

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

May 29, 2003

I, Michelle M. Davidson,
hereby submit this as part of the requirements for the degree of:
Master of Music
in Music History

It is entitled "One New German School, Two
Takes on the Bard: A Comparison of Berlioz
and Liszt's Compositional Approaches in Two
Shakespearean Programmatic Works"

Approved by:

May Sue Merson

Edward C. Nowaski



ONE NEW GERMAN SCHOOL, TWO TAKES ON THE BARD: A COMPARISON
OF BERLIOZ AND LISZT'S COMPOSITIONAL APPROACHES IN TWO
SHAKESPEREAN PROGRAMMATIC WORKS

A thesis submitted to the

Division of Research and Advanced Studies
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF MUSIC

in the Division of Composition, Musicology, and Theory
of the College-Conservatory of Music

2003

by

Michelle M. Davidson

B.M. Eastern Illinois University, 2000

Committee Chair: Mary Sue Morrow

UMI Number: EP26370

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EP26370

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

Although not new to the new nineteenth century, musical compositions inspired by extra-musical sources and ideas flourished during the Romantic era. A favorite source of musical inspiration for composers of programmatic music were the tragedies of William Shakespeare, which herald (and pre-figure) many of the tenants of the Romantic literary movement. Berlioz and Liszt were among those artists who not only found a connection between their own artistic ideals and those of Shakespeare, but who also composed symphonic works after Shakespearean tragedies.

Through examination of their Shakespearean pieces—Berlioz's *Roméo et Juliette*, and particularly the *Scène d'amour* movement and Liszt's symphonic poem *Hamlet*—this thesis compares the different approaches taken by Berlioz and Liszt to unite music and literature. This comparison reveals a startling distinction between the two works and approaches: while Berlioz's work attempts to relay the narrative of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, Liszt's symphonic poem depicts just one aspect of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*—the essence of the hero and more specifically, Hamlet's psychological transformation. The very different forms that these two works take as well as the different types of meaning that they convey result not only from the contrasting forms and genres of *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet*, but also from the two composers' different experiences with and exposures to Shakespeare and Berlioz and Liszt's individual philosophies on the expressive capabilities of music. Many of Berlioz and Liszt's musical preferences, encounters with Shakespeare, and ideas about musical expression stem from France and Germany's differing receptions of Shakespeare and musical aesthetics.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	2
Chapter 2	Shakespeare on the Continent	13
Chapter 3	Berlioz and Liszt Discover Shakespeare	33
Chapter 4	Berlioz and Liszt's Philosophies on Music	44
Chapter 5	Shakespeare and Musical Philosophy in <i>Roméo et Juliette</i> and <i>Hamlet</i>	65
Chapter 6	Conclusions: Berlioz and Liszt and Nationalism and Aesthetics	91
Appendix 1	Tables	102
Appendix 2	Musical Examples for <i>Hamlet</i>	108
Appendix 3	Musical Examples for <i>Roméo et Juliette</i>	118
Bibliography		128

Chapter 1

Introduction

At the concert in the afternoon two very interesting things were performed. One was a fantasia, *King Lear*; the other was a quartette dedicated to the memory of Bach. Both were new and in the new style, and Levin was eager to form an opinion of them. After escorting his sister-in-law to her stall, he stood against a column and tried to listen as attentively and conscientiously as possible. He tried not to let his attention be distracted, and not to spoil his impression by looking at the conductor in a white tie, waving his arms, which always disturbed his enjoyment of music so much, or the ladies in bonnets, with strings carefully tied over their ears, and all these people either thinking of nothing at all or thinking of all sorts of things except the music. He tried to avoid meeting musical connoisseurs or talkative acquaintances, and stood looking at the floor straight before him, listening.

But the more he listened to the fantasia of *King Lear* the further he felt from forming any definite opinion of it. There was, as it were, a continual beginning, a preparation of the musical expression of some feeling, but it fell to pieces again directly, breaking into new musical motives, or simply nothing but the whims of the composer, exceedingly complex but disconnected sounds. And these fragmentary musical expressions, though sometimes beautiful, were disagreeable, because they were utterly unexpected and not led up to by anything. Gaiety and grief and despair and tenderness and triumph followed one another without any connection, like the emotions of a madman. And those emotions, like a madman's, sprang up quite unexpectedly.

During the whole of the performance Levin felt like a deaf man watching people dancing, and was in a state of complete bewilderment when the fantasia was over, and felt a great weariness from the fruitless strain on his attention. . . . Anxious to throw some light on his own perplexity from the impressions of others, Levin began to walk about, looking for connoisseurs, and was glad to see a well-known musical amateur in conversation with Pestov, whom he knew.

"Marvelous!" Pestov was saying. . . . Particularly sculptureseque and plastic, so to say, and richly colored is that passage where you feel

Cordelia's approach, where woman enters into conflict with fate. Isn't it?"

"You mean . . . what has Cordelia to do with it?" Levin asked timidly, forgetting that the fantasia was supposed to represent King Lear.

"Cordelia comes in . . . see here!" said Pestov, tapping his fingers on the satiny surface of the program he held in his hand and passing it to Levin.

Only then Levin recollected the title of the fantasia, and made haste to read in the Russian translation the lines from Shakespeare that were printed on the back of the program.

"You can't follow it without that," said Pestov, addressing Levin. . . .

In the *entr'acte* Levin and Pestov fell into an argument upon the merits and defects of music of the Wagner school. Levin maintained that the mistake of Wagner and all his followers lay in their trying to take music into the sphere of another art, just as poetry goes wrong when it tries to paint a face as the art of painting ought to do, and as an instance of this mistake he cited the sculptor who carved in marble certain poetic phantasms flitting round the figure of the poet on the pedestal. "These phantasms were so far from being phantoms that they were positively slinging on the ladder," said Levin. . . .

Pestov maintained that art is one, and that it can attain its highest manifestations only by conjunction with all kinds of art.¹

Although musicologists may seldom look to the words of Leo Tolstoy for information about nineteenth-century musical practices, the great Russian novelist does, in this seemingly insignificant passage of *Anna Karenina*, offer up profound insight into the absolute and program music debate of his century. At one end of the spectrum falls the character Levin, who cannot make heads or tails of the strange, unorganized music he hears until he looks at the printed program, nor can he appreciate the ideas of "Wagner and his followers." The voice of opposition comes from Pestov, who tells Levin that the meaning of the *King Lear* fantasia lies in its printed program, praising this unification of music with literature as the "highest manifestation" of art.

Tolstoy's passage centers around the perennial question of how music, with its "inability to embody determinate concepts"² and which "employs no signs or symbols

referring to the non-musical world of objects, concepts, and human desires,”³ can express meaning from this non-musical world. In the nineteenth century especially, this ongoing debate spawned a multitude of critical writings and musical compositions that reflected the ideals of both the absolute and program music sides. Although programmatic music was not new to the nineteenth century, the number of composers who composed music after extra-musical sources, as well as the number of these pieces within many composers’ oeuvres was unprecedented. Both nineteenth-century and modern scholars have tried to explain this phenomena in a variety of ways. Hegel attributed it to the Romantic predilection for creating art whose meaning and significance was no longer derived from within itself, as in the classical period, but rather from the “feelings that the outward appearance generates.”⁴ In other words, Romantic artists could make their compositions more outwardly meaningful by associating it with something that already had literal meaning. Carl Dalhaus posits that the value of a Romantic work depended first and foremost on this literal meaning or poetic character.⁵ According to John Daverio, this “literalization” of music through figurative titles and poetic programs is “little more than an external means of signaling the music’s claims to artistic worth in an era that prized the written word over the transient and ineffable tone as a carrier of intellectual

¹ Leo Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina* (1877), trans. Constance Garnett (n.p.: Barnes and Noble Books, 1997), 619-620..

² Immanuel Kant; quoted in John Daverio, *Nineteenth-Century Music and the German Romantic Ideology* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1993), 11. Daverio provides no source for this citation.

³ Leonard B. Meyer, *Emotion and Meaning in Music* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), vii.

⁴ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Einleitung in die Aesthetik* (1842), ed. Wolfhart Henckmann (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1985), 112; quoted in Daverio, 7.

⁵ Carl Dalhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1989; originally published as *Die Musik*

substance.”⁶ Leonard B. Meyer contends that this tendency occurred in part because of a decline in sophistication of audiences in the nineteenth century, who could no longer “respond sensitively to the subtleties of syntactic process and formal designs” that characterized classical works.⁷ Thus, whatever the reasons for this change in compositional approach with the nineteenth century and the onset of Romanticism, composers created works that drew inspiration from a wide spectrum of extra-musical sources, including imaginary characters, autobiographical events, paintings, and most of all, literature.

Pieces composed after literary works demonstrate the complex relationship or exchange that is formed when a composer chooses to combine a literal art with a very abstract one. In literature, words carry specific meaning and it is this meaning after which composers model their compositions. On the other hand, composers must also treat their compositions as new works of art that must be able to stand apart from their literary sources. Jacques Barzun acknowledges this fine line between seeking inspiration and originality:

It is true that in the interests of music the words are more or less distorted. . . . But it is equally true that at the same time the music is continuously shaped in the service of words. . . . Those words carry a meaning and the composer . . . tries to follow it to make his inarticulate ones.⁸

Thus, it is by the composer’s ability to both convey the literary source and create a musically coherent work that he or she is judged. In other words, while we would be

des 19. Jahrhunderts, Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft, vol. 6 [Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1980]), 34.

⁶ Daverio, 8.

⁷ Leonard B. Meyer, *Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), 208-209.

⁸ Jacques Barzun, “The Meaning of Meaning in Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 66 (1980): 4.

disappointed if the programmatic music conveyed no sense of its extra-musical inspiration, we at the same time also expect the composition to be more than incidental music. Perhaps like Levin, we expect to be able to understand the *King Lear* fantasia without the written guide.

Tolstoy's passage in *Anna Karenina* not only alludes to the general program and absolute music debate and the ambiguity of meaning in pieces composed after literary works, but it also fittingly uses as the piece in question a fantasia inspired by Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The publication of the first translations of Shakespeare's works in the late eighteenth century sparked a Shakespeare Renaissance that made him internationally renowned and a source of inspiration for artists throughout Europe by the early nineteenth century. For composers searching for extra-musical sources for their programmatic compositions, Shakespeare's plays, with their freedom of form, colorful characters, and contrasting dramatic situations, provided a special artistic stimulation. As a result, a multitude of Shakespearean musical compositions, ranging from concert overtures to symphonic works to opera, were created in the nineteenth century.

The Shakespearean musical oeuvre alone reflects the vast spectrum of types of literary programmatic pieces composed in the nineteenth century. In order to make the absolute and program music debate clear, teachers of music history often organize pieces into camps, lumping all pieces with extra-musical associations into the programmatic group. While this type of organization may help students distinguish Brahms's symphonies from Liszt's tone poems and Berlioz's *Symphonie Fantastique*, it misleadingly implies that all programmatic works are composed essentially in the same way; they simply follow and are organized around an extra-musical source. In other

words, students do not learn to distinguish the different types of approaches employed by programmatic composers. An examination of these Shakespearean compositions of the nineteenth century reveals that composers approached composing programmatic music in variety of ways. As harbingers of the ideals of Romanticism, these composers sought out ways to be original in their music, often distinguishing themselves not only from the advocates of absolute music but also from other programmatic music composers.

A comparison of approaches of two of the best-known composers of Shakespearean program music yields a startling distinction. Although Hector Berlioz and Franz Liszt were linked as members of the “New German School” because of the number of programmatic pieces in their outputs, the two composers nevertheless had different philosophies and approaches on composing programmatic pieces.⁹ Using two of their Shakespearean pieces, *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet* as a case study, I will demonstrate that the ways in which they encountered and interpreted their literary sources (Chapter 3), combined with their philosophies on composing program music (Chapter 4), as well as how these ideas related to national musical traditions and aesthetics (Chapter 6), affected how they conceived their Shakespearean compositions (Chapter 5). To demonstrate how these different introductions and subsequent interpretations resulted, I will begin with a comparison of the history of Shakespeare’s reception in France and Germany (Chapter 2). The ways that these two countries received and viewed Shakespeare in the early nineteenth century set the stage for Berlioz and Liszt’s acquaintance with Shakespeare, thus affecting their interpretations and ultimately their Shakespearean compositions.

⁹ The designation “New German School” was coined by Franz Brendel in an address to the *Tonkünstler-Versammlung* at Leipzig in 1859 to describe the proponents of the “progressive musical party.”

Just as Levin and Pestov have differing opinions about what can be expressed in programmatic music, so do historical and modern scholars. According to Julian Rushton,

a piece of instrumental music with a 'programme' or an explicit extra-musical association conveyed by a title may direct the imagination through music to a visual, dramatic or poetic experience which the musical notes cannot literally be said to contain.¹⁰

Rushton's statement implies that the key to understanding a programmatic work resides in our own imaginations rather than in the notes themselves. If this philosophy is true, then every listener will interpret a programmatic work differently based on his or her imaginative abilities. And as numerous analyses of Berlioz's Shakespearean pieces and *Hamlet* demonstrate, both historical and modern imaginations have run rampant in seeking out extra-musical connections between these two works and their literary sources.

Some scholars are reluctant to draw direct connections between programmatic pieces and their extra-musical sources. On the most conservative end of the spectrum falls Alan Walker, who claims that to call these compositions (Liszt's symphonic poems) "program music" at all "raises many difficulties." According to Walker, we only have accepted the idea that they are programmatic because Liszt himself said they were. But discounting the composer's stated intentions, he maintains that Liszt's music is not "representational" of something outside it and always "unfold[s] according to its own laws," rather than those of the literary source.¹¹ Donald Francis Tovey, who, in his analyses of the *King Lear* overture and "Scene d'amour" from *Roméo et Juliette*, argues

¹⁰ Julian Rushton, "Music and the Poetic," in *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 153.

¹¹ Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989), 305.

that “we shall be doomed to disappointment if we look to Shakespeare to explain anything we have failed to understand in the music,”¹² claims that we shall only misunderstand the works as long as we try to connect them to the Shakespeare. Based on his own comparison of the “Scene d’amour” music with the sequence of speeches and ideas in the balcony scene of the play (which he does not describe), he concludes that “Berlioz was not hampering himself with any notion of making the music follow their course.”¹³ Richard Kaplan, in his work on Liszt’s symphonic poems, takes a similar view, asserting that the extra-musical source was not crucial to the conception of the music.¹⁴ Like Tovey, he claims that the key to understanding the music lies within the music itself rather than in the piece’s connection to its literary source.

Other scholars contend that Berlioz and Liszt based their programmatic compositions directly on their literary sources, and center their analysis of *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet* around parallels they can find between the music and the Shakespeare. Ian Kemp and Edward Murphy, in their analyses of *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet*, respectively, find very literal correspondences between moments in the music and scenes in their Shakespearean sources. Kemp posits a correspondence of lines by measures between the balcony scene in the play and “Scene d’amour,” arguing that both the feelings and dialogue of Romeo and Juliet are explicitly depicted in Berlioz’s music.¹⁵ Although he does not go as far as Kemp in connecting any specific moments in the music of *Hamlet* with lines of dialogue from the play, Murphy does argue that the narrative of

¹² Donald Francis Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis*, vol. 4, *Illustrative Music* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937), 86.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹⁴ Richard Kaplan, “Sonata Form in the Orchestral Works of Liszt: The Revolutionary Reconsidered,” *19th Century Music* 7 (1984): 152.

the play is represented in the music and finds many direct correlations between events in the music and the drama.¹⁶

While I do not deny that much of the value in listening to music lies in its ability to spark our imaginations, I do believe that these interpretations have ignored what the composers themselves said about extra-musical meaning in their compositions. Intentional fallacy or not, our own imaginations will be able to roam only after considering what expressive capabilities were even believed possible by the people who created the music in question. Thus, I want to offer interpretations of *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet* based first and foremost on what the two composers themselves said and experienced. Both wrote extensively on their views of program music (chapter 4) and both often referred to and pondered Shakespeare's works (chapter 3). Only with this foundation will I offer another interpretive reading of the two works, drawing upon both my own analyses and those of Berlioz and Liszt scholars. This process ultimately reveals that Berlioz and Liszt depicted the same type of source—Shakespearean plays—differently: While Berlioz sought to recreate the narrative of *Romeo and Juliet*, Liszt focused on the psychological struggle of Hamlet. Even though Berlioz claimed that he and Liszt's views on composing were "exactly the same,"¹⁷ I, in this one instance, will not take Berlioz at his word.

Ultimately, I want to use Berlioz and Liszt as case studies to explore the merits and abilities of expression in program music, centering around Levin's question of how

¹⁵ Ian Kemp, "*Romeo and Juliet* and *Roméo et Juliette*" in *Berlioz Studies*, ed. Peter Bloom (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 65.

¹⁶ Edward Murphy, "A Detailed Program for Liszt's *Hamlet*," *Journal of the American Liszt Society* 29 (Jan.-June 1991): 47-60.

important knowing the program is to understanding a programmatic work. I contend that understanding program music can occur on two different, but related levels. On one level we can appreciate the work purely for its musical characteristics (even if Levin could not), thus comprehending it on a musical level much like we would a symphony by Brahms or Nocturne by Chopin. Just because a work has an explicitly extra-musical title does not mean we *have* to think of the music in terms of its literary connection. After all, many so-called “absolute” pieces of which we are unaware may have had extra-musical meaning for their composers. Is knowing that “secret” program essential to our understanding and appreciation of those works? Take Tchaikovsky’s Fourth symphony as an example. Even though we now know that Tchaikovsky did indeed have a personal connection with the work—a connection that Timothy Jackson claims was the composer’s battle with being homosexual and ultimate resignation to fate—, we do not *have* to hear the piece as a representation of the composer’s troubled mind.¹⁸ People appreciated and understood the work for years before discovering this “secret” program in Tchaikovsky’s letters. On the other hand, how would our interpretation have been altered if Tchaikovsky had given the symphony an explicit title like “Fate” as did composers of the “New German School” in their programmatic works?

If we know the program from which the piece was inspired, though, we *have the ability* to devolve a second and deeper level of understanding. Using our purely musical understanding as a springboard, we can imagine how these musical elements relate to and depict elements from the extra-musical source. Before we can draw connections, we

¹⁷ Berlioz, *Journal des Débats Politiques et Littéraires*, April 25, 1835; quoted in Jacques Barzun, *Berlioz and the Romantic Century*, vol.1 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1950), 265.

must be acquainted with the literary source. Berlioz and Liszt's differing approaches to composing Shakespearean program music demonstrate that creating this deeper level of meaning can be achieved in different ways, thus affecting the way we, the listeners, hear and interpret the work in its relation to its program.

¹⁸ Timothy Jackson, "Aspects of Sexuality and Structure in the Later Symphonies of Tchaikovsky" *Music Analysis* 14 (March 1998): 3-25.

Chapter 2

Shakespeare on the Continent

Although virtually unknown on the European continent prior to the mid-eighteenth century, Shakespeare became an influential character as well as a source of inspiration to artists of the nineteenth century. Shakespeare, an Englishman who had been dead for nearly two hundred years by the turn of the nineteenth century, would seem an unlikely creative muse to the young Romantics of France and Germany. However, for the first time, Shakespeare achieved international fame. In order to understand how and why this appreciation for Shakespeare developed and the extent of Shakespeare's influence on the Romantic psyche, this Shakespearean rebirth must be examined. The reception history of Shakespeare in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries provides insight into why Shakespeare was such a source of inspiration for Romantic artists.

Shakespearean criticism outside of England did not begin until the eighteenth century, with the first published translations of Shakespeare's works into German and French. Prior to these first publications, mainland Europe had been introduced to the English playwright through Voltaire's criticism of Shakespeare. Voltaire encountered Shakespeare's plays both through reading them and by attending performances of them during his three years of exile in England during the late 1720s. Few read and critiqued

Shakespeare's works until the first French and German translations were published, though, in the mid-eighteenth century. Many German literary minds were exposed to Shakespeare's writing initially with the publications of C.W. Borcke's *Julius Caesar* in 1741 and C.M. Wieland's 1766 collection, which contained prose translations of twenty-one of the plays and a verse translation of *A Midsummer's Night Dream*. A new complete prose translation by J. J. Eschenburg appeared in 1775-1777. Other writers around this time translated plays individually. For example, both G. A. Bürger and Schiller produced a prose translation of *Macbeth* in 1782 and 1799-1800, respectively. Shakespeare's works were fully accepted into the German literary canon, though, with the publication of the first complete verse translations of Shakespeare's works by A. W. Schlegel, Dorothea Tieck, and Wolf von Baudissin from 1791-1801. This nine-volume set was considered to be the first reliable and authoritative German translation of the plays because of Schlegel's unrelenting intention to keep the language and tone as close to the English as possible. The modern scholar Simon Williams still considers Schlegel's work to be excellent.

The translations are faithful to the original without being prosaic, demonstrating a resourcefulness and imagination that often finds close German equivalents to Shakespeare's English. The alternation of verse and prose was scrupulously observed and the only changes allowed were either the excision or alternation of obscure references and obscenities. The German verse was flexible, pleasant to hear and rhythmically light, which made it ideal for the stage, while Shakespeare's ambiguous and multiple meanings were surprisingly well sustained in the German.¹

Williams also contends the Schlegel/ Tieck translation demonstrated that the German language could achieve an expressive status equal to that of Shakespeare's English, thus

¹ Simon Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, vol. 1, 1586-1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 151.

enabling Shakespeare's triumph on the German stage. Soon Shakespeare was performed more in Germany than in other country, including England.²

Although French translations by P. A. de Laplace of Shakespeare's plays filled four of the eight volumes of the *Théâtre anglais* (1745-1748), most French remained unacquainted with Shakespeare until the appearance of Pierre Letourneur's prose editions in 1776.³ Subsequent translations by Francois Guizot, Guillaume de Barante, and Amedée Pichot (1821), Bruguière de Sorsum (1826), and by A. de Vigny (1827) as well as performances of Shakespeare in Paris in 1822 and 1827 further secured Shakespeare's prominence and popularity in early nineteenth-century France.

As these French and German translations began to appear, debates arose among literary scholars and philosophers as to the merits of Shakespeare's approach to drama. Though French and German critical opinion did have a number of common elements, each country's literary tradition shaped its particular perspective and established the trajectory of Shakespearean reception. While modern writers rarely question his genius, Shakespeare's initial reception in France and Germany was very mixed, both among critics and within individual writers' critiques. Literary theory in the eighteenth century throughout Europe derived from French classical dramatists such as Jean Racine and

² Anne Paolucci, "Shakespeare as a World Figure," in *William Shakespeare: His World, His Work, His Influence*, vol. 3, *His Influence*, ed. John Andrews (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985), 668.

³ Only a few of the sources I examined mention the La Place translation. According to Peter Raby, *Fair Ophelia: Harriet Smithson Berlioz* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 43, La Place's work was not so much translations as scenarios. They were a mixture of prose and verse and often summarized, omitted, and altered the original Shakespeare. Because so few modern scholars of French Shakespeare reception mention them, I have concluded that few came to know Shakespeare (at least accurately) through LaPlace's translations and that their only historical importance is that they were the basis of Jean-Francois Ducis's adaptations begun in 1769. Letourneur's work is significant because it was the first *accurate* French translation of Shakespeare.

