non-support of the mother with child. Liszt disabused her just as frankly. Admitting his casual sexual relations with the woman, he denied the possibility that her pregnancy was his doing and told Anna firmly to kick “that lousy tart” out and let her shout it from the housetops. He was proved right: she was not pregnant. On first news of his attachment to Princess Carolyne, Anna advised practically: “Stay single and don’t get mixed up with high born ladies you have paid your dues there.”

True love was a different matter. She told him that his father had said to her when they met that if she had not a penny she was still his; that loving him with her heart and soul she would have followed him to the ends of the earth, without inquiring about his means of supporting her. All had gone well, their son had much of his father in him and had no need of money but of a loving woman.

A last example from the new information, revealed on 18 September 1860, that of his youthful hunting experiences: his mother had just sent him his father’s gun. To avoid hurt by openly proclaiming his present abhorrence of the practice, when in her simple view of manly pursuits she had bestowed a sacred relic, he chats jokingly of past and even future hunts. It typifies their mutual respect for each other’s differences. La Mara’s gentrified rewording or omission of the fond teasing, strong slang, and boisterous, even puerile humour that permeate these letters from and to the Liebes Kind [Dear Child] had damped down the sheer joie de vivre of this relationship that overrode all. Given the many missing letters on both sides, it is premature to condemn Liszt, the overworked world figure, as neglectful in writing to her, though perhaps less so in his seeing her rarely (as Hamburger says). Even in their disagreements, a trusting, wholehearted love pours from their pages. A simpler, more unbuttoned side of the “good son,” as Anna always claimed, is disclosed alongside an exceptional mother, utterly devoted, but neither possessive, reverent, nor unrealistic, whose voice is heard in all its tones, including well-deserved scolding, for the first time here. No Lisztian ever needs to use La Mara’s versions again.

* * *

Given the Liszt/d’Agoult correspondence’s history, it is a miracle that it came down to us at all, never mind as intact as it did. Marie d’Agoult’s handiness with scissors and consignment to the flames of some letters to suppress lapses in ink, particularly her own; the insane attempt to burn the whole bundle by one of her first trustees’ female relatives, following his death, account for some lacunae. Saved in the nick of time, the letters were published only in 1933–34 in two volumes by the grandson of Liszt and Marie, the Paris lawyer Daniel Ollivier, to radically overthrow a view of fraught relations and Marie’s far from loving influence, as suggested by Liszt’s biographer Lina Ramann in the 1880s.

15 “cette fichue drôlesse” (F 69, 21 September 1848; F 70, ca. 5 October 1848).
16 “bleib noch garçon und laß dich nicht viel ein mit hohe Damen du hast ja Lehrgeld gegeben” (A18, 9 December 1847).
17 A 25, 13 February 1849.
18 Ollivier, Correspondance de Liszt et de Madame d’Agoult.
Ollivier's volumes, rarely deliberately censored or reworded, have done sterling service but have become dated and inadequate for our modern critical requirements. Notes are extremely sparse, dates too often wrong or incomplete, causing misplacement and skewing of the letters’ storyline. Once Liszt's French descendants had public-spiritedly deposited the autographs, together with many other related documents, in the manuscripts department of the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, other scholars consulted them. They found five letters omitted by Ollivier, passages omitted or attributed to the wrong letter, even a letter attributed to Liszt but written by another bashful suitor, many misreadings, particularly of names, music examples omitted throughout, envelopes and their valuable information ignored, and the absence of 28 autographs whose text Ollivier had published.

Serge Gut and Jacqueline Bellas have labored to reconstitute in a single volume the whole of this extant correspondence, with as much accuracy as is compatible with print, supported by abundant reference material and tables. They have succeeded. Their edition can be used as a reliable standard reference now and in the long-term future. The editors added ten new letters: the five earlier omitted, four from Jacques Vier's earlier cited work, but re-edited from the autographs, and one from the archives of Madame Anne Troisier de Diaz. Two of the missing autographs surfaced in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York: they had to reprint the remaining 26 from Ollivier's text. They publish in emended chronological order 562 pieces. Liszt provides the larger share.

The layout guides the readers through the long text. First comes Serge Gut's perceptive biographical preface, then his introduction to the faithful editorial methods, next, Ollivier's prefaces to his two volumes. The letters follow, divided into fourteen subsections, then by year, each of which is preceded by a useful chronology that includes Liszt's concerts and often their programs, his compositions and writings. At intervals in the two-way exchange, a relevant, often hitherto unpublished document is inserted, such as extracts from their diaries. A section of biographical notes identifies every person mentioned by the protagonists. (Liszt and his Countess were socially charismatic, acutely interested in the latest trends, well read, well-traveled namedroppers.) Understandably, available information on some minor people proved thin; a few names have been forgotten in this mini-Robert 2. Tables of nicknames that they used, of names of towns in their day and ours; an extensive bibliography, an index (names of all people in letters and notes), another index of Liszt's musical compositions (with Raabe, Searle, and Gut numbers), and another list of Liszt's published writings and Marie's own published writings complete the apparatus. (Those pieces whose authorship has been disputed are credited without comment to Liszt.)