Pierre Corneille, seventeenth-century authors who followed the Aristotelian principles of unity among the time, place, and action of drama. Shakespeare's works did not adhere to these conventions and as a result, were often criticized. Many European critics also found fault with the juxtaposition of high and low material that was prevalent in Shakespeare's plays. To fulfill classical standards the subject matter and characters of a model drama had to be entirely elevated and aristocratic. It was according to these strict standards that Shakespeare's plays were evaluated.

Voltaire's critiques of Shakespeare's plays are credited with not only introducing the European continent to Shakespeare but also with igniting the debate on Shakespeare in the eighteenth century. While many of Voltaire's contemporaries dismissed Shakespeare's works as tasteless and formless, Voltaire's criticisms were more mixed. For example, De La Roche complained not only that Shakespeare's writing was random and lacked the classical unities, but that he inappropriately incorporated "buffoonery" into tragic scenes.⁴ Voltaire, on the other hand, after criticizing Shakespeare for not adhering to seventeenth-century literary standards, still acknowledged his genius and naturalness:

But in the pages of this buffoon [Shakespeare] are to be found fragments that impress the imagination and touch the heart. We hear the language of truth, of nature herself with no leaven of art. The author has reached the sublime without striving for it.⁵

Voltaire reiterated his view on Shakespeare in a letter to the French academy in 1776 just after the publication of Letourneur's translation. After describing Shakespeare's works

⁴ "Dissertation sur la Poesie Anglaise" in *Journal Littéraire*, the Hague, 1717; discussed in Augustus Ralli, *A History of Shakespearian Criticism* (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), 35.

⁵ "Art Dramatique" in *Dictionnaire Philosophique* 1765; quoted in Ralli, 46.

as “savage, low, unrestrained, and absurd,” he stated that Shakespeare did however contain “sparks of genius.” Furthermore he observed that “in this chaos of murders and buffoonery, heroism and wickedness, mixed dialogue of highest and lowest, are to be found natural and striking features.”⁶

Voltaire was not the only mid-eighteenth-century figure in France who expressed mixed views on Shakespeare. Even prior to the Letourneur translation of 1776 other critics responded to the little bit of Shakespeare they had seen or read in English. A survey of the criticisms of these writers reflects a consensus that Shakespeare, although a barbarian, nevertheless exhibited moments of genius. Shakespeare, however, paled in comparison to the classic writers. According to Diderot in his *Encyclopédie* article on genius in 1769, “sublimity and genius flash in Shakespeare like lightening in a long night; while Racine is always fine Homer full of genius, and Virgil of elegance.”⁷ Abbé J.B. Le Blanc acknowledged Shakespeare’s poetic abilities but felt that the constant mingling of these original qualities with the author’s overwhelmingly “bad taste” ruined the plays.⁸ Overall, for this generation of French critics—even the few that had some praise for Shakespeare—Shakespeare’s works were too banal, artless, and formless to demand serious consideration. Despite random flashes of insightfulness and naturalness, Shakespeare’s “problems” left a taint on his drama that could not be ignored.

The most important early German Shakespeare criticism stemmed from the pen of Johann Christoph Gottsched, a Leipzig literary historian and theoretician who advocated the adoption of French classical tragedy as a model for German dramatists. Thus, many of his criticisms parallel those of early French writers. For example, in 1742 he

⁶ Quoted in Ralli, 49.

⁷ Ibid., 48.

condemned Shakespeare for his failure to observe the classical unities.⁹ According to Williams, Gottsched also found fault with Shakespeare's eclectic mixture of social classes, on the grounds that classical decorum did not allow for the placement of admirable and heroic figures in circumstances that demeaned their status. For example, after his reading of Borcke's translation of *Julius Caesar*, Gottsched lamented that "the most foolish scenes of labourers and rabble" were set next to scenes with "the greatest Roman heroes who speak of the most important affairs of state,"¹⁰ thus echoing Voltaire's complaints about the chaotic mixture of high and low styles (see page 4). Unlike Voltaire, however, he did not find any redeeming sparks of genius to temper his opinion, which was almost wholly negative.

Some of Gottsched's contemporaries and many of the succeeding generation of literary commentators did not share his veneration of French classical ideals and thus approached Shakespeare's dramas from a completely different perspective. Mid-eighteenth-century intellectuals such as Johann Elias Schlegel, Moses Mendelssohn, and Christoph Martin Wieland prized Shakespeare particularly for his insightful illustration of humankind through his characters and for the inherent genius and imagination behind his works. Johann Schlegel was one of the first to propose that Shakespeare could not be judged by the same criteria as the French classical dramatists.¹¹ Unlike classical works,

⁸ *Lettres d'un Francois*, 1745; quoted in Ralli, 39.

⁹ Gottsched, *Beyträge zur kritischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit* 8:155; quoted in Klaus L. Berghahn, "From Classicist to Classical Literary Criticism, 1730-1806," in *A History of German Literary Criticism, 1730-1980*, ed. Peter Uwe Hohendahl (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988), 35.

¹⁰ Johann Christoph Gottsched, "Anmerkungen über das 592 Stück des Zuschauers" (1742), in *Shakespeare-Rezeption. Die Diskussion um Shakespeare in Deutschland*, vol. 1, ed. Hansjürgen Blinn (Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1982), 62.

¹¹ J.E. Schlegel, "Vergleichung Shakespears und Andreas Gryphs" (1741), *Ausgewählte Werke* (Weimar, 1963), discussed in Williams, 8.

where action and moral purpose dominated, Shakespeare's dramas conveyed a different priority—the centrality of the characters. It is these characters and their portrayal of human nature that this generation of Shakespeare advocates especially praised. Moses Mendelssohn wrote that

Shakespeare has realized the causes, consequences and effects of jealousy in a splendid play better, more accurately and more completely than such material has been treated in all schools of worldly wisdom.¹²

In this same passage Mendelssohn also contended that these in these characters, the audience or readers can see themselves. The poet and translator of Shakespeare, Wieland, also praised Shakespeare's genius in the formation and development of his characters. Wieland declared that "no one has better known and better expressed moral beauty, sublimity, decency, [and] kindness in sentiments and moral dealings than he [Shakespeare]."¹³ His views, along with the favorable critiques of Johann Schlegel and Moses Mendelssohn, illustrate the growing popularity of Shakespeare in Germany in the mid-eighteenth century. Although Gottsched had attempted to banish the English playwright from German drama with his pro-classical rhetoric, Gottsched had little influence on future generations. It was the ideas of J.E. Schlegel and Mendelssohn that ultimately prevailed.

This next generation of German writers became even more adamant in rejecting the classical tradition promoted by Gottsched. Recognizing that ideal taste in the Age of Enlightenment had become too narrow, literary minds sought out new models and ideals.

¹² Moses Mendelssohn, from his review of Lowth's *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum; praelectiones academicae Oxonii habitae* (1757) in *Auseinandersetzung mit Shakespeare*, ed. Wolfgang Stellmacher (Berlin: n.p., 1976), 58; quoted in Williams, 10.

¹³ Christoph Martin Wieland, "Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst and Dicht-Kunst," (1757); quoted in *Shakespeare-Rezeption*, 68.

As a result of this open mindedness as well as the publication of more Shakespearean translations, Shakespeare became better known and consequently more highly regarded. Shakespearean reception in late eighteenth-century Germany was overwhelmingly positive, but different critics valued different aspects of Shakespeare's genius. Many writers praised Shakespeare because he represented something different from the neoclassic dramas that had defined the Age of Enlightenment. By proposing that the dramatic unities were irrelevant and eclecticism in writing signified freedom for the artist, these writers helped to assimilate Shakespeare into Germany's literary canon.

Another reason many intellectuals in Germany were eager to refute the legacy of the French classical dramatists was their desire to create their own German national theatre. This movement was led first by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and was later supported by *Sturm und Drang* writers such as Johann Gottfried Herder. According to Klaus L. Berghahn, Lessing, "unlike Gottsched with his objective rule systems, had no fixed system of norms by which he measured every work of art. He preferred to make concessions to the genius rather than force him into the Procrustean bed of poetic rules."¹⁴ Lessing objected to classical rules in part because they merely transposed the conventions of the court and traditional class society into poetry. Herder objected for different reasons, but agreed that Shakespeare's works should be judged according to different standards.

In Greece, drama originated as it could not originate in the North. In Greece, it was something which cannot be in the North. Hence, in the North it is not and must not be what it had been in Greece. Thus Sophocles' drama and Shakespeare's drama are two things, which in a certain sense, hardly deserve the same name.¹⁵

¹⁴ Berghahn, 53.

¹⁵ Johann Gottfried Herder, "Shakespear" (1773); quoted in *Shakespeare-Rezeption*, 104.

Both Lessing and Herder found freedom in Shakespeare's works because they relied on imagination and not prescribed rules. This freedom of thought found in Shakespeare's works led to the recreation of a "true" human identity that is applicable to all times and places.¹⁶

It is in these notions of humanity and universality hinted at by Lessing and Herder that other *Sturm und Drang* writers perpetuated in their critiques of Shakespeare. Goethe and Jakob Lenz especially found these qualities in Shakespeare to be ingenious. In his essay "Shakespeare und kein Ende," Goethe argued that readers of all ages are depicted in Shakespeare's plays because every character and every place is portrayed as thoroughly English—or thoroughly the same. Even in plays such as *Romeo and Juliet* where the setting is Italy, the characters do not take on the national traits of their assigned setting. Because national identity is rarely emphasized in the plays, Goethe and his contemporaries viewed Shakespeare as universal and applicable to everyone. Hence, any reader or audience member could see him or herself in Shakespeare's characters regardless of the era or locale in which the play is set. Lenz, a friend of Goethe, also wrote about the universality and applicability of Shakespeare's characters to real life.

He [Shakespeare] raised a stage for the *whole human race*, where everyone stands, is amazed, is joyful, *can find themselves*, from the highest to the lowest. His kings and queens are as little restrained as the lowest rabble, feeling warm blood in their beating hearts, or giving vent to their bile in roguish jokes, for they too are human beneath the crinoline, know no vapours, do not die before our eyes in idle formulae, do not know the well-being of death [my italics].¹⁷

¹⁶ Peter J. Burgard, "Literary History and Historical Truth: Herder—'Shakespeare'—Goethe," in *Johann Gottfried Herder: Academic Disciplines and the Pursuit of Knowledge*, ed. Wulf Koepke (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1996), 66.

Ironically, these qualities that Lenz found appealing in Shakespeare are the same ones that Gottsched found too banal.

Overall, Shakespeare's plays became an endless source of inspiration for writers of the late eighteenth century. In a 1773 essay Herder described Shakespeare's effect upon him.

When I read him, I lose all sense of theatre, actor, and backdrop!
Nothing but individual leaves from the book of events, providence, and
the world waving in the storm of time! . . . for the sake of one theatrical
image, one grand event that only the poet oversees.¹⁸

Like Herder, Goethe also found Shakespeare to be inspiring and chose to express his admiration in a most original way—through the character Wilhelm Meister in the essay “Wilhelm Meister's Critique of Hamlet” from 1799. After being introduced to Shakespeare by his friend Jarno, Wilhelm exclaims to his friend:

I cannot recollect that any book, any man, any incident of my life
has produced such important effects on me, as the precious works to
which by your kindness I have been directed.¹⁹

Wilhelm goes on to state that Shakespeare had awoken in him “a thousand feelings and abilities . . . of which he had previously no understanding nor presentiment.”²⁰ Such exaltation of Shakespeare foreshadowed the type of heartfelt and personal praise that early nineteenth-century German writers would espouse.

¹⁷ Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz, “Anmerkungen über Theater,” quoted in *Shakespeare-Rezeption*, 143.

¹⁸ Herder, “Shakespear,” 1773; quoted in *Shakespeare-Rezeption*, 104.

¹⁹ Goethe, “Wilhelm Meister's Critique of Hamlet,” (1795); quoted in *Goethe's Literary Essays*, ed. J.E. Spingarn and trans. Viscount Haldane (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1921), 145.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 146.

A similar positive opinion of Shakespeare surfaced in France with Letourneur in the late eighteenth century, but he seems to have been a relatively isolated figure, surrounded by critics of more mixed opinions. For example, as late as 1799 Jean-Francois La Harpe voiced a complaint reminiscent of Voltaire, observing that if Shakespeare had known the rules of drama like Corneille, or imitated the Greeks like Racine, his pieces would have at least been better, even though his genius could never equal these other writers.²¹ Despite his isolation, however, Letourneur's advocacy set the stage for the type of criticism later produced by the French Romantics. Shakespeare's works were slowly growing in familiarity and popularity, especially after 1776 with the publication of Letourneur's translations. In their focus on Shakespeare's broad knowledge of humanity, Letourneur's critiques bear some resemblance to contemporary German thought, such as that by Lessing and Herder. In the dedicatory letter that precedes his translation, Letourneur contended that "Never did a man of genius penetrate more deeply into the abysses of the human heart nor cause passions to speak the language of nature with greater truth."²² Thus, unlike his French contemporaries, who compared Shakespeare to the classical dramatists, Letourneur placed Shakespeare above other writers. This acknowledgement of Shakespeare's genius in depicting natural human emotion became a central theme among the next generation of French critics.

Although artists, writers, and musicians of the early nineteenth century were preoccupied with expressing their own individual feelings, they also sought out their ideals in art and history of the past, worshiping older artists as saints. Through this

²¹ C.M. Haines, *Shakespeare in France: Criticism from Voltaire to Victor Hugo* (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), 71. While he offers no source for La Harpe's comment, he does state that La Harpe said this no later than 1799.

²² Quoted in Paolucci, 664.

process they found an endless source of inspiration especially in Shakespeare, ushering in a new wave of Shakespearean reception that coincided with the onset of the Romantic movement in Europe. Although they praised Shakespeare for many of the same qualities that writers such as Letourneur, Lessing, and Herder did, Romantic writers expressed their veneration for Shakespeare more frequently and with more intensity. Ludwig Tieck's description of the importance of Shakespeare to his life and art sheds light on the degree to which Shakespeare had consumed Tieck's thoughts.

The center of my love and knowledge is Shakespeare's spirit, to which, involuntarily and often without knowing it, I refer everything. Everything, whatever I experience and learn, is related to him, my ideas as well as nature. Everything explains him and he explains the other beings and so I study him incessantly.²³

Romantic writers worshiped Shakespeare because they found the embodiment of their own modern ideals in his works. Romanticism valued both the old and the new, the primitive and the modern, and the popular and the intellectual. Suddenly eclecticism was desirable, and gone were the confining shackles of classical dramatic writing. Early nineteenth-century artists and critics also praised Shakespeare's plays for their truthfulness in depicting real life and real people. This characteristic of fidelity to nature led many to deem Shakespeare's works as universal and applicable to all.

Because eclecticism in the arts had become one of the passions of the Romantics, Shakespeare's mixing of contrasting sentiments and literary elements was suddenly desirable. In Shakespeare's dramas the Romantics delighted in his many pairings of opposites. The most avid Shakespeare supporter in early nineteenth-century France, Victor Hugo, praised Shakespeare for the coexistence of the grotesque and the sublime,

terror and buffoonery, and tragedy and comedy in his works.²⁴ As examples of these most original meetings Hugo cited the interaction of Romeo with the Apothecary, Macbeth with the witches, and Hamlet with the grave-diggers. Hugo believed that because Shakespeare positioned these common characters with those of noble descent, a point of comparison could be more clearly recognized, making the sublime seem all the more sublime and the beautiful all the more beautiful.²⁵ Similarly, Chateaubriand contended that it is a great thing to combine contrasting sentiments and praised Shakespeare especially for his ability to create irony through contrasting emotions. For example, he found the “truth and energy” with which Macduff and Malcolm relay the misfortunes of Scotland in *Macbeth* to be especially wry.²⁶ In addition, in his discussion on *Romeo and Juliet*, Chateaubriand found irony in the parting of the two lovers the morning after their wedding, marveling at how Shakespeare painted this glorious morning and sweet, innocent parting with knowledge of the tragic catastrophe that was to follow.

Contemporary German critics also praised Shakespeare’s eclecticism. For example, Frederic Schlegel wrote that Shakespeare’s art depended on these types of juxtapositions²⁷ and singled out his commingling of the beautiful with the ugly.²⁸ A.

²³ Ludwig Tieck, “Briefe über Shakespeare,” *Kritische Schriften* (Leipzig, 1848; reprinted Berlin and New York, 1974), vol. 1, 141; quoted in Williams, 173-174.

²⁴ Victor Hugo, *Preface to Cromwell* (1827); quoted in Ralli, 212.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Chateaubriand, *Mélanges Littéraires*, 1801; quoted in Ralli, 206.

²⁷ F. Schlegel, “Shakespeares Behandlung des Wunderbaren” (1793), in *Auseinandersetzung mit Shakespeare*, 181-204; quoted in Werner Habicht, “Romanticism, Antiromanticism, and the German Shakespeare Tradition” in *Shakespeare and the Cultural Tradition*, ed. Tetsuo Kishi, Roger Pringle, and Stanley Wells (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994), 244.

²⁸ F. Schlegel, *The Greeks and the Romans*, 1797; quoted in Ralli, 115.

W. Schlegel also praised Shakespeare's eclectic mix of comedy with tragedy and lower-class characters with noble ones:

In Shakespeare's dramas the comic scenes are the antechambers of the poetry, where servants dwell; these prosaic attendants should not speak so loudly as to drown the conversation in the great hall; nevertheless, in those intervals when the ideal society has withdrawn, they deserve to be listened to; their daring mockery, their presumptuous imitations, can provide much information about the circumstances of their masters.²⁹

Tieck also found value in Shakespeare's use of tragic and comic characters. In his discussion of *The Tempest*, he argued that Shakespeare purposely introduced magical characters such as Ariel and Caliban to counteract the more serious lovers Miranda and Ferdinand, creating an eclectic cast that ultimately helped to sustain the audience's interest.³⁰ Overall, these writers found through these sub-plots and secondary characters that Shakespeare painted clearer pictures of the main, noble characters. What both F. Schlegel and A.W. Schlegel found especially appealing about these juxtapositions is Shakespeare's use of them to create characters of greater depth and as a result more true to life.

Naturalness and fidelity to real life was another Romantic characteristic that early nineteenth-century writers found and praised in Shakespeare. This idea stemmed from sentiments of writers in the late eighteenth century. As early as 1771, Goethe had declared that "through Shakespeare, nature herself utters her prophecies."³¹ Goethe continued to foster this notion throughout his life and in 1813 claimed that the basis of Shakespeare's work lay in the "truth and solidity of life."³² For many early nineteenth-

²⁹ A. W. Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur, Kritische Schriften und Briefe*, 7 vols. (Stuttgart, 1962), vol. 6, 138; quoted in Williams 150.

³⁰ Tieck, *Kritische Schriften*, Vol.1, 44; discussed in Williams, 175.

³¹ Goethe, "Stray Thoughts of Shakespeare," 1771; quoted in Ralli, 109.

³² Goethe, "Shakespeare and No End," 1813; quoted in Ralli, 123.

century writers these natural and truthful qualities were best exhibited by Shakespeare's characters in which the readers or audience members could see themselves. Stendhal claimed in his book *Racine and Shakespeare* that the characters Shakespeare presented seem so real because the readers and audience members already know them from their own lives.³³ The Romantics especially came to admire the English playwright's ability to make these fictional characters true to real life. Chateaubriand's statement that "no one has seen deeper into human nature than Shakespeare"³⁴ represented a commonly held sentiment among writers in the early nineteenth century. Many contemporary essays and critiques of Shakespeare pondered the Bard's aptitude for depicting the span of emotions that make up human nature. For example, Villemain contended that Shakespeare ingeniously expressed the great passions of the heart—ambition, jealousy, love of life, and pity.³⁵ Madame de Staël focused on a more specific human feeling.

Where Shakespeare surpasses is in depicting isolation: beside the torments of grief he shows man's indifference and nature's calm. The somber English imagination represents a man cut off by his troubles, as by contagion from all his friends. Society withdraws from his life before nature brings him death.³⁶

It is this reality of human emotion that is present in Shakespeare that enabled the Romantics, who were quite preoccupied with expressing feeling through art, to identify so readily with Shakespeare's characters.

Because they found his works applicable to their own lives and so true to real life in general, many Romantics discerned the notion of universality in Shakespeare's works,

³³Stendhal, *Racine and Shakespeare*, trans. Guy Daniel's (N.P.: Crewel-Collier Publishing Co., 1962), 39.

³⁴Chateaubriand, *Mélanges Littéraires*, 1801; quoted in Ralli., 206.

³⁵Villemain, *Mélanges Philosophiques, Historiques et Littéraires*, 1829; quoted in Ralli, 222.

believing that they transcend era, social class, and religion. For example, Heinrich Heine stated that Shakespeare's genius "rises above sect; he shows us neither Jews nor Christians, but oppressors and oppressed."³⁷ Similarly, A. W. Schlegel described Shakespeare's ability to capture every type of person in real life.

Shakespeare grasps every kind of character. His characters have individual peculiarities, but also significance beyond themselves. He combines characters so that they bring out each other's peculiarities.³⁸

In other words, all who read or see Shakespeare performed can find a model for themselves.

By the mid-nineteenth century Shakespeare was a well-known literary figure in consequence of numerous translations, performances, and insightful critiques of his works. Despite the similarity of much of the criticism, however, Shakespeare's works were not viewed and assimilated in the same way or at the same rate in France and Germany. By the early and mid-nineteenth century while Germans unanimously held Shakespeare as one their own, French writers and critics still treated Shakespeare as a foreigner.

For both countries, welcoming Shakespeare was initially a way to rebel against the classical heritage of the eighteenth century. Germany, however, shed this habit sooner than France. With the exception of Gottsched in the mid-eighteenth century, most literary critics in Germany whole-heartedly admired Shakespeare from the beginning of his introduction to their country. France was more tentative in its acceptance. While all major German literary figures acknowledged Shakespeare's genius by the 1770s, the number of

³⁶ Madame de Staël, *De La Littérature*, (1800); quoted in Ralli, 203.

³⁷ Heine, "Shakespeare's Maidens and Women;" quoted in Ralli, 247.

³⁸ A.W. Schegel, *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, 1808; quoted in Ralli, 118.

contemporary French writers who discussed Shakespeare was far fewer. Shakespeare's full-fledged "rebirth" in France did not occur until the Romantic movement at the turn of the nineteenth century.

While the admiration the French Romantics held for Shakespeare cannot be denied, their veneration was not shared by the classically-oriented members of the Académie Française, and a fierce debate about literary standards soon developed. In their quest for *liberté dans l'art*, romanticists like Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël argued that literature should reflect the ever-changing society and vary according to formative influences such as race, religion, and civilization.³⁹ Therefore, a work of art should be judged on its own merits, independently of prescribed dramatic standards. These ideas were perpetuated further in the works of Hugo, Stendhal, Vigny, Lamartine, and Dumas père, ultimately sparking a pamphlet war between the rebellious Romantics and the academicians over the relevance of the dramatic unities.

At the heart of this war was Shakespeare. For the Romantics, Shakespeare epitomized artistic freedom. Cairns describes Shakespeare as "manna to their souls" and interprets the coming of Shakespeare in France in religious terms, as "something miraculous that changed everything."⁴⁰ Not only was Shakespeare inspiring to the Romantics but his plays were also proof that drama did not have to follow the dramatic

³⁹ Chateaubriand, *Le Génie du christianisme*; de Staël, *De la littérature* and *De l'Allemagne*. Hugo also discusses these concepts in the prefaces to *Cromwell* and *Les Orientales* and in *William Shakespeare*.

⁴⁰ David Cairns, *Berlioz: The Making of an Artist*, vol.1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 243-244.

unities to be excellent. As a result, Shakespeare became an “instrument of war against the absolutist literary establishment.”⁴¹

This “absolutist literary establishment” or the *Académie de Française* did not stand idly by as the rebellious Romantics sought to pollute Parisian theatres and French literature. They also openly took part in this pamphlet war, purposely attempting to minimize Shakespeare’s growing popularity in France. For example, performances of Shakespeare’s plays were not even allowed in the *Académie*-controlled theatres until 1822. When *Othello* finally was performed in 1822 in Paris, the conservative newspaper *Pandore* published a notice of the new publication of the complete works of Jean-Francois Ducis, a dramatist beloved by the academicians for his reworkings of Shakespeare’s plays according to classical standards.⁴² The performance itself was a colossal disaster. After dodging a shower of eggs, vegetables, and coins in the first act, the actors, not wishing to prolong this discomfort, decided to skip to the fifth act. This did little to appease the angry audience, though, for the spectacle of the Moor smothering Desdemona so appalled them that they cried as the curtain was being prematurely dropped, “*à bas Shakespeare! C’est un lieutenant de Wellington!*”⁴³

This pamphlet war grew the most heated with the debate between Louis-Simon Auger, the secretary of the *Académie de Française*, and Stendhal after the publication of Stendhal’s *Racine and Shakespeare*. Stendhal’s implication that classicism was irrelevant and out-dated angered Auger so much so that in 1824 he accused the

⁴¹ Saint-Beuve, *Portraits Contemporains*, t.3 (1889), 394; quoted in Cairns, vol. 1, 242.

⁴² Cairns, 244. Ducis’s version of *Othello* (1792) is a good example of his Shakespearean reworkings. In this adaptation, Ducis changed the ending so that Othello discovers Desdemona’s innocence in time and does not murder her, thus making the play less gruesome and offensive and more appealing to refined classical tastes.

Romantics of having a horror of anything bright and amusing and of only preaching despair. The following year Stendhal responded to Auger's charges in ten letters that were added to *Racine and Shakespeare*. Much of Stendhal's argument lay in establishing that the dramatic unitites were irrelevant and unrealistic, citing Shakespeare's plays for support. For example, Stendhal pointed out that if Shakespeare had restricted the unfolding and resolution of the plots of his tragedies to thirty-six hours or less, as did Racine, he could never have created anything meaningful or believable. After all, if all the events of *Othello* took place in one and a half days, we would simply think Othello was crazy and feel nothing for him except contempt.⁴⁴

Both French and German Romantics were attracted to the writings of Shakespeare because they reflected many of the ideals of the Romantic movement. For both countries he was at one point a weapon in their written war against the shackles of classicism. The difference in the two countries' reception of Shakespeare is the timetable at which these events occurred. As early as the mid and late eighteenth century German writers such as Lessing, J. E. Schlegel, and Mendelssohn sought to distance themselves and their country's theatre from classical standards and particularly the rhetoric of Gottsched, using Shakespeare as a someone after whom to model their own work. This similar revolt did not begin in France until the turn of the nineteenth century, finally gaining full force in the 1820s. By this time Germany had fully assimilated Shakespeare into its literary canon. Shakespeare was no longer "new" as he was to many in France but instead was a revered historical literary figure. This distinction does not imply that Germans in the 1820s loved Shakespeare any less than France, but rather illuminates the

⁴³ Raby, 46.

⁴⁴ Stendhal, *Racine and Shakespeare*, 44.

intensely personal and immediate connection that French Romantics felt toward Shakespeare. Not only was he inspiration but moreover he represented them in their blazing literary battle to win artistic freedom. He was a religion to live by. He was venerated like a saint.

No one worshiped and lived by Shakespeare as did Berlioz and no one fell into the German tradition of revering Shakespeare as an old literary master as did Liszt.

Chapter 3

Berlioz and Liszt Discover Shakespeare

Early nineteenth-century thinkers were fascinated by the connections between the various fine arts. Authors like Schelling, Hegel, and Schopenhauer continually identified disciplines such as music, philosophy, literature, and painting as a “cohesive community,”¹ consequently blurring the boundaries between the arts. As a result, a true Romantic artist had to be proficient and knowledgeable in a secondary artistic discipline. Thus, a number of prominent nineteenth-century musicians took a much more active interest in literature and writing than in the previous centuries.

As two of the leading musicians of the nineteenth century, Berlioz and Liszt fall neatly into this category of Romantic artists who thought and wrote about literature. As one might suspect, both refer often to Shakespeare. His works undoubtedly were a great source of inspiration to both composers, serving as models for musical compositions. However, the two composers discovered Shakespeare differently, leading to a difference in the ways that they viewed Shakespeare and ultimately to a difference in the way they interpreted Shakespeare’s dramas in their music.

Essential to the understanding of how Berlioz and Liszt would interpret Shakespeare in their music is discerning the contrasting ways in which the two composers came to know Shakespeare. Their individual introductions to Shakespeare

¹ Leon Plantinga, *Romantic Music: A History of Musical Style in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1984), 13.

ultimately reflect the Shakespearean reception of the country in which they lived. While Berlioz discovered Shakespeare in one fateful night like many of the other French Romantics, Liszt's fascination with Shakespeare, like many other thinkers in Germany, stemmed from his general interest in literature.

By the 1820s, French literary opinion about Shakespeare had begun to shift from the equivocal position that characterized Voltaire's generation to a more general recognition of his genius. However, performances of the plays were rare, and a production of *Othello* in Paris in 1822 went practically unnoticed. That changed on September 11, 1827, when an English acting troupe produced *Hamlet* at the Odéon theatre, sparking the French Romantics' love affair with Shakespeare. Due to the influential pro-Shakespearean writings by leaders of the Romantic movement in Paris (discussed in the previous chapter), the interest of many Parisians had been sparked by the late 1820s and as a result, all of intellectual Paris flocked to the Odéon for this event, filling the theatre to its full capacity. Many present at the Odéon that night in 1827 described the event as a revelation. Alexandre Dumas's statement about his experience at the Odéon reveals the depth of this impression:

Suppose a man born blind who then received his vision discovered a world which he had no idea . . . and you will have some idea of the enchanted Eden to which the production opened the door.²

With this watershed performance and the ones that followed in the next few days, the literary debate about Shakespeare between the supporters of the Romantic movement and the classicists of the *Académie Française* moved into a larger cultural arena. For the

² Julien Tiersot, *Hector Berlioz et la société de son temps* (Paris: 1904), 51; quoted in Dale Cockrell, "A Study in French Romanticism: Berlioz and Shakespeare" *Journal of Musicological Research* 4 (1982): 90.

Romantics who had been trying to gather support for Shakespeare for twenty years, these performances and their favorable reception provided them with the support to dominant the literary scene in Paris. Sainte-Beuve's descriptions of what he called "the day every obstruction was so abruptly overturned" illustrate the growing intensity and ferocity of this literary war:

This play of Shakespeare's was not only a noble spectacle, it was an instrument of war. The enemy—the Absolutist literary establishment—was bombarded from the vantage point of Juliet's balcony; and we were filled with the hope of scaling with Romeo, in defiance of the unities, that lofty and forbidden stronghold of emotion and delight.³

Emile Deschamps, later Berlioz's librettist for *Roméo et Juliette*, expressed a similar sentiment, declaring that the Parisian audience was now ready for Shakespeare.

It is time to show to the French public this great Shakespeare, such as he is, with his magnificent plot development, the variety of his characters, the freedom of his ideas, his nicely proportioned mixture of comic and tragic styles, finally, his beauties always so new and original, and even some of his defects.⁴

If these French Romantics admired Shakespeare before 1827, they, having seen moving performances of his plays, now idolized Shakespeare, worshiping him as a literary god. Also present at that monumental performance at the Odéon was Berlioz, and, as he would proclaim many times throughout his life, Shakespeare and this night in 1827 in particular, changed his life.

Although Berlioz had read Letourneur's translation of Shakespeare's plays before 1827, the English troupe's performance of *Hamlet* was just as much a revelation to him

³ Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. 3, 394; quoted in Peter Raby, *Fair Ophelia: Harriet Smithson Berlioz* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 72.

as it was to the other French Romantics present that night at the Odéon. Berlioz wrote extensively on his first live Shakespearean experience in his *Memoirs*.

This sudden and unexpected revelation of Shakespeare overwhelmed me. The lightning-flash of his genius revealed the whole heaven of art to me, illuminating its remotest depths in a single flash. I recognized the meaning of real grandeur, real beauty, and real dramatic truth, and I also realized the utter absurdity of the ideas circulated about Shakespeare in France by Voltaire. . . and the pitiful pettiness of our old poetic school I saw . . . I understood . . . I felt . . . that I had risen from the dead and that I must get up and walk.⁵

Countless accounts that describe this performance of *Hamlet*, such as those cited above by Dumas, Deschamps, and Sainte-Beuve, but few are as emotionally charged as that of Berlioz. Although he vowed after this one performance never to see Shakespeare performed again, he nevertheless could not keep himself away from the Odéon the next night for a performance of *Romeo and Juliet*. After this second dose of Shakespeare Berlioz reinstated his oath.

After these two performances of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* I had no difficulty in keeping away from the English theatre; more experiences of that kind would have killed me.⁶

For Berlioz these two experiences sparked a life-long obsession with Shakespeare that would affect both his personal life and his artistic output. Similar to the other Romantics discussed above and in chapter 2, Berlioz no longer just admired Shakespeare; he found

⁴ Emile Deschamps, *La Préface des études françaises étrangères* (Paris: [n.d.]), 49; quoted in Cockrell, 88.

⁵ Hector Berlioz, *Memoirs*, trans. and ed. Ernest Newman (New York: Dover, 1960), 66.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 69.

in him a source of personal and artistic inspiration. After that night, Shakespeare was the “the interpreter of [his] life.”⁷

While many Romantics admired Shakespeare’s dramas because they could identify with his characters and situations, few made that identification so specific by falling hopelessly in love with a Shakespearean actress as did Berlioz. After that night at the Odéon, Shakespeare consumed Berlioz’s personal life. Recalling the time immediately after seeing *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, Berlioz described the mental state into which he fell:

I had spent some months in the kind of hopeless stupor of which I have only faintly indicated the nature and the cause, dreaming ceaselessly of Shakespeare and of the fair Ophelia of whom all Paris raved.⁸

This “fair Ophelia” was Harriet Smithson, the beautiful and talented Irish actress who played Ophelia and Juliet. Berlioz immediately fell in love with her and five years later married her. During his relentless pursuit of Smithson, Berlioz openly and frequently declared his passion for her to anyone that would listen, relating to his friend Albert DuBoys that this “sweetest Juliet” was his life, soul, heart, and heaven.⁹ Although he did not speak to her for several years after he initially saw her perform, he nevertheless, according to Peter Raby, harbored an intense passion for her “within the confines of his own theatrical imagination.”¹⁰ For Berlioz, Smithson was the personification of the Shakespearean heroines he had seen on stage. Throughout his life, even after they were

⁷ Berlioz, *Correspondance générale*, ed. Peter Citron, vol.1, (Paris, 1972), 208; quoted in David Cairns, *Berlioz, 1803-1832: The Making of An Artist* (London: University of California Press), 243.

⁸ Berlioz, *Memoirs*, 69.

⁹ Berlioz, *Correspondance générale* vol.2, 60; quoted in Julian Rushton, *The Cambridge Companion to Roméo et Juliette* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 10.

married, he often referred to her as “Juliet” or “Ophelia.” Upon learning that Smithson’s apartment was very near to his own, Berlioz wrote to his friend Humbert Ferrand in 1829 that “Ophelia is not so distant from me as I thought.”¹¹ In spite of the turmoil and exasperation of most of their married life, Berlioz continually referred to her as his Ophelia.¹² David Cairns writes that this association of Smithson with Shakespearean women demonstrates Berlioz’s preoccupation and the Romantic predilection for artist worship:

The actress personified the poet whose divine interpreter she was: worship of the artist and worship of the art, as he acknowledged, were deeply interfused, each intensifying the other.¹³

In other words, in Smithson Berlioz saw and felt Shakespeare, but in Shakespeare Berlioz saw and felt Smithson. Shakespeare was such a part of this couple’s connection that in retelling the circumstances of his wife’s death in his *Memoirs* Berlioz exclaims that only Shakespeare, the “Father,” could have understood the two of them and the complexities and trials of their ill-fated relationship.¹⁴

Berlioz’s intense and personal identification with Shakespearean characters and situations is reflected in his choice of several plays as sources for his own compositions. Obvious musical works indebted to Shakespeare are those with Shakespearean titles: *Overture to King Lear* (1831), *Roméo et Juliette* (1839), *Fantasie sur la Tempête de Shakespeare* (1830) which was later incorporated into *Lélio ou le retour à la vie* (1855), “Marche funèbre pour la dernière scène d’Hamlet” from *Tristia* No. 3 (1844), and the

¹⁰ Raby, 111.

¹¹ Berlioz, *Correspondance générale*: I, 113; quoted in Raby, 102.

¹² Berlioz, *Memoirs*, 469.

¹³ Cairns, vol. 1, 251.

¹⁴ Berlioz, *Memoirs*, 468.

solo song “La mort d’Ophelia” (1842) later arranged for *Tristia* No. 2. Even more indicative of his deep fascination with Shakespeare is the number of times the playwright’s characters and approach to drama surfaces in compositions without a direct Shakespearean connection. For example, when writing the *Cleopatra* cantata for the Prix de Rome, Berlioz associated Cleopatra with Juliet when she imagines that she is entombed with her ancestors. In a 1859 letter to Ferrand, Berlioz described his association.

It’s terrifying, horrific; it’s the scene where Juliet meditates on her entombment in the Capulet mausoleum, alive and surrounded by the bones of her ancestors, the body of Tybolt.¹⁵

The depth of Shakespeare’s artistic influence can also be perceived in *Les Troyens*, which according to Cairns, relies upon many Shakespearean elements. Not only does Berlioz quote the text of the love scene from *Merchant of Venice* for the love duet in the second scene of Act Four, he also adopted some of Shakespeare’s dramatic tendencies, particularly the use of open forms, the mixing of genres, and the disregard for the unities of time, place, and action.¹⁶ Berlioz himself acknowledged his indebtedness to Shakespeare, telling Liszt that it was a “Virgilian opera on the Shakespearean plan.”¹⁷ In a letter to Toussaint Bennet from 1856, Berlioz described the depth of Shakespeare’s influence on *Les Troyens*, saying “Shakespeare is the real author of the words and the

¹⁵ Berlioz, *Correspondance générale*: I, 270; quoted in Rushton, *Roméo et Juliette*, 11.

¹⁶ Cairns, *Berlioz, 1832-1869: Servitude and Greatness* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 599.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* Cairns offers no citation for this statement.

music. Strange that he should intervene—he, the poet of the north, in the great work of the poet of Rome.”¹⁸

Like the other French Romantics, Berlioz was drawn to Shakespeare both personally and artistically. He identified his own life with characters and events in Shakespeare's plays, worshiping Shakespeare like a saint. Furthermore, he sought to model his own works on those of Shakespeare, drawing especially on the elements that the French Romantics were heralding, such as freedom of form. Although perhaps perpetuated in an extreme fashion in the case of Berlioz, these tendencies were all exemplary of the French Romantic view of Shakespeare in the early nineteenth century.

Liszt's discovery of Shakespeare is undocumented and probably was not as eventful as Berlioz's. Nowhere in Liszt's correspondence or writings is a reference to his reading or seeing a work by Shakespeare for the first time. Instead, all of Liszt's discussions of the playwright imply that Shakespeare was a familiar author that he had known and regarded highly for some time; though he did not single him out as particularly significant. Unlike Berlioz, who placed Shakespeare on a pedestal high above other writers, Liszt seems to have simply regarded Shakespeare as part of the essential literary canon.

For Liszt, as well as many artists in the nineteenth century, reading and thinking about literature was a chief preoccupation. Believing that literature provided the key “to unlock the world,”¹⁹ Liszt surrounded himself with books,²⁰ reading feverishly

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, vol. 1 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983), 138.

²⁰ Maria Eckhardt, *Franz Liszt's Estate at the Budapest Academy of Music. I. Books*, trans. Erzsébet Mészáros (Budapest 1986) and “Liszt's Weimar Library: the Hungarica,” *New Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1991), 156-164; discussed in Ben

throughout his life in hope of satisfying what he called his “immense need to learn, to know, to deepen myself [himself].”²¹ Liszt described his immersion in literature to a friend in 1832.

Here is a whole fortnight that my mind and fingers have been working like two lost spirits—Homer, the Bible, Plato, Locke, Byron, Hugo, Lamartine, Chateaubriand, Beethoven, Bach, Hummel, Mozart, Weber, are all around me. I study them, meditate on them, devour them with fury.²²

In his Weimar years, Liszt especially surrounded himself with literature and furthering the public’s appreciation of it, involving himself heavily in various Goethe and Schiller festivals.

In his study of the intellectual side of Liszt, Ben Arnold classifies the works Liszt is known to have read, based upon the composer’s letters and writings. While he concludes that Liszt was well versed in the literary canons of both Germany and France and was knowledgeable of historical and contemporary authors, Arnold proposes that Liszt read a more select group of authors more frequently than others, thus creating his own core canon of literature from which he often drew inspiration, a canon that included Shakespeare.²³

Arnold, “Liszt as Reader, Intellectual, and Musician,” in *Liszt and His World*, Franz Liszt Studies Series, ed. Michael Saffle, no. 5 (New York: Pendragon Press, 1998), 37-60. Eckhardt’s studies reveal that Liszt’s libraries at Budapest and Weimar contained over 400 and 1300 titles respectively. Many of these books contain underlined passages and marginal annotations in Liszt’s own hand, proving that he did indeed read a great portion of the books he owned.

²¹ *Correspondance de Liszt et de la Comtesse d’Agoult*, ed. Daniel Ollivier, I, 82; quoted in Arnold, 39.

²² *Franz Liszt Selected Letters*, trans. and ed. Adrian Williams (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 7.

²³ Arnold, 39. This list also includes the Bible, Byron, Chateaubriand, Dante, Goethe, Hugo, Lamartine, Pascal, Sand, and Schiller.

Liszt's knowledge of Shakespeare seems to have been extensive. Not only did he own the collected works of Shakespeare in German, he also referred to *Othello*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest*, *A Winter's Tale*, *Hamlet*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, and *Macbeth* in his correspondence. Liszt also worked closely with Franz von Dingelstedt, one of Germany's most avid Shakespeare proponents,²⁴ who besides serving as the general manager of the Weimar Court Theatre, translated Shakespeare's histories and founded the German Shakespeare Society. Liszt's personal writings indicate that the composer also thought about Shakespeare extensively, and his discussions of *Hamlet* particularly illustrate the degree to which he contemplated Shakespeare's works. After seeing a production in Weimar in 1856, he discussed at length his views on the character of Hamlet in a letter to Agnes Street-Klindworth, describing him as "an intelligent and enterprising prince with lofty political aims, who waits for the favorable moment to take his revenge and at the same time achieves the goal of his ambition by having himself crowned in place of his uncle."²⁵

In the same letter he pondered the question of whether Hamlet loved Ophelia:

Yes, Ophelia is loved; but Hamlet, like any exceptional character, imperiously demands the *wine* of love from her, not contenting himself with the *milk*. He wishes to be understood by her, without submitting to the obligation of explaining himself.²⁶

These statements also point to the Shakespearean qualities that attracted Liszt.

The character of Hamlet seemed to have been of especial interest to the composer.

According to Jacques Barzun, part of the Romantic artist's mission was "to lead mankind

²⁴ Williams, *Selected Franz Liszt Letters*, 963.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 396.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

to self-fulfillment by exalting heroism and the tragedy of effort.”²⁷ Hamlet represents the epitome of the Romantic hero whose life ends tragically because of the consequences of his own efforts. Hamlet is a man driven by his own obsession with revenge. He experiences the same extreme emotions as many of the heroic figures in Romantic literature such as Goethe’s *Werther*, Chateaubriand’s *René*, and Byron’s *Childe Harold*. In Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, Liszt undoubtedly found a hero to exalt and as a result represented him in a tone poem by the same name. The concept of the hero of seems to have been of particular significance to Liszt, for many of his other symphonic poems also deal with this type of protagonist—*Mazeppa*, *Orpheus*, *Tasso*, and *Prometheus*.

As composers and avid literary consumers who were heavily associated with all of the leaders of Romanticism in Europe, Berlioz and Liszt naturally came to know Shakespeare’s works. Just how the two composers came to know Shakespeare, though, affected the way they understood and interpreted his plays. In his tour of the literary canon, Liszt discovered Shakespeare among the ranks of other great writers from whom he sought artistic inspiration. Berlioz, on the other hand, fell in love with Shakespeare on one single night—albeit the same night he met his future wife—and consequently forever intertwined his own life with that of Shakespeare. What the significance of these different introductions meant to the two composers of Shakespearean music remains to be seen.

²⁷ Jacques Barzun, *Berlioz and the Romantic Century*, vol. 1 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1950), 395.

Chapter 4

Shakespeare and Musical Philosophy in *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet*

Just as Berlioz and Liszt started with inspiration by Shakespeare but ended up with different approaches to composition, they started with similar inspiration for composing program music, but ended up with very different attitudes and theories. Both got their inspiration from Beethoven, and from precisely that aspect of Beethoven that most puzzled their contemporaries; his experimental treatment of form, particularly its narrative qualities.¹

In Beethoven's hands the symphony became according to David Cairns, a "medium for dramatic music of a scope and a scale not encountered before."² Cairns describes Berlioz's discovery of Beethoven as a "crucial liberation," stating that the "endless variety of compositional procedures" of Beethoven's "symphonic dramas" were parallel in Berlioz's mind to the formal freedom of Shakespeare's plays.³ This loose

¹ Berlioz and Liszt's admiration for Beethoven is especially significant because they lived in a society where many of Beethoven's works were believed to be the product of a deranged mind. See Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years, 1811-1847* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983), 183. For a more detailed discussion of Beethoven's reception in the 1830s see Kristen Marta Knittel, "Wagner, Deafness, and the Reception of Beethoven's Late Style," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 50 (Spring 1998): 49-82.

² David Cairns, "Berlioz and Beethoven," in *The Cambridge Companion to Berlioz*, ed. Peter Bloom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 225.

³ Ibid.

adherence to traditional forms also was a feature of Beethoven's music that attracted Liszt, who believed that Beethoven's works challenged the concept of form as a "necessary determinant for the organism of thought."⁴ Liszt was so convinced of the centrality of formal experimentation in Beethoven's output that he divided Beethoven's music into two styles based on the composer's adherence to traditional forms:

The first, that in which traditional and recognized form contains and governs the thoughts of the master, and the second, that in which the thought stretches, breaks, recreates, and fashions the form and style according to its needs and inspirations.⁵

It was the latter style that influenced Liszt in his own compositions.