Apart from the attractive cover featuring Liszt's Geneva portrait by Jean-Gabriel Scheffer looking back at Marie d'Agoult as portrayed in 1843 by Henri Lehmann, over a background of Giuseppe Canella's view of the Place de la

19From Liszt's friend, the future diplomat and writer, the young Marquis Théophile de Ferrière Le Vayer, 1 January 1834 (see ibid., I, 59–60; Gut/Bellas, Document I, 100).
Concorde in 1829, there are no other pictures. Space forced a choice: instead, for the first time, Liszt's music examples take their place in his letters, including the three page, hitherto unknown Valse pour Marie, sent from the Hague in November 1843. A facsimile of Liszt's hitherto unpublished letter from Carentonne in May/June 1834, his envelope of 28 May 1836, and an unpublished facsimile letter of December 1842 from Marie to Caroline de Montigny about Blandine's education with an attached letter from Liszt, are all printed beside the typed version of their letters, allowing us to see their similar handwriting in tune with their similar physical type.

Each letter, dated as completely as feasible, reproduces the autograph accurately and completely. Its precise archival source, earlier place in Ollivier's edition, and explanation of the dating follows at once. Copious notes below, skillfully cross-referenced throughout, illuminate pertinently the often-cryptic texts. All German, English, or Italian phrases, used as quotations or to shield the message from other eyes, are translated here. Even the crossed out words are re-instated in notes. This admirable example of scholarly editing allows the reader who may never have the chance to see the autographs the closest possible view of them.

The first letter, from Liszt [between January and April 1833], shortly after the newly discovered date of their first meeting, December 1832, addressed to Madame la Comtesse d'Agout [sic], begins auspiciously with the word "heureusement" [fortunately], to accept an invitation to her Paris home in formally correct style that cannot quite suppress his joy. The last, also from Liszt [Rome, 15 November 1864], follows a nine-year gap after Liszt's rejection on 2 June 1855, from Dusseldorf, of her request to go to Paris to deal with the problem of the severe illness of their daughters' governess. By September of that year, he had whisked both of them out of her reach to Berlin, then sent furious letters there to his daughters, who had innocently left behind for the governess and Carolyne to pass on to him, their mother's equally passionate pleadings, from Ostende, to refuse the invitation to the home of a stranger [Carolyne again]. The resultant silence may have lasted years, although letters must have passed between them before they met in May 1861 in Paris [the edition carries here the relevant pages of her 1861 diary], and again in October 1864, in the company of their only surviving child, Cosima. The letter notes carry Marie's impressions of Liszt and of what he said there, extracted from her 1864 diary. Liszt's last extant letter obviously answers a lost one of hers about modern music and promising him her newly published Dialogues on Dante and Goethe. Liszt refers to his own compositions inspired by Dante and Faust, refuses to discuss program music while discussing it with her all the while, but through a reminiscence of their old days, implies that she knows not of what she speaks. After discussing other music, he closes with a plea to pray for their two dead children. His tone is firm, politely pleasant, neither tender nor angry. They met again briefly in Paris in 1866. She was not to die until March 1876: she had not kept any further letters they might have exchanged, and neither had he.

In between, we witness the trajectory of one the most famous and public love affairs of the Romantic era: the passionate joys, sufferings, and headstrong acts
of two sincerely idealistic, artistically and morally driven, relentlessly modern souls, bringing into their traveling lives children and correspondence, and into that correspondence all the people, places, art, literature, ideas, causes, that they sought and considered in their turbulent passage to Spring 1844 and their bitter rupture at Marie’s instigation. The rupture degenerated into a personal feud, with the distressed children used as weapons. Within a few years, Liszt was pursuing in Weimar his second career as composer, conductor, court music director, and teacher, and his second equally public and controversial official liaison. She had become a lucid philosophic, historical, critical, and feminist writer ahead of her age, influential salon holder, friend and propagandist for republicans and German culture. Today it is her public acts and published views on arranged marriage, love, childbirth and children, the role of women in social, political, and legal terms that have caused her star to rise in academic Women’s Studies programs. Liszt’s avant-garde musical creativity is similarly in the ascendant again.

Their correspondence, whole and sequential at last, is an enthralling read. Those who do not yet know the old edition will be overwhelmed with its power to move and instruct—those who do will be overwhelmed by the fresh insights that its chronological rearrangement, new letters, restored passages and music examples, and above all the notes and biographical section, add to their old memories. Although scholarly editions equipped with much erudite paraphernalia, the two volumes above also deserve translation intact of their unfurling through correspondence of the minds and expression of uncommon individuals with much to say to our times. It is hoped that they will soon find their interpreters, into English and many other tongues.