Berlioz and Liszt also may have been inspired by the idea, then in circulation that Beethoven had in mind specific programs while composing. According to James Hepokoski, many of Beethoven's works were given poetic interpretations in the early and mid-nineteenth century.⁶ For example, in the 1820s A.B. Marx—a great advocate of program music—insisted in the *Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* that Beethoven's works had a *Grundidee* or fundamental idea behind them and that a listener could not understand Beethoven's works until this motivating idea had been apprehended.⁷ By mid-century Richard Wagner was also assigning narratives to many of

⁴ La Mara, *Letters of Liszt* 1: 151-52 (letter 91, to Wilhelm von Lenz, 2 December 1852); quoted in Kenneth Hamilton, "Liszt," in *The Nineteenth Century Symphony*, ed. D. Kern Holoman (New York: Schirmer Books, 1997), 143.

⁵ Adrian Williams, trans. and ed., *Franz Liszt: Selected Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 335 (letter 283, to Wilhelm von Lenz, 2 December 1852).

⁶ James Hepokoski, "Beethoven Reception: The Symphonic Tradition," in *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 431.

⁷ A.B. Marx, "Etwas über die Symphonie und Beethoven's Leistungen in diesem Fache," in *Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 1/19-21 (1824), 165-8, 173-6, 181-4; discussed in Hepokoski, 431. See also Scott Burnham, "Criticism, Faith, and the *Idee*: A.B. Marx's Early Reception of Beethoven," *19th Century Music* 13 (1990): 183-92.

Beethoven's works, including the third symphony and the Overture to *Coriolanus*.⁸ This tendency toward poetic interpretations of Beethoven's works was undoubtedly sparked by Anton Schindler, who relayed several stories about Beethoven and the poetic ideas (many of them Shakespearean) that inspired and governed his compositional processes. For example, Schindler claimed that when he asked Beethoven the meaning of the piano sonatas Op. 31, no.2 ("Tempest") and Op. 57 ("Appassionata"), Beethoven replied "Read Shakespeare's *Tempest*."⁹ Although Schindler's 1840 biography has been shown to be frequently unreliable, other sources close to Beethoven relate similar stories. Beethoven's student Ferdinand Ries stated that "Beethoven often thought of a definite subject in his compositions"¹⁰ and Carl Czerny was convinced

that many of Beethoven's finest works were inspired by similar visions and pictures drawn from reading and his own imagination; and that if it were possible to obtain a sure knowledge of these circumstances, we should have the key to his compositions and their rendering.¹¹

Though these poetic interpretations and anecdotes may not stand up to modern scholarly scrutiny, Berlioz and Liszt would have had little reason to doubt their veracity.

⁸ Richard Wagner, "Beethoven's 'Heroic Symphony'" and "Beethoven's Overture to *Coriolanus*," in *Richard Wagner's Prose Works Vol. 3: The Theatre*, trans. William Ashton Ellis (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1894; reprint, New York: Broude Brothers, 1966), 221-224 and 225-227 (page citations are to the reprint edition). For a modern analysis of various nineteenth-century Shakespearean interpretations of the *Coriolan* overture, see Lawrence Kramer, "The Strange Case of Beethoven's *Coriolan*: Romantic Aesthetics, Modern Subjectivity, and The Cult of Shakespeare," *Musical Quarterly* 79 (summer 1995): 259.

⁹ Anton Schindler, *Beethoven as I Knew Him*, trans. Constance S. Jolley and ed. Donald W. MacArdle (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966), 406.

¹⁰ Franz Wegeler and Ferdinand Ries, *Beethoven Remembered*, trans. from the original *Biographische Notizen über Ludwig van Beethoven* (1838) by Frederick Noonan (Arlington: Great Ocean Publishers, 1987), 77.

¹¹ Frederick Niecks, *Programme Music in the Last Four Centuries* (New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969), 131. Niecks does not cite a source for this quotation.

Though I have been unable to verify whether Liszt or Berlioz knew of these anecdotes or programmatic interpretations, both could easily have been aware of them. Liszt's personal correspondence especially supports my contention that Berlioz and Liszt were attracted to the programmatic qualities of Beethoven's music, for he was in contact with Beethoven disciples, such as Czerny, Wilhelm von Lenz, and of course, Wagner. It is possible that Berlioz came to know these Beethoven anecdotes through Liszt himself, for they were quite good friends and often discussed and performed Beethoven together. For example, they performed Beethoven's fifth piano concerto (*Emperor*) together in 1841 in Paris with Liszt at the piano and Berlioz conducting.¹²

Whether inspired by the anecdotes or not, both Berlioz and Liszt clearly articulated their concept of Beethoven as a composer whose music was filled with a drama never equaled by his predecessors. Berlioz's own writings indicate that he was accustomed to hearing Beethoven's symphonies as, according to Daniel Albright, "musical embodiments of literary masterpieces, as if every movement . . . had an occult programmatic content."¹³ Liszt also wrote about extra-musical elements present in Beethoven's works, referring to the Andante of the Seventh Symphony as a "banquet of phantoms and angels."¹⁴

Despite these similarities Berlioz and Liszt drew upon this dramatic inspiration in different ways. While Berlioz tried to faithfully express the drama of a literary work—and particularly Shakespeare's drama—by what ever means, Liszt strove to draw upon

¹² Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, 182.

¹³ Daniel Albright, "Berlioz's Semi-Operas: *Roméo et Juliette* and *La Damnation de Faust* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2001), 48.

¹⁴ Williams, *Franz Liszt: Selected Letters*, 590 (letter 513 to the Grand Duke Carl Alexander, 1 November 1862).

and recreate drama in his compositions in order to create a new, unified form: the symphonic poem. As a result of this difference in the two composers' compositional ambitions, Berlioz's Shakespearean pieces are easier to link to their literary sources, while Liszt's Shakespearean composition is a more general depiction of the emotions present in its corresponding play. A closer look at the two composers' methods and ideas about program music will illustrate this difference, which arises from their distinctive concepts of the expressive abilities of music.

Berlioz discussed music's expressive abilities throughout his writings and critiques. Deeming music as the most expressive of all the arts,¹⁵ he even defined it as the "art of combining sounds so as to touch the emotions."¹⁶ Thus, it was by the degree of expression that he judged music—both his own and that of other composers.

But more often one encounters methodical, calm, cold minds who, after patiently studying theory, amassing observations, and taking every possible advantage of their imperfect talents, manage to create works that seem to fit the commonplace idea of music, works that satisfy the ear without beguiling it, works that speak neither to the heart nor to the imagination. Merely satisfying the sense of hearing is a far cry from providing the exquisite sensations this sense is able to experience, nor can the delights of the heart and the imagination be cheaply bought. And since in the true musical compositions of whatever school these delights are found combined with a most intense sensuous pleasure, I believe these impotent contrivers must also be struck from the ranks of musicians: They lack feeling.¹⁷

According to Berlioz, the aim of expressiveness in music is the "arousing in us the idea

¹⁵ Berlioz, *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris* (1837) 16; discussed in Jacques Barzun, *Berlioz and the Romantic Century*, vol. 1 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1950), 175.

¹⁶ Hector Berlioz, "The Art of Music," in *The Art of Music and Other Essays*, trans. and ed. Elizabeth Csicsery-Rónay (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 1.

of the various affections of the soul and awakening through the ear alone sensations which in nature human beings can perceive only through other senses.”¹⁸ Unfortunately, though, because he thought many could not “feel nor understand the power of music,”¹⁹ Berlioz was compelled to design his compositions so that a uniform meaning could be easily discerned. Because he felt the “truth of the parallel between music and something outside will be recognized only by those who know ahead of time the subject treated by the composer,”²⁰ Berlioz thus composed music based on specific programs that enabled his listeners to recognize and understand his own expressive goals. By drawing on a literary work in the composition of a piece, he could make his music more than simply expressive. Instead, music based on literary works could be expressive of drama and more importantly, a specific narrative. According to Barzun, to achieve these expressive goals, “all marked changes in music yield expression: if these expressions are suitably ordered they will create dramatic meaning.”²¹ These changes, or “images or comparisons” in the words of Berlioz, —presumably the program, “should be regarded in the same way as the spoken words of an opera.”²²

The result of his philosophy was a tendency to adhere to the narrative of his literary sources in his compositions. A brief look at Berlioz’s comments on his *King Lear Overture* will shed light on the degree of this faithfulness. In a letter to Baron von Donop, Berlioz explained the bizarre timpani part in terms of its relationship to Shakespeare’s *King Lear*.

¹⁷ Ibid., 1-2.

¹⁸ Berlioz, *Revue et Gazette de Musicale de Paris* (1837); quoted in Barzun, 175.

¹⁹ Berlioz, “The Art of Music,” 1.

²⁰ Berlioz, *Revue et Gazette de Musicale de Paris* (1837); quoted in Barzun, 181.

²¹ Barzun, 180-81.

There used to be a custom at the French court, still observed in Charles X's time around 1830, of announcing the king's entrance into his apartments after Mass on Sundays to the sound of an enormous drum which beat out bizarre rhythm in five-four time . . . This gave me the idea of accompanying Lear's entrance into his council chamber, for the scene of the division of the kingdom, with a similar kind of effect on the timpani. I did not intend to portray his madness until the middle of the Allegro, when the cellos and basses take up the introduction's theme in the middle of the storm.²³

Not only did Berlioz tell us exactly which scene from the play this timpani passage depicts, but he also alluded to where he portrayed Lear's madness in the work. In his *Memoirs* Berlioz wrote that he approved of the King of Hanover's very literal interpretation of the overture, making it clear that he was indeed thinking of specific moments from the play when composing the work. According to Berlioz, the King of Hanover said that he "followed it all, the King's entry, into his council, the storm on the heath, the terrible scene in the prison, and Cordelia's lament. Oh, this Cordelia! How you have portrayed her—such tenderness and humility. It's heart-rending, and so beautiful."²⁴ Thus the composer's approval of the King's very literal interpretation of the overture demonstrates his belief that music could be specific enough to convey a narrative. As in the case of the *King Lear Overture*, because he so openly strove to associate particular passages in his overture with specific scenes in the play, Berlioz indeed felt he could tell a story through his music.

While Berlioz believed that program music should follow the program very literally—just as an opera closely follows the plot—he stressed relentlessly that instrumental music has far more expressive capabilities than vocal music. Even though

²² Berlioz, "Preface" to *Symphonie Fantastique*, *New Berlioz Edition*, vol. 16, ed. Nicholas Temperley (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1972).

²³ Berlioz, *Correspondance Generale*, vol. 5, 601.

²⁴ Berlioz, *Memoirs*, ed. Ernest Newman (New York: Dover, 1960), 320.

many of his dramatic works contain chorus (and all but one of his Shakespearean dramatic works do), Berlioz reserved the most dramatic and meaningful moments in a program for the orchestra alone. *Roméo et Juliette*, with its alternation of choral and instrumental movements, especially reflects Berlioz's choice of instrumental music to represent the most important dramatic moments of the play, a decision openly acknowledged in the preface to the work:

The duets of love and despair are entrusted to the orchestra . . . [since] duets of this nature have been treated vocally a thousand times by the greatest masters, it was prudent as well as novel to attempt another mode of expression . . . [and] because the very sublimity of this love made its depiction so dangerous for the composer that he had to give to his fantasy a latitude that the definite meaning of sung words would never have allowed him.²⁵

A glance at the score to *Roméo et Juliette* confirms that any interaction between the young lovers is expressed by music alone. Neither Juliet nor Romeo ever utter a word in the entirety of this work. Berlioz called this type of instrumental music writing the *genre instrumental expressif*, defining it as “music which gives way to itself, needing no words to make its expression specific; its language then becomes quite indefinite, thanks to which it acquires still more power over *beings endowed with imagination*.”²⁶ Thus, the “sublime life dreamed of by poets” could become a reality.²⁷

What this *genre instrumental expressif* was capable of depicting remains unclear to scholars today as it did in Berlioz's own mind. In his 1832 essay, “De l'Imitation Musicale,” Berlioz pondered music's ability to imitate, contending that two types of

²⁵ Berlioz, “*Avant-propos*” to *Roméo et Juliette*, in *New Berlioz Edition*, vol.18, 383.

²⁶ Berlioz, on the “*genre instrumental expressif*” from *Le Correspondant*, 22 October 1832; quoted in Julian Ruston, *Roméo et Juliette* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 90.

imitation in music exist: physical and emotional. While he acknowledged the value of physical or direct imitation because it can be used as a means to achieve emotional imitation, Berlioz regarded the emotional imitation of the extra-musical as the way to achieve true expression in music, ultimately lifting music high above the other arts.²⁸ While Berlioz had very precise ideas of how to effect expression in music, he was less convinced about what subject matter from an extra-musical source could be expressed, questioning how the soundless could be expressed with sounds. Two solutions (or at least two trains of thought) emerge from Berlioz's various discussions of the type of subject matter music could depict. First and foremost, Berlioz claimed to draw only upon those scenes and situations from literature that "inherently lent themselves to musical representation"²⁹ for emotional imitation. However, when the depictive powers of the *instrumental expressif* have been surpassed, physical imitation or words—whether sung, recited, or read—must be brought into the composition to fill in gaps in meaning left by the abstract nature of instrumental music.³⁰ Berlioz openly acknowledged that "music cannot replace the word,"³¹ and as Berlioz's dramatic music testifies, words do play a surprisingly prominent role in the compositions of a composer who exalted the expressive powers of instrumental music. For example the symphonic works, *Lélio* and *Roméo et Juliette*, contain extensive choral movements.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Niecks, 224.

²⁹ Berlioz, "De l'Imitation Musicale," 1832; quoted in Jeffrey Langford, "The 'Dramatic Symphonies' of Berlioz as an Outgrowth of the French Operatic Tradition," *Musical Quarterly* 69 (Winter 1983): 54.

³⁰ Berlioz; quoted in Niecks, 224. Niecks does not cite a source for this quote.

³¹ Berlioz, in a footnote appended to the text of the *Symphonie fantastique* Program used at a concert in 1836; quoted in Nicholas Temperly, "The *Symphonie fantastique* and its Program," *Musical Quarterly* 57 (1971): 603.

Berlioz typically used chorus and words when he wanted to relay factual information from the plot. While the inclusion of this material was necessary for the conveyance of the overall plot structure, these choral sections never function as emotional zeniths. For example, the text of the “Prologue” from *Roméo et Juliette* outlines the dramatic action of the play, essentially setting the stage for the play that will be acted out by the orchestra. The first stanza that the chorus sings efficiently conveys the background information that is necessary to the understanding of the rest of the play.

Ancient slumbering hates
Have risen up as if from hell.
Capulets, Montagues, two enemy clans,
Have crossed blades in Verona.
However, the Prince has suppressed
These bloody riots,
Threatening death for any who,
 Despite his orders,
Again have recourse to the justice of the sword.

While this text conveys none of the intense emotion associated with the rest of the play, it is integral to setting up the drama that will be depicted instrumentally.

Words, both spoken and sung, take on an even greater role in *Lélio*. This mix of music and discourse—which Berlioz called a “mélologue,”³² relays the very detailed, specific story of the artist from who returns to life after the tumultuous events of the *Symphonie fantastique*. Like *Roméo et Juliette*, *Lélio* is an instrumental work that contains choral passages that narrate a program. For example, the chorus in “Fantasie sur la Tempête de Shakespeare” outlines and comments upon the more dramatic moments of the Shakespearean play that are depicted by the orchestra in subsections “La tempête,”

³² Berlioz, in a letter to Mme Leseur, July 2, 1831; quoted in Peter Bloom, “A Return to Berlioz’s *Retour à la Vie*,” *Musical Quarterly* 64 (1978): 354.

“L’action,” and “Le dénouement.” The opening choral section of the “Tempete”

movement illustrates this function:

Miranda! Miranda!
 He comes who is destined to be your spouse;
 you will know what love is,
 Miranda!
 For you, there will be the dawn
 of a new life.
 Miranda! Addio!

This text prepares the listener for the “storm” that brews in the following instrumental section, subtitled, “La Tempete.” Of course it is the consequences of this storm that eventually grant Miranda her freedom and new life. Without this text, though, the significance of the storm and the overall plot would be unclear. But as one would expect of Berlioz, the very dramatic “storm” is depicted with the orchestra alone.

Lélio also contains spoken text between movements, conveying the action of the artist’s story and explaining the musical movements that precede and follow. In the spoken dialogue immediately before the “Tempete” movement, the audience learns that the piece of music that follows is a rehearsal of a composition by the artist. Just before the artist begins his rehearsal, he tells the orchestra

We’re going to rehearse my “Fantasia on Shakespeare’s *Tempest*.” Watch your conductor closely; only that way will you get the wiry, precise, exact ensemble that even the best orchestras achieve only rarely.

Without this interpolated spoken dialogue in the work, the listener would never know that the “Tempete” movement is really a work within a work. This type of exactness could never be achieved by orchestral music alone.

Berlioz’s use of chorus in movements of these two works indicates that while he used instruments to represent the most dramatic and inherently musical material, he

frequently employed texts—whether spoken or sung—to particularize these emotions. For Berlioz, who exalted the expressive capabilities of music above all other arts, that which was emotional could be musical. But to fully comprehend and appreciate it, this emotion had to be placed in a context. “Music alone could not provide a set of images specific enough to suit his purpose”—to tell the story of something that had profoundly affected him.³³ Thus, for Berlioz, the rest of the story had to be included in the musical composition, and this “rest of the story” is what he often assigned to the chorus. Through this process of conveying both the “musical” and the “nonmusical,” Berlioz created dramatic compositions that closely follow, or in using his own words, “imitate,” an entire extra-musical program.

While Berlioz drew upon extra-musical sources to further the expressive capabilities of his music, Liszt sought out literary programs for his compositions because he had more philosophical aspirations concerning the future of orchestral music and the arts. Through his music Liszt felt he could revolutionize not only the accepted aesthetic standards, but also Western humanity’s ability to communicate feeling. Because Liszt’s compositional intentions were broader than Berlioz’s, Liszt conveyed literary programs more generally in his compositions.

As is the case with Berlioz, Liszt’s ideas on program music shed light on our understanding of how and why he sought to revolutionize music. Central to Liszt’s ideas about program music was his contention that drawing upon poetry and literature added meaning and feeling to his compositions. For Liszt, music

presents at one and the same time the intensity and the expression of feeling; it is the embodied and intelligible essence of feeling; capable of

³³ Ibid., 601.

being apprehended by our senses it permeates them like a dart, like a ray, like a dew, like a spirit, and fills our soul.³⁴

Thus, because music embodied feeling, giving musical utterance to literary works was a way for Liszt to express his own experience with the other arts. In the preface to the earliest edition of the “*Suisse*” volume of the *Années de pèlerinage*, Liszt hinted at the purpose of his programmatic compositions.

I have latterly traveled through many new countries, have seen many different places, and visited many a spot hallowed by history and poetry; I have felt that the varied aspects of nature, and the different incidents associated with them, did not pass before my eyes like meaningless pictures, but that they evoked profound emotions within my soul; that a vague but direct affinity was established between them and myself, a real though indefinable, a sure but inexplicable means of communication, *and I have tried to give musical utterance to some of my strongest sensations, some of my liveliest impressions* [my italics].³⁵

The number of programmatic compositions in Liszt’s oeuvre demonstrates that he felt that music had enormous expressive capabilities, especially if it could convey such abstract qualities such as the composer’s feelings about a particular subject. Liszt did acknowledge, though, that music cannot literally imitate art or life.

It is obvious that things which can appear only objectively to perception can in no way furnish connecting points to music; the poorest of apprentice landscape painters could give with a few chalk strokes a more faithful picture than a musician operating with all the resources of the best orchestras. But if these same things are subjectivated to dreaming, to contemplation, to emotional uplift, have they not a kinship with music, and should not music be able to *translate them into its mysterious language?*” [my italics]³⁶

³⁴ Liszt, “Berlioz und seine *Harold-Symphonie*” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 43 (1855), in *Source Readings in Music History: The Romantic Era*, ed. Oliver Strunk (New York: W.W., Norton, 1965), 109.

³⁵ Quoted in Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years, 1848-1861* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989), 358.

In his article “Robert Schumann’s *Klavierkompositionen*” Liszt relayed a similar sentiment, adamantly expressing that the other arts have more power than music to specifically depict objects. Once again Liszt stated that a painter’s brush has more definitive power in picturing a landscape than pages and pages of music.³⁷ Nowhere did he state that music could represent specific objects or events. In fact, he seemed to have thought this notion to be absurd. “Nobody thinks of writing music so ridiculous as that which they call picturesque.”³⁸

Liszt’s music reflects his belief that music could not depict specifics because his programmatic compositions only depict the extra-musical in a very general sense. His symphonic poems do not recreate scene-by-scene musical commentaries of their literary sources. The composer himself stated that this type of extra-musical depiction should not be the goal of a symphonic poem.

The purpose and goal of a poem is no longer the representation of a main character’s actions, but rather of affects which take place in his soul. It is far more important to show how the hero feels than how he behaves, and for that reason only a minimum of facts are needed to show how this or that emotion holds sway in him.³⁹

Modern scholars also believe that Liszt’s symphonic poems only depict the programmatic very generally:

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Discussed in Arthur Ware Locke, *Music and the Romantic Movement in France* (New York: Books for Libraries Press, Books for Libraries Press, 1920); reprint, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972), 157 (page citations are to the reprint edition). Locke does not provide a citation for this quote.

³⁸ Liszt; quoted in Niecks, 278. Niecks does not cite a source for this quotation.

³⁹ Liszt, “Berlioz und seine Haroldsymphonie,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 43 (1855), in *Source Readings in Music History*, 25.

[Liszt] was not fundamentally interested in describing extra-musical scenes or objects, but rather in translating into music the emotions and sentiments attached to the subjects of his symphonic poems. In his concern with the universal rather than the particular, with the contemplation of passive or poetic ideas rather than depiction of external events, Liszt is markedly different from the narrative style of Berlioz or the tone-painting of [Richard] Strauss.⁴⁰

Liszt also drew upon literary sources in his compositions because he had a larger agenda. The composition of programmatic pieces was one way in which Liszt could drastically alter the Western European symphonic tradition. He felt that orchestral music in Germany had become too formulaic and prescriptive and consequently was disenchanted with the model sonata forms advocated by A.B. Marx and Czerny, blaming these forms for changing “quite respectable people into *formulae*.”⁴¹ Therefore, Liszt took it upon himself to rescue German music from the “slough of mediocrity in which it was wallowing.”⁴² His answer was the invention of a new genre—the symphonic poem.

As a leading proponent of Romanticism, Liszt subscribed to the movement’s ideals of seeking liberation from normal formal constraints. As discussed in Chapter 2, dramatic writers had shed the constraints of time, space, and action espoused by the classicism of the previous generation. Claiming that geniuses “create new forms for new ideas, new skins for new wine,” and that they should seek out the “new and bold” and “unusual and intricate combinations,”⁴³ Liszt, in his critique of Berlioz’s *Harold en Italie*, praised composers of programmatic music (Berlioz especially) for not letting traditional forms govern their works:

⁴⁰ Derek Watson, *Liszt* (London: J.M.Dent and Sons, 1989), 186.

⁴¹ La Mara, *Letters of Liszt* 1:273 (letter 154, to Louis Köhler, 9 July 1856); quoted in Hamilton, 143.

⁴² Hamilton, 143.

Even though these [programmatic] works violate the rules, in that they destroy the hallowed frame which has devolved upon the symphony; even though they offend the ear, in that in the expression of their content they do not remain within the prescribed musical dikes; it will be none the less impossible to ignore them later on as one ignores them now, with the apparent intention of exempting oneself from tribute, from homage, toward a contemporary.⁴⁴

Liszt similarly abandoned the constraints of sonata form in own his music, fashioning his thirteen symphonic poems after another work of art, most often drawing upon literature for his sources. These sources include Hugo's *Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne* and "Mazeppa" from *Les Orientales*, Herder's *Prometheus*, Byron's *Tasso*, Lamartine's *Les Préludes*, and Goethe's *Faust*. In Liszt's late symphonic poems especially, the poetic idea of their corresponding literary works guided the musical form. In many cases, any change, return, or modification of a musical motive in a symphonic poem was subject to its relation to the development of a poetic idea rather than to purely musical considerations. Listeners have wrestled with this uniqueness in formal approach. After hearing a performance of a symphonic poem, Richard Wagner wrote that "one might be bewildered by their form when comparing the tone poems with the things we have been accustomed to."⁴⁵ A more modern interpretation also recognizes the innovation expressed by Wagner: "Through the observance of this principle Liszt sought to free his music from the schematicism of 'classical' form and to open up for it

⁴³ Liszt, "Berlioz und seine *Harold-Symphonie*," in *Gesammelte Schriften*, IV 47-69; quoted in Hepokoski, 433.

⁴⁴ Liszt, "Berlioz und seine *Harold-Symphonie*," in *Source Readings in Music History*, 108.

unlimited possibilities of formal design.”⁴⁶ As a result of this free approach to form, Liszt’s symphonic poems vary in size and in form. While *Hamlet* lasts only ten minutes, *Ce qu’on entend sur las montagne* takes forty minutes to perform. While some symphonic poems loosely resemble the four-movement structure of a symphony through contrasts in mood and tempo, others such as *Les Préludes* transform a single motive, by placing it in different musical contexts. Thus, Liszt turned to the other arts, especially literature and poetry, which could guide him in creating a new form different from that of his more traditional predecessors.

Besides using literature to revolutionize the accepted formal processes of music, Liszt also drew upon literary forms because he wanted to create an art that had more meaning than absolute music. As discussed in Chapter 3, many Romantics, including Liszt, were proficient in other art forms. L. A. Whitesell contends that these well-rounded artists were a direct result of the Romantic desire to tear down any constraining barriers. While this desire undoubtedly manifested itself first within single art forms, it also had ramifications for the arts as a whole. Whitesell claims that in the nineteenth century, the boundaries of arts were no longer sovereign and presents Robert Schumann’s statement

⁴⁵ Richard Wagner, “On Franz Liszt’s Symphonic Poems,” in *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, 242.

⁴⁶ Constantin Floros, “Die Faust-Symphonie von Franz Liszt: Eine semantische Analyse,” *Musik-Konzepte 12: Franz Liszt* (Munich, 1980), 50; quoted in Richard Kaplan, “Sonata Form in the Orchestral Works of Liszt: The Revolutionary Reconsidered,” *19th-Century Music* 8 (1984): 143. Kaplan himself also states, “It is the long-standing consensus concerning Liszt’s symphonic poems, then, that in them he repudiated traditional forms, and created new, unique structures based on the programs of the individual.”

that “the aesthetic principle is the same in every art; only the material differs” as evidence.⁴⁷ Many other Romantics espoused similar sentiments, also calling for a unity of the arts. For example, Frederick Schlegel expressed his plans for the development of an “Universalpoesie,” in which he intended

to unite all the divided genres of poetry, and to set poetry in relationship to philosophy and rhetoric. It has as its goals the combining and fusing of poetry and prose, genius and criticism, art-poetry and folk-poetry, making poetry alive and social, and making life and society poetic.⁴⁸

E. T. A Hoffmann also discussed the benefits of blending the arts, focusing on music in particular. He believed that Romantics could realize their goal of touching the outer, more ideal world through music because it

reveals to man an unknown realm, a world quite separate from the outer sensual world surrounding him, a world in which he leaves behind all feelings circumscribed by intellect in order to embrace the inexpressible.⁴⁹

Thus, by unifying a tangible art of the real world—such as literature—with music, the constraints of the physical world could be suspended. According to Hoffmann, once this other realm has been reached, the artist can bring back something marvelous and beautiful to the real world, thus helping to give people an art to “readily believe in” and ultimately allow them to wander in this blissful “Romantic land.”⁵⁰

Like F. Schlegel, Schumann, and Hoffman, Liszt too believed the modern composer should seek inspiration in literature and art because the other arts “inhabit a

⁴⁷ L.A. Whitesell, “E.T.A. Hoffmann and Robert Schumann: The Blending of Music and Literature in German Romanticism” *Journal of the American Liszt Society* 13 (1983): 75. Whitesell states that the Schumann quote is from the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* but offers no specific issue or date.

⁴⁸ F. Schlegel, *Athenaeum* I, 2, 204; quoted in Whitesell, 74.

⁴⁹ E.T.A. Hoffmann, *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 12 (4 and 11 July 1810); translated in David Charlton, ed., *E.T.A. Hoffmann's Musical Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 236.

similar emotional world, even though they may express that world in very different ways.”⁵¹ According to Liszt, art, like nature,

is made up of gradual transmissions, which link together the remotest classes and the most dissimilar species and which are necessary and natural, hence also entitled to live. Just as there are in nature no gaps, just as the human soul consists not also in contrasts, so between the mountain peaks of art there yawn no steep abysses.⁵²

Liszt felt that music and literature particularly, “more than ever before, are mutually attracted” and “striving for inner union”⁵³ that would be the most intimate combination of art forms ever.⁵⁴ By intertwining literature and painting with music, Liszt felt he could bring unity to the arts by reconciling the different ways the different arts express, ultimately creating a new type of art that could represent the innermost ideal of art: to express the soul.

What one thinks of, what the strong men have thought of, and will always think of, is to impress music more and more with poetry in order to render it the organ of that part of the soul which, if one may believe those who have felt, loved, and suffered strongly, defies analysis and does not admit of the settled and definite expression of the human language.⁵⁵

Like Hoffman, Schlegel, and Schumann, expressing the soul through this “infinite art,” takes us beyond “this miserable, paltry, earthly shell,” and opens up to us the “meadows of infinity,” and the “murmuring springs of delight,” and “sweeps us into the maelstrom of the passions which carries us out of the world into the harbor of a more beautiful

⁵⁰ Hoffmann, *Der Dichter und der Komponist* II, 83; quoted in Whitesell, 83.

⁵¹ Walker, 358.

⁵² Liszt, “Berlioz und seine *Harold-Symphonie*,” in *Source Readings in Music History*, 112.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 130.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 128. By other art forms, Liszt implies song and opera specifically.

⁵⁵ Liszt; quoted in Niecks, 278. Niecks does not cite a source for this quotation.

life.”⁵⁶ For Liszt, music based on literary works was simply more meaningful and closer to nature. By uniting a piece of music with a literary work, he thought he could create a new art form that could speak uniformly to more people, insuring that only one interpretation would occur to his listeners—the composer’s impressions about a work of art. “With the help of a program, the composer indicates the direction of his ideas, the point of view from which he grasps a give subject.”⁵⁷ Through his works could listeners experience the beauty of the Romantic, idealized world.

Ultimately Berlioz and Liszt’s different goals behind programmatic compositions affected both the type and style of their Shakespearean compositions. While both composers heralded Beethoven as their predecessor in the composition of dramatic music, they interpreted the concept of drama in their music very differently. Berlioz composed music based on literary sources that had affected him personally and consequently adhered more strictly to the form and plot of the literary source. By depicting instances from literary works that were the most dramatic and therefore inherently musical and by using chorus to physically imitate moments that could not be represented musically, Berlioz recreated and added meaning to something that had moved him deeply. This something was often Shakespeare. Liszt, on the other hand sought out literary sources to serve as models for a new type of musical genre, the symphonic poem, because he wanted to create more modern sounding music, leaving behind the prescriptive forms of his predecessors. Liszt also felt that in joining literature and music he was creating a unity in the arts that could revolutionize the way people thought about and interpreted the arts. Unlike Berlioz, Liszt was not interested in telling a beautiful,

⁵⁶ Liszt, “Berlioz und seine *Harold-Symphonie*,” in *Source Readings in Music History*, 110.

moving story. He simply wanted to create music that was more meaningful and therefore could express more feeling to its audience.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 126.

Chapter 5

Shakespeare and Musical Philosophy in *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet*

A closer look at the Shakespearean pieces composed by Berlioz and Liszt will clarify the two composers' compositional approaches. Specifically, I will examine and compare the Shakespearean piece of music to the corresponding play to determine how the Shakespearean elements are manifested in the music. For this comparison of their approaches, I have selected the two composers' most representative Shakespearean pieces. Although *Hamlet* is Liszt's only work on a Shakespearean theme, it also makes for an interesting comparison because it is the most programmatic of all the symphonic poems.¹ Choosing one Shakespearean piece by Berlioz has proven to be a more difficult decision, for pieces based on Shakespearean plays make up a substantial portion of his oeuvre. I have chosen *Roméo et Juliette* because it contains a multiplicity of approaches typical of Berlioz. Furthermore, both pieces were written late in Berlioz's and Liszt's careers, therefore representing a full development of both composers' ideas on program music. Although the differing generic natures of these two works complicate a direct formal comparison, they both clearly illustrate Berlioz and Liszt's approaches to composing program music and their different interpretations of Shakespeare.

¹ Kenneth Hamilton, "Liszt," in *The Nineteenth Century Symphony*, ed. D. Kern Holoman (New York: Schirmer Books, 1997), 145.

To determine the relationship between the music and the literary narrative in *Hamlet* and *Roméo et Juliette*, I will first compare the organization of the two pieces, paying special attention to the role traditional forms play. Then I will focus specifically on the interrelationship between the pieces and their literary sources, noting what specific extra musical elements are represented—whether they be the narrative or characters—and ultimately on how Berlioz and Liszt portrayed these in their music.

Hamlet and *Roméo et Juliette* represent polar opposites of the programmatic music spectrum, thus making a direct formal comparison of the two impossible. While the single-movement *Hamlet* takes around fifteen minutes to perform, *Roméo et Juliette*, with its four operatic act-like divisions, lasts nearly two hours. While *Hamlet*, like Liszt's other symphonic poems, is solely for orchestra, *Roméo et Juliette* is difficult to categorize generically because its intermingling of orchestra, chorus, and descriptive titles and subtitles to convey a drama. (See Table 1 for a complete list of the movements, individual scenes, and scoring.) The differing generic labels that scholars have attempted to assign to *Roméo et Juliette* demonstrates this difficulty. While Louis Ellson claims that the work is "not a symphony at all, but rather a free cantata, with much orchestral interluding, or a set of orchestral movements with vocal adjuncts,"² David Cairns states that it is a "music drama for the concert hall."³ Other scholars emphasize the operatic features of the work. Jeffrey Langford contends that *Roméo et Juliette* is as much an "opera as it as symphony"⁴ while Daniel Albright describes *Roméo et Juliette* as a

² Louis C. Elson, *Shakespeare in Music* (New York: 1901), 341; cited in Vera Micznik, "Of Ways of Telling, Intertextuality, and Historical Evidence in Berlioz's *Roméo et Juliette*" *19th Century Music* 24 (2000): 22.

³ David Cairns, "Berlioz in Verona," *Music and Musicians* 12 (April 1964): 15.

⁴ Jeffrey Langford, "The 'Dramatic Symphonies' of Berlioz as an Outgrowth of the French Operatic Tradition," *Musical Quarterly* 69 (1983): 92.

“symphony that has swallowed an opera—the opera keeps spilling out around the edges.”⁵

Liszt and Berlioz also had different approaches to realizing their program music, particularly in the area of movement form. As was discussed in the previous chapter, Liszt’s symphonic poems were revolutionary because they did not follow a prescribed, traditional form. Their forms were determined by an extra-musical idea, usually in the form of a literary source. The later symphonic poems, including *Hamlet*, show the most revolutionary approaches to form because they contain no remnants of sonata form (as some of the early ones do). *Hamlet* comprises a variety of different sections created by contrasting tempos, textures, and moods, with unity maintained through thematic transformation. (See Table 2. The programmatic titles I have assigned to the themes will be explained later in this chapter.) Liszt’s juxtaposition of two themes, both at different points within a single section and simultaneously, unifies the various contrasting sections of the work. This technique is especially effective when two already familiar themes are placed together. While the programmatic significance of this will be discussed later in this chapter, Liszt’s intermingling of themes serves another purely musical purpose: that of keeping his listeners’ ears attuned most closely to the melodic content of his composition. Unlike in a traditional sonata form, harmonic motion does not figure prominently into the form of this work. Although Liszt’s harmonic language is clearly chromatic and adventuresome, thus making the tonal areas somewhat vague, he continually returns to the key area of B minor. Thus, the statement, development, and

⁵ Daniel Albright, *Berlioz’s Semi-Operas: Roméo et Juliette and La Damnation of Faust* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2001), 47.

transformation of thematic material serve as structural guideposts in understanding this work, rather than movement away from and back to the tonic key.

Despite its generic ambiguity as a whole, *Roméo et Juliette*, unlike *Hamlet*, does employ many traditional forms. Many scholars contend that the overall structure of the work resembles a four-movement symphony in the tradition of Beethoven's Ninth. Despite its extraneous movements—the prologue, strophes, Juliet's funeral march, and the programmatic tomb scene—the basic outline of the other movements—*Roméo seul*, *Scène d'amour*, *Queen Mab Scherzo*, and the finale—create a fast, slow, scherzo, chorale finale sequence respectively. Furthermore, these four “symphonic” movements are, in many instances, in the traditional form expected of their respective places in a symphony. For example, the “first” movement, *Roméo seul*, is in sonata form. *La Reine Mab* is a scherzo much in the tradition of Beethoven. In other instances, forms are not as clear cut, but nevertheless still resemble aspects of traditional forms, such as in the *Scene d'amour*, which contains elements of both sonata and rondo forms. (See pages 76-83 for a discussion of that movement.)

Now that I have identified the overall structures of the two works, the next step in recognizing the two composers' different compositional approaches is seeing how their ideas about musical expression discussed in the previous chapter are actually manifested in *Hamlet* and *Roméo et Juliette*. At the heart of Liszt's conception of program music lie two conflicting philosophies: As was discussed in chapter four, he believed that while music composed after literary works was more meaningful than absolute music, music at the same time was incapable of expressing anything specific. The interrelation of music and program in *Hamlet* offers insight into Liszt's seemingly contradictory approach to

composing programmatic works. Although Liszt evidently did not believe that his composition could depict anything so specific as the actual plot of the Shakespearean tragedy, the symphonic poem nevertheless is saturated with extra-musical meaning. In *Hamlet* Liszt focused his compositional efforts on one general aspect of Shakespeare's work—the transformation of the character of Hamlet.

The most substantial piece of evidence supporting Liszt's intention not to mirror the plot of *Hamlet* in his symphonic poem comes from Liszt himself. According to Liszt's student, Lina Ramaan, Liszt, while sitting with her in a performance of *Hamlet*, whispered to her that the opening motive was the musical utterance of Hamlet's most famous line "To be or not to be?"⁶ (see example 1 and table 2).⁷ What is significant about this statement is that this motive occurs in the first two measures of the musical work and therefore demonstrates that Liszt clearly was not following the sequence of events portrayed in the play, because Hamlet's soliloquy does not occur until the first scene of act III. Instead, with this motive Liszt has illustrated the defining moment in Hamlet's—the hero's—character. In his soliloquy Hamlet ponders whether he should take action against his uncle to avenge the murder of his father. In this moment he makes the decision to seek revenge, a decision that shapes the events in the rest of the play. In "setting" this particular line of text, Liszt sets the stage for the psychological drama that Hamlet will experience and for the subsequent transformation of his character.

⁶ Lina Ramaan, *Lisztiana*, ed. Arthur Seidl (Mainz, 1983), 258. Although past scholars have ignored Ramaan's biographies and interpretations as unreliable, current scholars, such as Kenneth Hamilton, claim that Ramaan's accounts are in fact accurate. Hamilton, 145.

⁷ All musical examples from *Hamlet* are from the 1976 Ernst Eulenburg study score, edited by Humphrey Searle.

Other scholars certainly have attempted to identify specific programmatic elements in *Hamlet*, but Hamilton is the only one who uses Ramaan's account as evidence.⁸ Although Edward Murphy contends that this opening material represents Hamlet's brooding, he does not state that it is a setting of the first line of the "To Be" soliloquy, nor does he mention Ramaan's anecdote.⁹ Lawrence Casler simply labels this passage as an introduction that sets the gloomy stage for rest of the piece.¹⁰ The differing interpretations of this opening already demonstrate a divergence both between existing analyses and between these analyses and my own interpretation.

Having thus established the initial character of Hamlet through his portrayal of the vacillating soliloquy, Liszt then illustrates the transformation of Hamlet's character with thematic transformation. As discussed above, Liszt, after stating his primary themes once, restated them throughout the composition in a variety of guises. This process of thematic transformation allowed Liszt to create sections of music that are contrasting but at the same time unified through their similar melodic content. The transformation of these themes in the symphonic poem corresponds to the transformation of Hamlet's character in the course of the play's events. Although not thematically derived from the first theme (the "To Be" motive), the second melodic idea (see example 2, labeled as B in Table 2) also portrays an aspect of Hamlet's change in character. With its gradual increase in speed, instrumentation, ascending chromatic line, and volume, this passage accompanies Hamlet's rise to action. Accompanying the B theme and this rise to action

⁸ I thank Kenneth Hamilton for pointing out this crucial piece of evidence to me. Much of my interpretation of *Hamlet* was inspired by his own thoughts on the work.

⁹ Edward W. Murphy, "A Detailed Program for Liszt's *Hamlet*," *The Journal of the American Liszt Society* 29 (Jan.-June 1991): 50.

¹⁰ Lawrence Casler, *Symphonic Program Music and Its Literary Sources*, Book 2 (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 414.

are chords played by the winds and upper strings that resemble the A material harmonically and thematically. As we hear this A theme transformed in the context of the B theme, we are reminded of the music and soliloquy that instigated this new material. After having answered the question asked of the first theme, Hamlet is now preparing himself for action. The entrance of the third theme (see example 3, labeled as C and “Hamlet” in Table 2) represents Hamlet in all his heroic grandeur. Despite their very different interpretations of this work, Hamilton, Murphy, and Casler all herald this second theme as indicative of Hamlet’s heroic character. While Hamilton refers to this melodic material as Hamlet’s “noble” or “action” theme,¹¹ Casler contends that it “represents the more intense and violent aspects of Hamlet’s personality.”¹² Murphy repeatedly refers to this thematic material as “Hamlet’s music” throughout his analysis.¹³

One of the reasons why scholars believe the *Hamlet* symphonic poem to be more programmatic than the others is because of Liszt’s reference to Ophelia’s entrance in a footnote in the score.¹⁴ Liszt’s note accompanies the introduction of a new section of music that returns in mood and texture to the opening material.¹⁵ Continuing to interpret events as representations of specific events from the play, scholars have subsequently labeled this section as Ophelia’s music. While I do not deny Liszt’s association of Ophelia with this section of music, I would like to propose a slightly different interpretation of this passage that again reflects Liszt’s stated intentions about what his music depicts.

¹¹ Hamilton, 150.

¹² Casler, 414.

¹³ Murphy, 47-60.

¹⁴ Liszt’s footnote at m. 160 states: “Dieser Zwischensatz 3/2 Takt, soll äusserst ruhig gehalten sein und wie ein Schattenbild erklingen, auf Ophelia hindeutend.”

The purpose and goal of a poem is no longer the representation of a main character's actions, but rather of affects which take place in his soul. It is far more important to show how the hero feels than how he behaves, and for that reason only a minimum of facts are needed to show how this or that emotion holds sway in him.¹⁶

Thus, my interpretation of this "Ophelia" section will revolve not around actual events from the plot—the "character's actions," but instead around "how the hero feels and "how this or that emotion holds sway in him."

The introduction of this Ophelia music is reminiscent of the opening of the work, not only because of its return to a similar instrumentation, dynamic level, and tempo of the "To Be" motive, but also because it recalls the movement resolution of seconds out to thirds found in the opening theme (see example 4, labeled as D and "Ophelia" in Table 2, compare to example 1). Like in the first theme, the interval that permeates this section is the minor third. Also included are the ascending chromatic lines found in the opening of the work. This Ophelia material last only briefly, for fragments of Hamlet's heroic motive (the second thematic material) interrupt it before it returns again. Although Hamilton contends that Hamlet's interjections are settings of his command "Get thee to a nunnery,"¹⁷ I find that these fragmented Hamlet motives better represent the hero's conflicting emotions in regard to his love for Ophelia and his duty to avenge his father's death. After the discourse of this section is complete, it becomes obvious which path Hamlet chose, for the Hamlet heroic music silences and defeats the Ophelia theme. The Ophelia music in its exact form is never heard again in the work. With this interpretation,

¹⁵This passage was one of two interludes added by Liszt in a revised version of the score.

¹⁶Franz Liszt, "Berlioz und seine *Harold-symphonie* (1855)," in *Source Readings in Music History: The Romantic Era*, ed. Oliver Strunk (New York: W.W. Norton, 1965), 165.

the Ophelia material is not actually depicting Ophelia herself, but rather Hamlet *seeing* or *thinking* of Ophelia. Because the melodic content of the “Ophelia” music is derived from the opening “To Be” passage, interpreting this entire passage as a part of Hamlet’s psychological struggle seems plausible.

In similar fashion, most Liszt scholars contend that the climax of the symphonic poem occurs with the repeated orchestral strikes (see example 5, labeled as E and “duel” in Table 2), agreeing that this section in the music depicts a murder by the hand of Hamlet. Disputed, however, is *who* is the victim of Hamlet’s rage in this passage. Murphy contends that this entire passage depicts the duel scene and its fatal consequences for Claudius.¹⁸ Hamilton believes this music, with its “slashing chords,” sets Hamlet’s slaying of Polonius. Again, Hamilton’s argument is the most plausible because it is supported by historical evidence. According to Ramann, Liszt himself associated this climax with Polonius’s murder. While sitting in the audience during a performance of the two piano version of *Hamlet*, Ramann reported that Liszt said “The rat! The rat!” at the climax of the work. Liszt’s exclamations obviously refer to Hamlet’s line at the moment of stabbing Polonius through the curtain, “How now? A rat! Dead for a ducat, dead.”¹⁹ Regardless of who exactly has been slain here, the overall meaning conveyed is one of violence and aggression. Again, my interpretation of this passage reflects Liszt’s intention to “show how the hero feels.” Liszt’s statement to Ramann implies that this violence and aggression came from Hamlet. Whether this most violent moment for Hamlet was his slaying of Polonius in his mother’s bedroom or at the end of the play with the murder of Claudius, does not matter because both deeds are the result of

¹⁷ Hamilton, 150.

¹⁸ Murphy, 48.