* * *

No negative criticisms? All reviewers worth their salt have reservations. Mine concern the indexes, and therefore address the publishers rather than the conscientious editors here. All three publishing houses have “spoiled the ship for a hap’orth of tar”: it is surely the high cost of every extra page in huge volumes that will never grace the bookracks in airports that dictated the systematic omissions. They discourage buyers, block citations by some scholars (subtle publicity), and frustrate even persistent researchers in many fields of nineteenth-century studies.

In our computer age, when the “search” function finds instantly any combination of letters or numbers in a stored text, book indexes need to become ever more complete and “user friendly.” No matter their riveting readability and faithfulness to the complex documents, the pertinence of the notes, appendices, chronologies, and lists, all qualities that contribute to making the above weighty editions the only reliable standard references for many decades to come, these editions nonetheless exasperate readers, especially researchers, since their indexes do not reflect accurately nor proportionately the contents of the documents and critical apparatus.

Prospective buyers, students and scholars, routinely check indexes for specific contents. When a title or name is absent, they often reject the book. Having forgotten the exact year of the relevant letter, readers waste valuable time
locating a remembered phrase or event, or the dates of a person, given quite properly only in the first note. None of the three indexes include names of places, hence fail to flag concert venues and other important events or institutions therein, nor, for instance, headings for titles of books and ephemera, works of art, political movements and incidents, all common topics in the letters.

For quick reference to people, in his thirty-six-page index Williams has sensibly placed there, once and for all, rather than in notes, their dates and a capsule identification, except when he leads readers by an asterisk from the name to the fuller biographical sketches nearby. Other musicians’ compositions mentioned in letters appear very conveniently under their composer’s names. So far so good. Titles of books, newspapers, journals, institutions such as the Opéra-Comique, Paris itself, of course, do not benefit from the same excellent method. Hamburger’s 7-page index is an unadorned list of names of people mentioned in the letters, a debasing misrepresentation of the wealth of information contained in the correspondence and in her full notes, where it is harder for readers to find it retrospectively. Gut and Bellas’s twenty-nine-page index is the standard onomastic one used in France. Other appendices supply biographical sketches, nicknames, a concordance table of towns, without page number references, a list of the protagonists’ works, but of no other works mentioned by those voracious consumers of print, music, buildings, paintings and statues, visitors to so many public and private institutions.

If their publishers had granted even ten extra pages to an expanded index in each book, those pages might easily have been won back by cutting that same material from notes and other tables; readers and rapid checkers of indexes would all have found the information at once. For example, much time is wasted searching with only the name “Constantinople” and dates in the mid-1840s in mind for mentions of Liszt’s tour there in 1847, his earlier thought of taking the dying Parisian courtesan Marie Duplessis there as companion, and in Fall 1838 of journeying there with Marie d’Agoult (whose pregnancy with Daniel had cancelled that hope). Once located (in letters mailed from Jassy, Galatz and Paris!) this material appears in varied forms in all three of these long labors of love and service to nineteenth-century scholarship.20

Immortal figures are inherently protean. According to a generation’s fashionable likes and critical vogues, some of a figure’s multiple facets attract attentive, often very creative appreciation at the expense of other facets and other figures. Reliable editions and translations of Liszt’s letters are of utmost importance to fuel new, maybe important appraisals of his messages in tune with these changing vogues and to counter the graying of concert and record store Liszt devotees. The documents that these great figures bequeathed to us abide immutable through the seasons of critical and generational styles, their many layers and facets awaiting intact the scrutiny of new and future eyes. Providing ready and trustworthy access to them is the prime aim of editorial scholarship. The three volumes reviewed above all do this.

20Williams, nos. 960–68 and 206–12; Hamburger, F 64 and A 17; Gut/Bellas, nos. 545–47. I cannot guarantee that other letters in the editions do not also mention Constantinople.
At a time when, in print shops, compositors no longer sling hot lead while a boy reads the text aloud, when copy editors can no longer afford to devote endless hours to such volumes, when camera-ready copy provided by the author is the norm, the cleanliness of these editions is admirable. There are very few typographical errors, only a handful of tiny errors about tiny facts. It would be petty to list them: scholars will recognize them; they will not lead other readers astray in what they seek. All three editions are essentially trustworthy. That reassuring fact represents an enormous step forward in Lisztian scholarship. The four editors are owed all our gratitude, as are their publishers, despite my remarks about indexes, for demonstrating their faith in dense, cultural or scholarly, timeless editions of documents. For the sake of present and future generations, these editions should be on the shelves of all academic and large public libraries. For creditable scholarship, all writers on Liszt or his nineteenth-century world need henceforth to have access to them. Dear Readers, please update your Liszts.

Pauline Pocknell


---
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