Hamlet's psychological struggle to seek revenge. Violence was the path he chose to take, and it is this sentiment that Liszt choose to express musically. This passage in the music illustrates this side of Hamlet's character rather than a particular murder scene from the play.

The extra-musical implications of the funeral march that conclude the work are obvious: Because this section recalls and transforms both of the themes previously associated with Hamlet and because it occurs at the end of the work, scholars have unanimously labeled this passage as a funeral march for Hamlet. Although these literal interpretations are certainly plausible given the content, somber mood, and position of this music in the piece, they again ignore Liszt's contention that his symphonic poems depict the hero's feelings instead of the action of the plot. Because both the "Hamlet" and the "To Be" themes that I previously associated with his changing state of mind recur here in their final transformations, I propose that this section similarly represents Hamlet's final mental transformation—the one that brings about his death.

The most prominent melodic element of the funeral march is the restatement of the "Hamlet" theme in a more dirge-like and somber mood than in its original guise (shown in its original form in example 3, funeral march version example 6). What before was very fast and angry now is augmented rhythmically to create a lyrical, sweeping, and mournful gesture. Making the aural connection, though, between this final statement and its first presentation is inevitable, because not only does Liszt use the same key (b minor) and maintain the same melodic contour, but he also provides fragments of the "Hamlet" theme in its original guise just before the funeral march version begins. Although played by the clarinet and bassoon here in a much less "heroic" fashion, the restatement of

¹⁹ Hamilton, 145.

portions of the “Hamlet” material reminds us of the theme in its original syncopated statement, preparing us for its resolution in the funeral march (see example 7). However, because this material is fragmented—we are only teased with one measure snippets of the material—and because the mood of the theme is remarkably different due to its sparse instrumentation, the listener cannot help but recognize the transformation that has already taken place—both melodically and contextually.

Elements of the “To Be” motive frame and are interspersed throughout this final section as well. While a literal restatement of the “To Be” melody introduces the “Hamlet” theme of the funeral march proper, the piece concludes with one last allusion to the “To Be” motive, reusing the now familiar thirds first heard in the opening two measures (see example 8A). Liszt also recreates the mood of the “To Be” motive through the accompaniment of the timpani, which like at the very beginning of the work, accompanies the winds and creates an eerie foreboding (see example 8B). Fragments of the “To Be” material are also littered throughout the funeral march proper, sometimes juxtaposed with statements of the “Hamlet” music. For example, in the beginning of the funeral march when Liszt first recalls the fragments of the “Hamlet” material in its original rhythm (see example 7), he also alludes to elements of the “To Be” music. Although significantly different from the original statement melodically, this restatement in the strings recalls the rhythm of the “To Be” motive, most resembling the flute’s part in the opening two measures of the work. The only difference between the two is that in the funeral march version many of the rhythmic values are cut in half. Like the opening material, these fragments also begin on the last beat of the measure with a two-note slur to the downbeat of the next measure. This is then followed with a quick rest (eighth rest

in original form, sixteenth rest in funeral march version) and then a short-long gesture (eighth followed by two whole notes tied together in the original form, sixteenth followed by a quarter in the funeral march). Although not a direct quotation, the allusion to the original “To Be” theme that Liszt provides here through maintaining a similar rhythmic gesture effectively reiterates the original question that had opened the work and that we have just heard in a literal restatement immediately before the funeral march, but also how, through its encounters with the “Hamlet” action material as represented by the juxtaposition and fragmentation of the two themes in this section, it has significantly changed.

By recalling and referring to these important motives and their programmatic implications in this funeral march, Liszt not only directs the listener’s sympathy toward the fallen hero, but also continues to convey the psychological struggle that Hamlet underwent in the course of the play and in the course of the symphonic poem. Through the recurrence of the “To Be” motive, we are reminded of the question that Hamlet asked himself and the answer that ultimately led him down the path to violence (the “Hamlet” theme) and his own death (the Funeral March). By using the Hamlet theme as melodic material in a dirge, Liszt captures the bittersweet essence of Hamlet’s demise. He does avenge his father’s death and therefore, his rise to action (the “Hamlet” theme) was not for nothing. However, we are reminded because this is a funeral march that this action led to his own death. Thus, Liszt’s Shakespearean composition, in focusing exclusively on Hamlet and his various mental states rather than the action of the plot, does not simply retell a literary narrative, as we often expect to find in programmatic compositions.

An examination of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Roméo et Juliette* reveals that Berlioz chose to depict different types of extra-musical elements from his literary source than Liszt. Overall, his composition follows its literary source more faithfully than Liszt's because it narrates the action of the plot more clearly. To reach this goal, Berlioz, as discussed in the previous chapter, relied on both words and the *genre instrumental expressif*.

The most obvious way that Berlioz created the recognizable sequence of events from the Shakespeare is through the use of words. Not only did Berlioz give the various movements of *Roméo et Juliette* narrative descriptions, he also used chorus and solo singing extensively. Because he used texts, both written and sung, Berlioz could clearly convey action and events from the play, making it easy for the listener to follow the plot. (Refer to Table 1 again for the list of movements and their descriptive titles.) A focused examination of the *Scène d'amour* will illustrate the degree of specificity that Berlioz achieved through words. Berlioz offers the following description at the beginning of the movement that the audience could follow in their copies of the concert program: "Nuit sereine—Le Jardin de Capulet silencieux. Les jeunes Capulets sortant de la fete, passent en chantant des réminiscences de la musique du bal. Juliette sur balcon et Roméo dans l'ombre. Scène d'amour. Orchestre seul." These titles leave no doubt that the music of this movement is the famous balcony scene between Romeo and Juliet. From Berlioz's written description we also learn that the scene takes place on a peaceful night in the Capulet family's deserted garden, and also that the other Capulets are singing in the background on their way home from the ball. With these "stage directions" in mind, the listener can then pinpoint these elements as the music proceeds.

As the title suggests, the ‘Nuit sereine,’ begins very quietly and peacefully with little rhythmic or harmonic motion. Sustained, *pianissimo* chords played by the strings and flute convey a general sense of stillness and slumber, clearly establishing the setting and mood of the remainder of the movement (see example 9).²⁰ Out of the midst of this “Nuit sereine,” arise the voices of the singing Capulets. Once this mood has been established, Berlioz turns the spotlight on the lovers. Suddenly the voices drop out and the orchestra takes over for the remainder of the movement, pouring out some of the most remarkable and memorable melodies of all of Berlioz’s oeuvre. The “scène d’amour” has begun.

While Berlioz’s written description offers the listener a narrative outline for the movement, sung words also play a role in conveying specific meanings. For example, the text of the singing Capulets described above provides several key bits of information:

Yo, Capulets, good night!
 Yo, goodnight, boys, ciao for now!
 Ah, what a night, what a ball!
 What a fabulous dance.
 What crazy talk . . .
 Lovely girls of Verona
 Underneath those high larch-tress,
 Go dream of dancing and love
 Till dawn comes.
 Tra la la la!
 What a great party . . .
 Dames of Verona . . .
 Go dream of dancing and love.²¹

²⁰ All musical examples for *Scène d’amour* are from the *New Berlioz Edition*, vol. 18. Edited by D. Kern Holoman. London: Bärenreiter, 1990.

²¹ This translation comes Julian Rushton, *Berlioz: Roméo et Juliette*, Cambridge Music Handbooks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 35. Rushton provides no source for this translation, so I assume it is his own.

This choral section of the movement not only reinforces the mood of the blissful and dreamy night, but it also provides pertinent information to the plot, such as the city where the story takes place and the name of one of the families involved. We are also reminded that a festive ball given by the Capulets has just ended. Sung texts such as this leave no doubt in the hearer's mind exactly where in the course of the play the music has reached.

Through the use of words in the *Scène d'amour* Berlioz guides our interpretations of his work by referring to specific moments in the play as well as particular circumstances of scenes, such as the setting. However, focusing entirely on the titles and descriptions of movements and the text for the choral passages will only reveal one side of Berlioz's efforts to convey meaning in the work. Berlioz's instrumental passages are also saturated with extra-musical meaning—that is, through the use of *genre instrumental expressif*. Starting with the knowledge that this instrumental section of the *Scène d'amour* represents the famous balcony scene between Romeo and Juliet, most scholars interpret the “*Scène d'amour*” literally: all believe that the music conveys the passionate conversation between the characters. Despite the common ground in which they all start, though, these interpretations diverge almost as soon as the instrumental section begins. A brief examination of analyses by Julian Rushton and Ian Kemp will illustrate these discrepancies.

Rushton contends that Berlioz used thematic material and orchestration to convey Romeo and Juliet's conversation. As the “*scène d'amour*” proper proceeds, a dialogue occurs between two ranges of instruments, each of which has its own theme. While high woodwinds often speak the voice of Juliet, cellos and horns often respond as Romeo. Although Rushton states that the music does not convey the specifics of the characters'

dialogue, he does nevertheless contend that Berlioz followed the framework of Shakespeare's scene, citing places in the music that he believes correspond to passages in the play. For example, he states that the musical scene opens with Juliet's opening soliloquy (example 10) and soon after is answered by Romeo in the cello, from the shadows down in the garden (example 11). After a repeat of all this thematic material (and subsequently, Romeo and Juliet's conversation), a change in tempo and mood interrupt the previous thematic material (example 12)—an event that Rushton believes "reflect[s] Juliet's startled response at finding herself addressed with words of love from the darkness" ("I take thee at thy word. Call me but love, that, thus bescreen'd in night, So stumblest on my counsel?").²² Thus, Rushton does in fact connect specific moments in the musical scene with specific moments within the balcony scene.

Kemp applies a similar method in his analysis of the "Scène d'amour," going one step further than Rushton by linking nearly all the musical events to specific lines from the play.²³ An examination of his analysis of this opening section reveals the type of specificity that he maintains the music conveys and also differences in his interpretation from Rushton's. Unlike Rushton, who contends that the opening thematic material represents Juliet's opening soliloquy (example 10), Kemp proposes that this music is a setting of *Romeo's* first lines in the scene as he watches Juliet underneath her balcony:

But soft! What light through yonder window breaks?
It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.
Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,
Who is already sick and pale with grief,
That thou her maid art far more fair than she:
Be not her amid, since she is snvious;
Her vestal livery is but sick and green

²² Ibid.

²³ Ian Kemp, "Romeo and Juliet and *Roméo et Juliette*," in *Berlioz Studies*, ed. Peter Bloom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 65-66.

And none but fools do wear it; cast it off.
 It is my lady, O, it is my love!
 O, that she knew she were!
 She speaks, yet she says nothing: what of that?
 Her eye discourses; I will answer it.
 I am too bold, 'tis not to me she speaks:
 Two of the fairest stars in all the heaven,
 Having some business, do entreat her eyes
 To twinkle in their spheres till they return.
 What if her eyes were there, they in her head?
 The brightness of her cheek would shame those stars,
 As daylight doth a lamp, her eyes in heaven
 Would through the airy region stream so bright
 That birds would sing and think it were not night.
 See, how she leans her cheek upon her hand!
 O, that I were a glove upon that hand,
 That I might touch that cheek!²⁴

Continuing in this fashion, Kemp contends that the contrasting melodic material that follows this opening section (example 11) represents Romeo's speech just after he has heard Juliet sigh, "Ay me."

O speak again, bright angel! for thou art
 As glorious to this night, being o'er my head.
 Unto the white-upturned wondering eyes
 Of mortals that fall back to gaze on him
 When he bestrides the lazy-pacing clouds
 And sails upon the bosom of the air.²⁵

Although both Rushton and Kemp propose that this aforementioned melodic material represents Romeo (even when it returns to conclude this opening section), their interpretations of the return of the opening music (first statement in example 10) differ, illustrating that while Rushton associates melodic material consistently with the same characters, Kemp's analysis is based on the dialogue from the play. While Rushton labels this music consistently as the Juliet theme, Kemp, who previously associated this

²⁴ William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, Act 2, Scene 2, lines 1-25, in *The Unabridged William Shakespeare*, ed. William George Clark and William Aldis Wright (London: Running Press, 1989), 892.

theme in its first statement with Romeo's opening dialogue, connects this return of the opening material with Juliet and more specifically with her famous soliloquy "O Romeo, Romeo! Wherefore art thou Romeo?"²⁶

Rushton and Kemp's varying interpretations of this movement illustrate not only the degree of difficulty in attempting to attach specific extra-musical meaning to instrumental music but also that Berlioz's *genre instrumental expressif* here has met its goal: it lends itself to interpretation by those "beings endowed with imagination."²⁷ Whether these scholars are correct in their linking of specific passages of Berlioz's music with the corresponding passages from the Shakespeare is beside the point, though; because both believe that Berlioz's purely instrumental depiction of this scene closely follows the narrative of the balcony scene from the play. As discussed in Chapter 4, Berlioz did want his programmatic music to be specific—with and without words. The type of specificity that these scholars propose does not reflect Berlioz's ideas on what the *genre instrumental expressif* could convey, because their interpretations attach words to music (either through something relayed in the play or dialogue) that was meant to be understood and more importantly *felt* without language. In other words, Rushton and Kemp both seem to start with the Shakespearean scene in mind and try to make the Berlioz scene fit into that framework. While I believe that Berlioz does indeed convey specific meaning here, I propose that the way to divulge this meaning is through finding out what the music itself suggests. Because Berlioz used words in so many other movements of *Roméo et Juliette* and in many other instances throughout his

²⁵ Shakespeare, lines 26-32, 892.

²⁶ Ibid., lines 37-40.

²⁷ Berlioz on the "genre instrumental expressif" from *Le Correspondant*, 22 October 1832; quoted in Rushton, 90.

programmatic oeuvre to convey specific details from a narrative, the use of strictly instrumental music in this most important scene must be significant. I assume that because there are no words in the “Scène d’amour,” this is one of those literary moments that according to Berlioz “inherently lent [itself] to musical representation,” and I conclude that this instrumental section must be interpreted as a representation of the type of “emotional imitation” that Berlioz reserved solely for the *genre instrumental expressif* (see Chapter 4, footnote 29). In the preface to the work, which was originally printed in the libretto available at the 1839 performance, Berlioz explained his reasons for setting the “Scène d’amour” instrumentally:

In the celebrated scenes in the orchard and the cemetery, the two lovers’ dialogue, the asides of Juliet and passionate declarations of Romeo are not *sung*—in fact, the duets of love and despair are confined to the orchestra. The many reasons for this are easy to grasp. First (and this would be sufficient justification of its own), this is a symphony, not an opera. Moreover, the greatest composers have produced thousands of *vocal* duets of this kind; it seemed prudent as much as singular to try some other way of doing it. Then there is the very sublimity of this love, whose depiction by a musician is fraught with peril; his invention should be allowed the scope which the exact sense of sung words restrains, but which is possible in such circumstances with instrumental music, richer, more varied, less restricted, and thanks to its very indefiniteness, incomparably more powerful.²⁸

Thus, I propose an analysis of the “Scène d’amour” that meets the music on its own terms and not of those of the play: This movement is only specifically programmatic when placed and analyzed in its relationship to the larger work.

Before this relationship can be determined, though, the music itself must be examined, paying special attention to Berlioz’s use of form, which is in itself a purely musical feature. The recurring themes in the “Scène d’amour” delineate a form, that, unlike Liszt’s, also relies on tonality and tempo, creating the types of contrasts that, as

was discussed in Chapter 4, Berlioz deemed necessary to convey expression. (See Table 3 for my complete analysis of this movement.) The first section of the “Scène d’amour” proper, with its two themes (first statements in examples 10 and 11) and modulation from A major to C major, resembles the exposition section of any contemporary sonata form. The “development” section begins after a strong cadence to C Major and an abrupt change to a faster tempo (shown in example 12). With yet another change in tempo and return to A major and a restatement of the B theme from the “exposition,” but not before a trip through F sharp minor and the introduction of yet another theme (see example 13, labeled as “D” in Table 3), Berlioz seems to have arrived at a recapitulation. However, this final section, with its episodic subsections and modulations, yields another form of its own—a rondo. While the rondo theme still uses the now very familiar B theme from the “exposition” and D material from the third section, they are combined, juxtaposed, extended, and in the same key (see example 14). Through the use, reuse, and organization of thematic material, Berlioz has managed to create a unified and coherent structure that resembles traditional forms—precisely the opposite of the approach taken by Liszt.

On its own terms the “Scène d’amour”—with its allusions to traditional forms and clear tonal structures—contains little that might be immediately deemed as literary. But even upon a single hearing, the music certainly expresses some type of meaning, albeit the type of general emotional expression that any nineteenth-century symphonic piece might evoke. According to Vera Micznik, Berlioz’s *genre instrumental expressif* “invokes complex recognizable signs, or figures, which communicate the general ideas conventionally associated with particular musical formations” and that these embedded

²⁸ Berlioz, “*Avant propos*,” *New Berlioz Edition*, vol. 18, 383.

“conventional meanings . . . although not actually present in a concrete, physical sense, allow transmission of verbal concepts, or in other words, make music ‘speak’ more precisely within the nonverbal medium of instrumental music.”²⁹

Thus, Berlioz’s use of “topics” in the “Scène d’amour” creates an essence of emotional exchange that is free of its literary source. In other words, we do not have to know Shakespeare’s scene nor the title of the work and movement to understand the types of general feeling this music expresses. However, knowing the verbal detail offered by the rest of the work as well as that by Shakespeare’s allows us to infer more specific meaning. In the “absolute” sense, Berlioz creates an allusion of a conversation not only through frequent use of recitative-like passages (example 15) but also through declamatory melodic material played by the violas (example 10). His orchestration also suggests verbal interchange both through the ranges he uses to distinguish voice types (as noted by Rushton and Kemp) and through the number of instruments that play a melody. Frequently only one instrument or one instrument type plays primary thematic material, implying that this is a quiet and intimate scene. In the midst of all this quietness, solitude, and nocturnal ambiance, arises a soaring, passionate melody (B in my diagram, first statement shown in example 11), that, as shown in my formal diagram of the movement, recurs throughout the movement to reinforce this feeling.

Having established this implicit musical meaning, Berlioz can relay specific details and ultimately a program by placing this music in a verbal context that in itself contains specific meaning: both the context of the rest of the movement and work, as well as the Shakespearean context. As was discussed earlier, the choral section that opens the movement sets the stage for the instrumental section that follows, conveying the time of

²⁹ Micznik, 33.

day and location where the movement takes place. The instrumental section of the *Scène d'amour* also takes on more specific meaning when examined in the context with the rest of the work. Berlioz's choral prologue offers the most precise detail about the events depicted in the rest of the symphony by connecting future musical material with text that describes the action of events. For example, we hear the B theme from the "Scène d'amour" just as the chorus sings "Romeo trembling with anxious joy/ Reveals himself to Juliet, and from her heart/ The flames leap up in response" (see example 16).³⁰ Thus, having heard this music in this context where meaning—thanks to words—is very specific, we will associate any recurrence of this material with Romeo and Juliet declaring their love to one another.

Keeping all these immediate verbal contexts in mind, we can yet understand the movement in relation to its macro-context and as noted in Chapter 3, the impetus for the work: Shakespeare's play. From our knowledge of the play and especially this most famous scene, we know that Juliet begins the scene speaking to herself, unaware that Romeo is below her balcony listening. Remembering the quiet, sparsely orchestrated, declamatory melodies that open the musical scene, we can make this literary context provided by Shakespeare fit with this music, a combination that allows for the expression of specific details out of the inherent expression that is already there. When Juliet discovers the eavesdropping Romeo, she is startled—a change that the music also takes in to account (theme C, example 12) through the change in texture, thematic material, instrumentation, and tonality. Interestingly, though, these abrupt changes that seem so fittingly to describe Juliet's astonishment, also delineate the movement to the development of this quasi-sonata form structure. What before simply represented passion

³⁰ Deschamps's libretto, in Rushton, 92.

and the essence of an emotional exchange and met musical formal expectations, now conveys specific details about characters, plot, and setting, and most importantly, furthers the narrative structure. Thus, unlike Rushton and Kemp who seem to try and make Berlioz's music fit the Shakespeare, my interpretation of this movement derives first and foremost from the music itself. Only after assessment of Berlioz's formal procedures and use of topics can we determine any connections between the music and the program. Because the topics that Berlioz employs fit the emotions conveyed in the narrative so well, inferring extra-musical meaning from the movement is unavoidable if the contexts of the movement, work, and play are realized.

In summary, Liszt and Berlioz's formal approaches are as different as the types of literary meanings they convey. Ironically, the *Scène d'amour*—the work that most closely follows its literary source and subsequently conveys the narrative structure of Shakespeare's play—employs many traditional musical formal devices, such as thematic and harmonic elements of sonata and rondo forms. *Hamlet*, on the other hand, in its lack of literary narrative, contains no allusions to any traditional forms. As was discussed earlier, its musical form—characterized by contrasting sections that restate and transform previously heard thematic material—is governed by the poetic *idea* of the hero's psychological transformation that Liszt extrapolated from the play. It contains none of the harmonic and tonal motion necessary to delineate any recognizable form. Thus, while Berlioz manipulates traditional forms within the context of choral sections and movements throughout *Roméo et Juliette* as a whole to create his extra-musical meaning, Liszt allows his extra-musical idea to govern his musical formal processes—an unconventionality that certainly makes no reference to traditional musical forms.

Before a comparison of the two composers' approaches can be complete, a general comparison must be made between the works and their corresponding literary sources. This type of examination further supports my interpretations about what their works convey from the Shakespeare. Both Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* contain events and characters that Liszt and Berlioz chose not to depict in their corresponding Shakespearean compositions. But when comparing the percentage of plot elements that *are* depicted in the two works, *Roméo et Juliette* clearly represents a greater number of the characters and events than *Hamlet*. In *Hamlet* the only characters that are obviously represented are Hamlet, Ophelia, and either Polonius or Claudius, while in *Roméo et Juliette* not only are all of the main characters clearly represented (including Romeo, Juliet, Friar Lawrence, the Prince, Mercutio, and the two families), Berlioz also includes very minor characters such as the people returning home from the ball in the *Scène d'amour*. Furthermore, Liszt portrayed far fewer events in *Hamlet* than Berlioz in *Roméo et Juliette*, with the only clear depictions being Hamlet's rise to action, his seeing Ophelia, his murderous deed, and being killed. Berlioz, on the other hand, sets the majority of the events in the play to music (see Table 4).³¹ Again, a comparison of the two composers' decisions about what to depict from the Shakespeare yields the same distinction: Berlioz's composition more closely follows its literary source than Liszt's.

³¹ The reason that some of the events of *Roméo et Juliette* differ from that of *Romeo and Juliet* is because Berlioz and Deschamps worked primarily from what they saw that night at the Odéon performance in 1827. At this performance, the rewritten version of *Romeo and Juliet* of David Garrick, a late eighteenth century actor and director, was performed. This more "romanticized" version was preferred to the original by early nineteenth-century actors and audiences because Juliet awakens in time to see Romeo alive and have a brief union before his poison takes effect. Garrick's version also includes a scene where Romeo is seen wandering alone on the stage and thus explains the *Roméo seul* movement.

Judging the merits of these compositions by their degree of adherence to their corresponding literary sources, though, is not my goal. What these interpretations of Shakespeare in music ultimately illustrate are different approaches to composing program music. What I hope to have demonstrated in this discussion is that Berlioz's musical representation is more literal than Liszt's. From Berlioz, we have learned that music can indeed accompany a drama without being "incidental," and with the right forces music *can* indeed tell a story. Due to its sheer length, use of written and sung words that narrate action and provide settings, and through a clearer delineation of different characters and events through instrumentation and form in the music, *Roméo et Juliette* comes closer than *Hamlet* in telling the story of a Shakespearean tragedy. Berlioz's approach not only exemplifies his theories on music and particularly on what music is capable of expressing, but also his personal experiences with Shakespeare. In "setting" all that he heard and saw on the fateful night at the Odéon, he was able (and sought) to recreate the story of two young lovers facing formidable odds—an experience with which he certainly came to identify with in his relentless wooing of Harriet Smithson. Through this comparison of these two exemplary works, we have also seen that programmatic music does *not* always retell a story. Just because a piece is programmatic does not mean that there is an underlying plot being conveyed. From Liszt's *Hamlet*, one can see that programmatic music can also be about a concept inspired by an extra-musical source. In his Shakespearean composition, Liszt instead focused on one aspect of the drama to develop in his single movement composition—that of the character of Hamlet and the transformation that he undergoes. Just as *Roméo et Juliette* is exemplary of Berlioz's

experiences, *Hamlet* too reflects Liszt's contention that music best represents feeling rather than actions and his desire to create a new type of music that unifies the arts.

Chapter 6

Conclusions: Berlioz and Liszt and Nationalism and Aesthetics

This examination of Berlioz and Liszt's personal encounters with Shakespeare and their philosophies on the expressive capabilities of music has yielded a more subtle distinction between the approaches of two composers whose music is often simply grouped together as "programmatic." A close comparison of the approaches employed in *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet* has demonstrated that not only were Berlioz and Liszt's ideas about how to compose program music strikingly different, but also that the type of meaning that they wanted to convey derived from the composers' personal Shakespearean experiences. As shown in chapters 2 and 3, the roots of the two composers' encounters with and interpretations of Shakespeare lay in France and Germany's literary traditions. Thus, any conclusions made about the various approaches of nineteenth-century programmatic music composers must also take national music traditions into account. As two of the leading Romantic artists active in France and Germany, Berlioz and Liszt must also be examined in this context.

The most obvious distinction between the national musical traditions of France and Germany in the early nineteenth century lies in the type of music that was most often composed and preferred by audiences. While French musical life continued to revolve around opera, Germany promoted and fostered its own tradition of orchestral music. As

the small number of instrumental composers from the time indicates, nineteenth-century France was not a hotbed for symphonic music composition. Despite all of the Romantic ideals circulating among leading literary figures of the time, these revolutionary currents did not infiltrate music until much later in the century. Thus, mainstream musical life in Paris existed in much the same way it did during the eighteenth century: as a center of operatic composition and patronage. Germany, of course, was still reeling in the aftermath of Beethoven's monumental impact on its musical life. With the help of Haydn and Mozart, Beethoven undoubtedly elevated symphonic composition to the genre *par excellence* for German musicians, simultaneously securing Germany's position as the leading proponent of instrumental music in Europe. Like Goethe, Herder, and the Schlegels, who sought to distance themselves from other European traditions by establishing their own national theatre style, German composers similarly found their own distinct national music tradition in the symphony.

France and Germany's differing national traditions illustrate one important distinction that affected Berlioz and Liszt's personal compositional approaches and that has continually surfaced in this study: the use or absence of words in compositions influenced by a literary work. As was discussed in chapter 4, Berlioz clearly felt that words were necessary to convey the specific meaning that he wanted his compositions to express. While the manifestation of this philosophy in his music certainly distinguishes him from many other composers of instrumental music—especially Liszt—, this proclamation of the necessity of words as well as the need to convey specific meaning has its roots in late eighteenth-century French aesthetics. In other words, reliance on words as well as preference for clear meaning was simply part of French taste. In his

discussion of musical life in eighteenth-century Paris, James Johnson states that opera audiences and critics measured the artistic worth of music by its capacity to imitate.

Listeners in Paris in the middle years of the century spoke of musical expression in terms of images or recognizable sounds, with music painting its particular meaning. To them, music presented a clear picture in a one-to-one correspondence of tone to image or it had no expression at all.¹

For these audiences, then, expression was of the utmost importance. One contemporary critic wrote that “if we cannot understand the sense of the expressions music contains it has no wealth for us.”² The philosophers Diderot and Rousseau also believed that discernible meaning was of the utmost importance, both having little patience for music without clear images.³ Due to the overwhelming emphasis on the content of librettos in discussions of opera and the commonly held contention that “beautiful words are the first foundation of beautiful music,” critics and audiences undoubtedly thought this “wealth” could only be achieved through words.⁴ Thus, because these audiences and critics, in their proclamation that “sounds by themselves are incapable of representing anything other than sound,” placed the burden of expression upon the text.⁵ These eighteenth-century French aesthetics—determining the artistic worth of music by its expression, the predilection for conveying specific meaning, and the reliance on words to meet these

¹ James H. Johnson, *Listening in Paris: A Cultural History*, Studies on the History of Society and Culture, ed. Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 35-36.

² Charles Batteux, *Les Beaux-arts réduits à un meme principe* (Paris: Durand, 1746), 266-67; quoted in Johnson, 37.

³ Johnson, 39.

⁴ Jean-Laurent Lecerf de la Vièlle, *Comparaison de la musique italienne et de la musique francaise*, quoted in Georges Snyders, *Le Gout musical en France aux XVII et XVIII siècles* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1968), 25; quoted in Johnson, 36.

⁵ Abbé d’Arnauld, *Reflexions sur la musique en général, et sur la musique francaise en particulier* (n.p., 1754), 25; quoted in Johnson, 38.

standards—undoubtedly prefigure Berlioz's ideas on the merits of music and compositional approach.

With the opera reform of the late eighteenth-century, manifested in the highly successful works of Gluck and the growing number of orchestral music concerts, Parisian audiences began to react against this previous predilection for imitation in French opera. By the 1830s and full maturity of Berlioz, critics and listeners commonly rejected any music that contained prescribed, specific meaning, instead valuing music that inspired individual interpretations. The critic F. J. Fétis wrote that the “immense superiority of music over the other arts is in the marvelous variety of feelings that strike each individual differently.”⁶ Manifestations of these types of sentiments were of course heralded by leaders of the contemporary literary rebellion when writers such as Hugo, Chateaubriand, and later George Sand, in distancing themselves from past literary traditions, espoused the significance of the individual.

Berlioz and his approach to composition straddles both this older French tradition of using words to transmit a specific meaning and the newer aesthetic that valued purposeful ambiguity in music that allowed listeners to contrive their own individual meanings. His use of words in most of his orchestral works—whether written as in *Symphonie Fantastique*, spoken as in *Lélio*, or sung as in *Roméo et Juliette*—to express such specific meaning as a story certainly places him in this older tradition. Contemporary critics recognized this aspect of Berlioz's work, often criticizing him for being a traditionalist in “this time of mastering the new perspective, of exploring its implications and experimenting with ways of capturing and conveying music's

⁶ F.J. Fétis, “Des Sensations musicales” *Revue musicale* (25 Feb. 1832): 26; quoted in Johnson, 275.

meaning.”⁷ For example, one reviewer of the *Symphonie Fantastique* castigated Berlioz for “writing on the notice [the written program] all that he wanted to paint” rather than leaving listeners to their own “vague and infinite reveries.”⁸ This study has also demonstrated the degree of personal expression that Berlioz incorporated into his compositions. This focus on personal feelings throughout his *Mémoires* and through the intertwining of his own life with literary figures, both in his writings and music, follows the early nineteenth-century French aesthetic emphasis on the individual.

Roméo et Juliette is the exemplary culmination of this combination of aesthetic approaches. While the sung words in the beginning and end of the work convey specific meaning by relaying the plot, locale, and characters of Shakespeare’s tragedy, the inner orchestral movements (such as the *Scène d’amour*) provide that dramatic ambiguity that allows for individual interpretation. As the numerous contrasting analyses of the “*Scène d’amour*” attest, Berlioz did indeed succeed in allowing for individual interpretation. Whatever we may be able to interpret from the “*Scène d’amour*,” the overall, generalized meaning we discern in the work just by its title, subtitles, and mood further reflects Berlioz’s modernity. Both associating a symphony with a literary work and using such an unprecedented form and genre was in themselves avant-garde. Furthermore, the symphony conveys the type of tragic love story that French Romantics idealized because of its assertion of the individual against repressive society. According to Jacques Barzun, the combination of “art and love [signified] the individual at war with society. The

⁷ Johnson, 270.

⁸ *L’Artiste* (1ère serie., t.13, 1837): 294-95; quoted in Johnson, 272.

greater the love, the fiercer the war.”⁹ Thus, the very inspiration and foundation for Berlioz’s work was in itself not only a personally moving story to him, but it also represented contemporary French aesthetics.

Like the French preference in the 1830s for music that allowed for individual interpretation, German aesthetics in the early nineteenth century rejected music that contained definite and specific meaning. Franz Brendel, who coined the term “New German School” and promoted its ideals, proposed that music should only convey a “general idea, while leaving the particular to the free play of the imagination.”¹⁰ Like the French critic Fétis, Schumann chastised Berlioz for providing a written program for *Symphonie Fantastique*:

Berlioz himself has told us in an accompanying program note what it is all about. As a German, I can only say that he might have spared himself—and us. There is something unseemly and charlatan-like about such guideposts. . . . In a word, the German, with his sense of tact and his distaste for intimate detail, does not like such explicit instruction. . . . One prefers to be spared the intimacies of the genius’ workshop—the origin of creation, the tools, and the secrets. . . . So let the artist keep his labor pains to himself. God knows what monstrous things might be disclosed to us could we but witness the moment of conception of every work of art!¹¹

Not wishing to criticize a work that, after initially astonishing and horrifying him, eventually filled him with “wonder and admiration,” Schumann attributed Berlioz’s specific program to French preferences:

⁹ Jacques Barzun, “Introduction” in *Music in Paris in the Eighteen-Thirties*, ed. Peter Bloom, Musical Life in 19th-Century France, vol. 4 (Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1987).

¹⁰ Franz Brendel, *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland and Frankreich: Von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, 2nd ed, vol. 2 (Leipzig: H. Matthew, 1855), 244-45; quoted in Berthold Hoeckner, *Programming the Absolute* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 167.

¹¹ Robert Schumann, “Berlioz’s *Sinfonie Fantastique*” (1835), in *Robert Schumann: A Selection from the Writings*, trans. and ed. Henry Pleasants (New York: Dover, 1965), 84-85.

Berlioz was writing for his own French compatriots, of course, who are little impressed by ethereal modesty. I can picture them sitting there, reading the program note and applauding their countryman for having got it all down so trenchantly; the music itself concerns them not at all.¹²

Schumann's comments confirm the differences between French and German aesthetics in the early nineteenth century. Whether or not Schumann was aware of changes in French preferences by the 1830s (which of course stemmed from the ideas of early German literary Romantics), he, clearly distinguishes German musical tastes from traditional French preferences.

As was discussed in Chapter 2, this acknowledgement of and call for a separation between French classicism and new German Romantic ideals yielded the development of a German national artistic persona. This search for national identity in music manifested itself most prominently in the development and reiteration of the German symphonic tradition. The ramifications of Beethoven's music on later nineteenth-century composers have been well explored and supported by many scholars, but one of the most important Beethovenian affects that became a national standard was the desire for breaking artistic barriers. In other words, exhibiting individuality was in itself a German aesthetic preference. Whether following in the footsteps of Beethoven or trying to distance themselves to avoid comparison with so great a giant, German symphonic composers throughout the nineteenth century continued to search for new ways to exert individuality in music and ultimately distinguish and elevate German music. As was discussed in Chapter 4, unifying music with the other arts was a way for composers to create new forms and genres and thus continue to set the precedent for symphonic composition

¹² Ibid., 85.

throughout Europe. At the heart of this constant search for individuality lay the very premise of a new national style.

This German preference for individuality also emphasized another important but somewhat contradicting aesthetic: the need for the arts to have meaning for the masses. According to Berthold Hoeckner, while nineteenth-century music should exude Germanness, it at the same time should “transcend its Germanness and become universal.”¹³ Many German philosophers and critics felt the need for a universal art was a result of the problems with language. Kant focused on the inadequacies of spoken and written words in expressing aesthetic ideas, stating that “no language can express [them] completely and allow us to grasp it.”¹⁴ Wagner similarly expressed his ideas on the shortcomings of language, noting that all of the different world languages of his modern Europe prevent many people from communicating with each other. By creating an art form that transcends language, people would again be able to share emotion and achieve a power of expression as in the supposed primitive time before the divergence of European languages. This art form—which he concludes is music—would allow spoken and written thought to “entirely dissolve into feeling,” and ultimately allow all the world to “become *knowers* through . . . *feeling* [his italics].”¹⁵

In order for this inherently abstract art to communicate sentiment and feeling that is applicable and accessible to the masses, it must have a foundation or underlying context that can be understood by all. In absolute music, this context exists in the syntax

¹³ Hoeckner, 3.

¹⁴ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, trans. Werner S. Pluhar (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987), 182; quoted in Hoeckner, 6.

¹⁵ Richard Wagner, *Wagner on Music and Drama: A Compendium of Richard Wagner's Works*, selected and arranged by Albert Goldman and Evert Sprinchorn, trans. H. Ashton Ellis (New York: Da Capo Press, 1981), 153, 188, 189.

of the music itself—usually through specific formal, melodic, and harmonic events that work together to create a coherent whole. Derived from the ideas of Herder and Friedrich Schlegel, this desire to understand the relationship between particular events and the larger whole is another facet of nineteenth-century German aesthetics that affected musical composition and criticism¹⁶ However, many recognized that nineteenth-century audiences comprised the growing middle class—people who only understood and participated in music at an amateur level. Thus, program music was particularly important in this discourse because it tosses another element into the purely musical commixture—an extra-musical event—that provides the listener with another, but more discernible and definite context or whole. When the listener knew the given programmatic context then he or she could contrive informed interpretations of the various parts (the musical elements all working together) to understand the greater whole. This relationship is analogous to the German simultaneous promotion of the individual (whether it be the individual interpretations the listener creates or the individuality of the composer's abilities) and desire to express feeling that can be understood universally.

Liszt's ideas about program music and their realization in *Hamlet* closely echo all of these facets of nineteenth-century German nationalism and aesthetics. On the broadest level, the symphonic poem was Liszt's response to the proliferation and continued evolution of the German symphonic tradition. More specifically, by drawing on extra-musical material he was able to create a genre that not only provided a context that was accessible to all, but one that also allowed him to exert his own individuality, both in his personal response to the literary work (in the case of *Hamlet*) and through the use of innovative formal processes, and thus fulfilling German expectations that the program not

¹⁶ Hoeckner, 5.

be too specifically depicted. According to the nineteenth-century German philosopher and follower of Hegel, Eduard Krüger, “typically German art concentrates exclusively upon the character of the subject.”¹⁷ Thus, in focusing on just one slightly ambiguous aspect of the tragedy Liszt’s approach again reflects a full assimilation of German musical style as well as aesthetics.

The striking correspondences between Berlioz and Liszt’s individual ideas and France and Germany’s national traditions and aesthetics demonstrate that a combination of factors worked together to create their differing approaches to “setting” a Shakespearean play. I do not claim that any one of these factors was the primary influence on the programmatic compositional procedures for *Roméo et Juliette* and *Hamlet*, but rather that all of these different facets—whether they be the composers’ individual ideas and biographies or national musical preferences—coexisted and interacted to create an impetus for their approaches. Recent trends in musicology insist that meaning in music should be determined through examination of not only the notes on the score, but also contemporary historical, social, political, aesthetical contexts, and the composer’s interaction with these larger contexts. My interpretation of Berlioz and Liszt’s compositional approaches and their Shakespearean compositions has attempted to reflect these current standards by examining as many facets as possible. Unlike the music critic, Pestov, from *Anna Karenina*, I, in the process of this study, have not found all the answers to the *King Lear Overture* in just the music and written program.

¹⁷ Eduard Krüger, “The Relationship Between Beauty and Character,” from “Hegels Philosophie der Musik,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, vol. 17 no.10 (22 July- 23 August 1842): 39-40, in Peter le Huray and James Day, ed., *Music and Aesthetics in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth-Centuries*, abridged edition, Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Music (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 362.

In the course of this study I have marveled at the complex relationship between the programmatic piece and its literary source. While each can stand on its own and have the inherent meaning that exists within the confines of its own medium—that is, the music itself has musical meaning without the literary source and vice versa—the two artworks, when unified, create an intersection that is difficult to pinpoint. Perhaps it is this indeterminate and ambiguous ground that has led to so many varying interpretations of programmatic pieces. Thus, in my study I have attempted to illuminate some of these different facets that intermingle to create a musical and literary unified structure. I do not propose that one correct interpretation exists for a programmatic piece because instrumental music in itself is ambiguous—a feature that both Berlioz and Liszt pondered frequently. What I do maintain, though, is that our interpretations can be more informed if we take into account the composer's approaches, focusing especially on the aspects that form these approaches. In the case of Berlioz and Liszt and their Shakespearean pieces, we can understand their approaches through examination of their personal encounters with Shakespeare, their countries' reception of Shakespeare and musical traditions and aesthetics, and their individual philosophies about creating meaning in music. Like Levin, we must also earnestly search for a guide—not a written programme as he did in *Anna Karenina*—, but rather the more complex guide provided by the composer's biography and philosophy and national aesthetics and traditions.

Appendix 1

Table 1: Overall structure of Romeo et Juliette

Part	Movement	Descriptions/ Individual Movements	Scoring
I	Introduction	Combats Tumulte Intervention du Prince	orch. orch. orch.
	Prologue		men's chorus/ orch.
	Strophes Scherzetto		contralto solo/men's chorus/orch. tenor solo/men's chorus/orch.
II		Romeo seul Tristesse Concert et Bal Grande Fete chez Capulet	orch. orch. orch. orch.
III	Scene d'amour	Nuit sereine Le Jardin de Capulet silencieux et desert. Adagio (Scene d'amour)	men's chorus/ orch. men's chorus/ orch. orch.
IV	Scherzo	La Reine Mab, ou la fee des songes	orch.
	Convoi de Funebre de Juliette		chorus/ orch.
	Romeo au Tombeau des Capulets	Invocation Reveil de Juliette	orchestra orchestra
	Finale	Le foule account au cimetiere Rixe des Capulets et des Monagus	bass solo, chorus, orch. bass solo, chorus, orch.

Table 2: Thematic Analysis of Hamlet

Theme	A	B	A	A	A
Programmatic Title	"To Be"	"call to action"	"To Be"	"To Be"	"To Be"
Description		fragments of A	chromatic scalar passages in acc.	fragments of rhythm	diminished 7th chord of A developed,
Key area	B major	B minor	B minor---transitory B Minor		ambiguous
mm.	1--8	9--32	33-40	41-50	50-73

Theme	A	C	D	C	D
Programmatic Title	"To Be"	"Hamlet"	"Ophelia"	"Hamlet"	"Ophelia"
Description	fragmented theme, acc. by ascending runs		winds, violin only	fragmented	winds, violin only
Key Area	ambiguous---V ped.	B Minor--D Minor--A flat Minor	C sharp minor	A flat Minor	E Major
mm.	74-102	103-159	160-175	176-201	202-217

Theme	B and C	E and C	A	A and C	C
Programmatic Title	"action and "Hamlet"	"Duel" and "Hamlet"	"To Be"	Funeral March	Funeral March
Description	themes juxtaposed more impassioned	C fragmented, slashing chords (Major sevenths)	literal quotation of opening	both themes fragmented and juxtaposed	C is augmented and fragmented
Key Area	C minor, A flat Minor-- B minor--E flat Major		B minor	D minor	B Minor
mm.	218-283	284-337	338-345	346-360	360-375

Theme	A and C
Programmatic Title	"To Be" and "Hamlet"
Description	return to mood of opening, A is disrupted by fragments of C
Key Area	B Minor
mm.	375-388

Table 3: Analysis of "Scene d'amour" from Scene d'amour

	Section 1				Section 2			
Tempo	Adagio	Un pochetto animato	Tempo 1	Animato	Allegro agitato		Un poco meno vivo	
Melodic Material	A	B	A(1)	B(1)	C (develops half step motive from A, originally played by flutes)		Recitative-like	
Scoring	viola/ cello	cello/ Eng. Horn	cello	cello/ viola with Eng. Horn/ bassoon	winds		cello	
Key	A major	C sharp minor	A major	C major	C major		A major	
Measure numbers	125-144	144-154	155-168	169-181	182-204		205-219	
	Section 3				Section 4			
Tempo	Agitato	Adagio	A tempo					
Melodic Material	C(1)	D (m.250)	D and B intertwined	Episodic	Episodic	D and B(1)	D and B(1)	D and B(2) phrase prolonged
Scoring	winds	flute/ Eng.horn	strings			violin	flute/ clarinet violin interruptions	violin/ then cello
Key mm.	C major 220-243	F sharp minor--A major 243-274	A major 274-291	unstable 292-299	E Major 300-319	A major 320-332	A major 333-339	A major 340-348

Tempo				animato un poco	piu animato				
Melodic Material	pause	D and B (partial)	Episodic		B and D(3)	B and D(3) Episodic	B (fragmented)	Codetta	
Scoring		violin			flute/ oboe/ clarinet with string	strings/ bassoon	clarinet/violin/ cello		
Key mm.		A major 349 350-354	E flat major 355-357	modulating 358-359	B minor 362-366	E Major 367-371	modulating 372-375	A major 375-380	A major 381-388

Table 4: Comparison of events in *Romeo and Juliet* with that of *Roméo et Juliette*

<u>Play</u>	<u>Symphony</u>
Act I	No. 1 <i>Combats, tumulte. . .</i>
Prologue	Strife, intervention of the Prince
Strife, intervention of the Prince	Prologue
Rome and friends	No.2 <i>Roméo seul</i>
Mercutio's Queen Mab speech	
Ball at Capulet's	<i>Grande fete chez Capulets</i>
Act II	
Garden, Love Scene	No. <i>Scène d'amour</i>
The marriage	
	No. 4 <i>La reine Mab</i> (Scherzo)
Act III	
Death of Mercutio,	
Romeo kills Tybalt and is banished.	
Love-scene in Juliet's room.	
Juliet betrothed to Paris.	
Act IV	
Juliet takes potion and appears dead.	No. 5 <i>Convoi funèbre de Juliette</i>
Act V	
Romeo to the tomb, kills Paris, takes poison, dies.	No. 6 <i>Roméo au tombeau</i> : Romeo takes poison, Juliet awakens, brief reunion, Romeo dies.
Juliet awakens, stabs herself, dies.	Juliet stabs herself, dies.
Friar Lawrence's narration	No. 7 Friar Lawrence's narration:
Prince forces reconciliation.	Friar forces reconciliation.

Example 5: Theme E, mm. 294-299

294

Kl. Fl.

Fl.

Hb.

Cl. (A)

Fg.

Cor. (E)

Tbe. (E)

Tps.

Hps.

Tb.

mit Holzschlageln

Pk.

sehr kurz
molto secco

1. V.

2. V.

Br.

Ve.

Kb.

1. V.

2. V.

Br.

Ve.

Kb.

dimin.

dimin.

pp

pp

E. E. 8686

Example 6: Theme C in Funeral March, mm. 360-368

44 360 T

Fl. (P) lugubre len. len. len.

Cl. (A) (P) lugubre len. len. len.

Fl. G (P) lugubre len. len. len.

Cor. (E) (P) lugubre len. len. len.

1. V. marcato marcato marcato

2. V. marcato marcato marcato

Vi. marcato marcato marcato

Cello marcato marcato marcato

Kb. marcato marcato marcato

T len. len. len. poco rit. dimin.

Cl. (A) len. len. len. dimin.

Fl. G len. len. len. dimin.

Cor. (E) len. len. len. dimin.

1. V. len. len. len. dimin.

2. V. len. len. len. dimin.

Vi. len. len. len. dimin.

Cello len. len. len. dimin.

Kb. len. len. len. dimin.

K. Z. 3444 poco rit. dimin.

Example 7: Themes A and C at the beginning of the Funeral March, mm. 346-359

A

338 R Sehr langsam und düster (wie Anfangs).
Molto lento e lugubre (come primo).

Full orchestral score for Theme A, measures 338-359. The score is written for a full orchestra, including strings, woodwinds, brass, and percussion. The tempo and mood are indicated as "Sehr langsam und düster (wie Anfangs)" and "Molto lento e lugubre (come primo)". The score includes various dynamics such as *pp*, *ppp*, *pp sempre*, and *pp perdendo*. Performance instructions include "staccato", "schwankend recitativo", "gastopft", and "mit Mehrwortschlageln". The score is divided into two systems, with the first system ending at measure 359 and the second system beginning at measure 360.

S C
Moderato-funebre.

Full orchestral score for Theme C, measures 360-359. The score is written for a full orchestra, including strings, woodwinds, brass, and percussion. The tempo and mood are indicated as "Moderato-funebre". The score includes various dynamics such as *pp*, *ppp*, *pp sempre*, and *pp perdendo*. Performance instructions include "staccato", "schwankend recitativo", "gastopft", and "mit Mehrwortschlageln". The score is divided into two systems, with the first system ending at measure 359 and the second system beginning at measure 360.

K. K. 8080

Example 7: continued

B *A-like* 43

The musical score is arranged in two systems. The first system (measures 349-43) includes parts for Clarinet (A), Flute, Cor. (E), 1.V., 2.V., Br., Vn., and Kb. The second system (measures 44-48) includes parts for Clarinet (A), Flute, Cor. (E), 1.V., 2.V., Br., Vn., and Kb. The score is marked with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a 2/4 time signature. The first system is marked with a handwritten 'B' above the Clarinet part and 'A-like' above the Flute part. The second system is marked with 'poco rit.' above the Clarinet part and 'solo sax' below the Cor. (E) part. The score is numbered 349 at the beginning of the first system and 43 at the end of the first system. The publisher's name 'K.F. 8668' is printed at the bottom of the second system.

Cl. (A)
Fl.
Cor. (E)
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vn.
Kb.

Cl. (A)
Fl.
Cor. (E)
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vn.
Kb.

K.F. 8668

Example 8A: Theme A at the end of the Funeral March, mm. 375-377

48 **A**

375

rit. lang. (lungo)

cresc. > rinf.

Solo. (p)

Solo. (p)

pp

rit. (lungo) (p)

E. F. BARK

Example 8B: Theme A allusion at the end, mm. 382-392

47

382

Fl.
Hr.
Cl.
(A)
Bsn.
Cor.
(E)
Tbn.
(D)
Tpt.
P.
V.
Va.
Cb.

H. K. 1888

Appendix 3: *Roméo et Juliette* examplesExample 9: "Nuit sereine" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 1-9

136

3

Scène d'amour

Nuit sereine - Le Jardin de Capulet, silencieux et désert.

Les jeunes Capulets, sortant de la fête, passent en chantant des reminiscences de la musique du bal.

Allegretto (♩ = 92)

Flûtes I, II

Hautbois

Cor anglais

Clarinettes (en La) I, II

Bassons I, II

III, IV

Corn (en Mi) I

(en Fa) II

(en La haut) III

(en Ré) IV

1^{er} Chœur derrière la scène Ténors

Basses

2^{me} Chœur derrière la scène Ténors

Basses

Violons I

II

Altos

Violoncelles

Contrebasses

Allegretto

*Ce double chœur doit s'écouter au fond du théâtre ou dans un salon voisin de l'orchestre si la Symphonie est entendue dans une salle de concert. Il n'est pas nécessaire que le maître de chœur puisse voir la mesure du chef d'orchestre, il suffit qu'il puisse entendre la réplique des corns commençant à la 35^e mesure. Le chef d'orchestre devra le mouvement du chœur qu'il entendra sûrement. Il faut abaisser un ou deux instruments, violons ou altos, pour donner le ton aux choristes et les empêcher de baser, les choristes ne pouvant pendant qu'ils chantent rien entendre de l'orchestre qui joue aussi piano que possible. (H. B.)

Example 10: Theme A, "Scène d'amour" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 124-134

124 H Adagio (♩=88) (Une mesure de ce mouvement équivaut à un peu plus que deux du mouvement précédent.)

FL. *uniss.*
pp

C.A.

Cl. I (La) *pp* *I solo*

Cl. II (Mi)

Corn II (Fa)

III (La)

1^{er} Chœur
Tén.
Basses

2^{me} Chœur
Tén.
Basses

Vna

Altos *con sord.* *espressivo* *ppp*

Vlles *con sord.* *pp* *espressivo*

Cb. *pp* *pizz.*

Adagio *p*

Example 10: continued

The musical score is divided into two systems. The first system, starting at measure 129, includes staves for C.A., CL (La), I (Mi), Cors II (Fa), III (La), Vns, Altos, Vlies, and Cb. The second system, starting at measure 132, includes staves for C.A., CL (La), Bns, I (Mi), Cors II (Fa), III (La), Vns, Altos, Vlies, and Cb. The score features various musical notations including notes, rests, and dynamic markings such as *pp* (pianissimo). The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 4/4.

129

C.A.

CL (La)

I (Mi)

Cors II (Fa)

III (La)

Vns

Altos

Vlies

Cb.

132

C.A.

CL (La)

Bns

I (Mi)

Cors II (Fa)

III (La)

Vns

Altos

Vlies

Cb.

Example 11: Theme B, "Scène d'amour" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 146-153

146 *b*

FL.

CL. (La)

Cor IV (Ré)

Vns.

Altos

Vlles

Cb.

150

(Mi)

Cor I (Fa)

(La)

(Ré)

Vns.

Altos

Vlles

Cb.

poco f *sf* *un poco dim.*

poco f cresc. poco *sf*

cresc. poco a poco *sf* *un poco dim.*

p

canto espressivo

p

ppp

ppp

cresc.

* Il n'y a pas de fautes ici, cet accord est bien celui d'un $\sharp$ mineur. (H. B.)

Example 12: Theme C, "Scène d'amour" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 178-184

178 Allegro agitato (♩ = 152)

FL M

Hr

Cla

Cl (La)

Bns

(Mt)

(Fa)

Cors

(La)

(Rc)

Voa

Alto

Vles

Cb

dum.

dum.

dum.

dum.

Allegro agitato

Example 13: Theme D, "Scène d'amour" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 248-263

The musical score is presented in two systems. The first system, measures 248-259, includes parts for Flute (Fl.), Horn (Hr.), Clarinet in A (Cl. A.), Clarinet in Bb (Cl. Bb), Violin (Vln.), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vcl.), and Contrabass (Cb.). The second system, measures 260-263, includes parts for Flute (Fl.), Clarinet in A (Cl. A.), Clarinet in Bb (Cl. Bb), Violin (Vln.), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vcl.), and Contrabass (Cb.). The score features various musical notations including dynamics (p, pp, ppp, pppp), articulation (accents, slurs), and performance instructions (solo, espressivo, con sord.). A large 'D' is written above the first system, and a measure number '159' is written above the second system.

Example 13: continued

160

256 1

Fl.

Hb.

C.a.

Cl. (La)

Vna

Alto

Vlcs

Cb.

260 1

Fl.

Hb.

C.a.

Cl. (La)

Vna

Alto

Vlcs

Cb.

Example 14: Themes B and D, "Scène d'amour" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 274-385

162

274 *S* ($\text{♩} = 100$) *retenu a tempo*

Fl. *p dolce assai*

C. a.

Cl. (La) *pp*

Bns *pp*

Cor I (Mi) *soli*

Vns *poco ma dolce* *poco cresc.*

Altos *pp*

Vlles *pp*

Cb. *pp*

280

Fl. *pp*

Cl. (La) *pp*

Bns *pp*

Vns *p*

Altos *soli espressivo* *cresc.* *sf* *meno f* *p*

Vlles *soli espressivo* *cresc.* *sf* *meno f* *p*

Cb. *cresc.* *sf* *meno f* *p*

Example 15: Recitative-like material "Scène d'amour" from *Scène d'amour*, mm. 203-222

156

203 *ritard* *N* *un peu moins vite*

Fl. *p*

Hb. *p*

Cl. (La) *p*

Vns *p*

Altos *p* *pizz.*

I *senza sord.* *col carattere di recit.*

Vlcs I *p* *senza sord.* *pizz.*

II *p* *pizz.*

Cb. *p*

211 *O* *agitato*

Fl. *p* *cresc.*

Hb. *p* *cresc.*

Cl. (La) *p* *cresc.*

Vns *arco* *poco f* *ppp*

Altos *arco* *poco f* *ppp*

Vlcs I *poco f* *ppp*

II *poco f* *ppp*

Cb. *poco f* *ppp*

Example 16: Pre-Quote of "Scène d'amour" from *Prologue*, mm. 91-98

B Material

K Andante con moto e appassionato assai (100)

Fl. *una.* *f* *dim.*

Hb. *f* *dim.*

Cl. (La) *f* *dim.*

Cont. *f* *dim.*

Petit Chœur
Tén. Basses *f* *dim.*

e - te Se se cou vre à Ju li et te. Et de son cœur les feux e -

Vna *f* *dim.*

Altus *f* *dim.*

I *f* *dim.*

Vlles *f* *dim.*

II *f* *dim.*

Cb. *f* *dim.*

Fl. *p*

Hb. *p*

Cl. (La) *p*

Cont. *p*

Petit Chœur
Tén. Basses *p*

ta tent à leur tour.

Vna *pizz.* *p*

Altus *pizz.* *p*

Vlles *pizz.* *p*

Cb. *pizz.* *p*

Bibliography

- Ackermann, Peter. "Absolute Musik und Programmusik: Zur Theorie der Instrumental Musik bei Liszt und Wagner." In *Franz Liszt und Richard Wagner: Musikalische und geistesgeschichtliche Grundlagen der neudeutschen Schule*. 21-27. Munich: Katzbachler, 1986.
- Adelson, Deborah. "Interpreting Berlioz's *Overture to King Lear*, Op. 4: Problem and Solutions." *Current Musicology* 35 (1983): 46-56.
- Albright, Daniel. "Berlioz's *Roméo et Juliette*: Symphonic Metamorphoses on a Theme of Shakespeare." *Journal of Musicological Research* 19 no. 2 (2000): 135-176.
- _____. *Berlioz's Semi-Operas: Roméo et Juliette et La Damnation de Faust* Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2001.
- Altenburg, Detlef. "Franz Liszt and the Legacy of the Classical Era." *19th-Century Music* 18 (summer 1994): 46-63.
- Andrews, John F., ed. *William Shakespeare: His World, His Work, His Influence*. Vol 3, *His Influence*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985.
- Arnold, Ben, ed. *The Liszt Companion*. London: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Barzun, Jacques. *Berlioz and the Romantic Century*, 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1950.
- _____. "Romeo and Juliet in Music." In *Critical Questions*, ed. Bea Frieland. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- _____. "The Meaning of Meaning in Music: Berlioz Once More." *Musical Quarterly* 66 (1980): 1-20.
- Behler, Ernst. *German Romantic Literary Theory*. Cambridge Studies in German, ed. H.B. Nisbet and Martin Swales. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Berlioz, Hector. *The Art of Music and Other Essays*. Translated and edited by Elizabeth Csicsery-Rónay. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- _____. *Correspondance générale*. 4 vols. Edited by Pierre Citron. Paris: Flammarion, 1972.
- _____. *Memoirs*. Translated and edited by Ernest Newman. New York: Dover, 1960.

- Blinn, Hansjürgen. *Shakespeare-Rezeption: Die Diskussion um Shakespeare in Deutschland*. Vol.1, *Ausgewählte Texte von 1741 bis 1788*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1982.
- Bloom, Peter, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Berlioz*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- _____, ed. *Music in Paris in the Eighteen-Thirties*. Musical Life in 19th-Century France, vol.. 4. Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1987.
- _____. "A Return to Berlioz's *Retour à la vie*." *The Musical Quarterly* 64 no.3 (1978): 354-85.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. *After Beethoven: Imperatives of Originality in the Symphony*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1996,
- _____. "Idealism and the Aesthetics of Instrumental Music at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 50 (1997): 387-420.
- Bonner, Andrew. "Liszt's *Les-Préludes* and *Les Quatre éléments*: A Reinvestigation." *19th-Century Music* 10 (1986): 95-107.
- Bowie, Andrew. "Music and the Rise of Aesthetics." In *The Cambridge History of the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Jim Samson, 29-54.
- Burgard, Peter J. "Literary History and Historical Truth: Herder__ 'Shakespeare'—and Goethe." In *Johann Gottfried Herder: Academic Disciplines and the Pursuit of Knowledge*, ed. Wulf Koepke, 61-77. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1996.
- Burnham, Scott. "Criticism, Faith, and the *Idee*: A.B. Marx's Early Reception of Beethoven." *19th-Century Music* 13 (1990): 183-192.
- Cairns, David. *Berlioz, 1803-1832: The Making of an Artist*. London: A. Deutsch, 1989. Reprint Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- _____. *Berlioz, vol. 2 1832-1869: Servitude and Greatness*. London: Penguin Press, 1999. Reprint, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Casler, Lawrence. *Symphonic Program Music and its Literary Sources*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.
- Chailley, Jacques. "*Roméo et Juliette*." *Revue de musicologie* 63 (1977): 115-122.

- Charlton, David. *E.T.A. Hoffmann's Musical Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Cockrell, Dale. "A Study in French Romanticism: Berlioz and Shakespeare." *Journal of Musicological Research* 4 (1982): 85-113.
- _____. "Hector Berlioz and 'le systeme Shakespearien.'" Ph.D diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978.
- Dalhaus, Carl. *Nineteenth-Century Music*. Translated by J. Bradford Robinson. California Studies in 19th-Century Music, ed. Joseph Kerman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Daverio, John. *Nineteenth-Century Music and the German Romantic Ideology*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1993.
- Deschamps, Emile. "Préface" to *Macbeth et Roméo et Juliette. Tragédies de Shakespeare, traduites en vers français avec une préface, des notes et des commentaires*. Paris: publisher?, 1874.
- Dömling, Wolfgang. "Die Symphonie fantastique und Berlioz' Auffassung von Programmusik." *Die Musikforschung* 28 (1975): 260-283.
- Elliott, John R., Jr. "The Shakespeare Berlioz Saw." *Music and Letters* 57 (July 1976): 292-308.
- Floros, Constantin. "Grundsatzliches über Programmusik." *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* 6 (1983): 9-29.
- _____. "Literarische Ideen in der Musik des 19 Jahrhunderts." *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, 2 (1977): 7-62.
- Friedheim, Philip. "Berlioz' *Roméo* Symphony and the Romantic Temperament." *Current Musicology* 36 (1983): 101-111.
- Gilman, Laurence. *Stories of Symphonic Music, a Guide to the Meaning of Important Symphonies, Overtures, and Tone-Poems from Beethoven to the Present Day*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1907.
- Graham, Arthur. *Shakespeare in Opera, Ballet, Orchestral Music, and Song*. Studies in History and Interpretation of Music. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1997.
- Green, Frederick C. *Literary Ideas in 18th Century France and England*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1966.

- Goethe. "Wilhelm Meister's Critique of Hamlet." In *Goethe's Literary Essays*. Edited by J.E. Spingarn and translated by Viscount Haldane. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1921.
- Gooch, Bryan N.S. and David Thatcher. *A Shakespeare Music Catalogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Habicht, Werner. "Romanticism, Antiromanticism, and the German Shakespeare Tradition." In *Shakespeare and Cultural Tradition*, ed. Tetsuo Kishi, Orger Pringle, and Stanley Wells, 243-252. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994.
- Haines, C.M. *Shakespeare in France: Criticism from Voltaire to Victor Hugo*. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.
- Hamilton, Kenneth. "Liszt." In *The Nineteenth-Century Symphony*, 142-162. New York: Schirmer Books, 1997.
- Hartnoll, Phyllis, ed. *Shakespeare in Music*. London: Macmillan, 1966.
- Hepokoski, James. "Beethoven Reception: the Symphonic Tradition," in *The Cambridge History of the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hoeckner, Berthold. *Programming the Absolute*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Hohendahl, Peter Uwe, ed. *A History of German Literary Criticism, 1730-1980*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988.
- Holomon, D. Kern. "Berlioz." In *The Nineteenth-Century Symphony*, 108-141. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Berlioz*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Hugo, Victor. "Preface to *Cromwell* (1827)." In *Movements, Currents, Trends: Aspects of Thought in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Eugen Weber, 39-62. Sources in Modern History. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992.
- _____. *William Shakespeare*. Translated by Melville B. Anderson. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1905.
- Huray, Peter le and James Day. *Music and Aesthetics in the Eighteenth and Early-Nineteenth Centuries*. Abridged edition. Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Music. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Johnson, James H. *Listening in Paris: A Cultural History*. Studies on the History of Society and Culture, ed. Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Kemp, Ian. "Romeo and Juliet and *Roméo et Juliette*." In *Berlioz Studies*, ed. Peter Bloom, 37-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Kaplan, Richard. "Sonata Form in the Orchestral Works of Liszt: The Revolutionary Reconsidered." *19th-Century Music* 7 (1984): 142-52.
- Keiler, Allan. "Liszt and Beethoven: The Creation of a Personal Myth." *19-Century Music* 12 no. 2 (Fall 1988): 116-131.
- Kemp, Ian. "Romeo and Juliet and *Roméo et Juliette*." In *Berlioz Studies*, ed. Peter Bloom, 37-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Kramer, Lawrence. *Music as Cultural Practice, 1800-1900*. California Studies in 19th-Century Music, ed. Joseph Kerman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- _____. *Music and Poetry: The Nineteenth Century and After*. California Studies in 19-Century Music, ed. Joseph Kerman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Strange Case of Beethoven's *Coriolan*: Romantic Aesthetics, Modern Subjectivity, and The Cult of Shakespeare." *Musical Quarterly* 79 (summer 1995): 256-280.
- Knittel, Kristin Marta. "Wagner, Deafness, and the Reception of Beethoven's Late Style." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 50 no.1 (Spring 1998): 49-82.
- Knodt, Eva. "Dramatic Illusion in the Making of the Past: Shakespeare's Impact on Herder's Philosophy of History." In *Johann Gottfried Herder: Language, History, and the Enlightenment*, ed. Wulf Koepke, 209-223. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1990.
- Langford, Jeffrey. "The 'Dramatic Symphonies' of Berlioz as an Outgrowth of the French Operatic Tradition." *Musical Quarterly* 69 (Winter 1983): 85-103.
- Liszt, Franz. "Berlioz und seine *Harold-symphonie* (1855)." In *Source Reading in Music History: The Romantic Era*, ed. Oliver Strunk, 106-133. New York: W.W. Norton, 1965.
- _____. *Briefe*. Edited by La Mara. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1893-1905.

- _____. *Sämtliche Schriften*. Edited by Detlef Altenburg. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1989—.
- _____. *Franz Liszt: Selected Letters*. trans. and ed. Adrian Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Locke, Arthur Ware. *Music and the Romantic Movement in Paris*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Taubner, and Co., 1972.
- Longyear, Rey M. "Liszt's Philosophical Symphonic Poems: Their Intellectual History." *The Journal of the American Liszt Society* 32 (July-Dec. 1992): 42-51.
- Lounsbury, Thomas R. *Shakespeare and Voltaire*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.
- Macdonald, Hugh. *Berlioz. The Master Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1982.
- _____. *Berlioz Orchestral Music*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1969.
- Macnutt, Richard. "An Unpublished Letter of Berlioz about 'La Reine Mab'." In *Festschrift Albi Rosenthal*, ed. Rudolf Elvers, 227-230. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1984.
- Merrick, Paul. *Revolution and Religion in the Music of Franz Liszt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Meyer, Leonard B. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Micznik, Vera. "Of Ways of Telling, Intertextuality, and Historical Evidence in Berlioz's *Roméo et Juliette*." *19th-Century Music* 24 no.1 (2000): 21-61.
- Morrow, Mary Sue. *German Music Criticism in the Late Eighteenth Century: Aesthetic Issues in Instrumental Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Murphy, Edward W. "A Detailed Program for Liszt's *Hamlet*." *The Journal of the American Liszt Society* 29 (Jan.-June 1991): 47-60.
- Newman, Ernest. "Romeo and Juliet." In *Berlioz, Romantic and Classic*, edited by Peter Heyworth, 181-185. London: Victor Gollanez, 1972.
- Newman, William. S. "Liszt's Interpreting of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas." *The Musical Quarterly* LVIII no.2 (April 1972): 185-209.

- Niecks, Frederick. *Programme Music in the Last Four Centuries: A Contribution to the History of Musical Expression*. New York: Haskell House, 1969.
- Orrey, Leslie. *Programme Music: A Brief Survey from the Sixteenth Century to the Present Day*. London: Davis-Poynter, 1975.
- Paddison, Max. "Music as Ideal: The Esthetics of Autonomy." In *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, ed. Jim Samson, 318-342. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Plantinga, Leon B. "Berlioz: Use of Shakespearean Themes." *Yale French Studies* 33 (1964): 72-79.
- _____. *Romantic Music: A History of Musical Style in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1984.
- Raby, Peter. *Fair Ophelia: Harriet Smithson Berlioz*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Ralli, Augustus. *A History of Shakespearean Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Ramann, Lina. *Franze Liszt: Als Künstler und Mensch*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1880-1894.
- Rose, Michael. *Berlioz Remembered*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 2001.
- Rosen, Charles. *The Romantic Generation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Rushton, Julian. *Berlioz: Roméo et Juliette*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- _____. "Music and the Poetic." In *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, ed. Jim Samson, 157-177. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- _____. *The Musical Language of Berlioz*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Saffle, Michael, ed. *Analecta Lisztiana I: Liszt and His World*. Proceedings of the International Liszt Conference held at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University 20-23 May 1999. Franz Liszt Studies Series, no. 5. Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1993.
- _____. and James Deaville, ed. *Analecta Lisztiana II: New Perspectives on Liszt and His Music, Essays in honor of Alan Walker's 65th Birthday*. Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1997.

- _____. *Franz Liszt: A Guide to Research*. Garland Composer Resource Manuals, no. 29. New York: Garland, 1991.
- _____. *Liszt in Germany 1840-1845: A Study in Sources, Documents, and the History of Reception*. Franz Liszt Studies, no. 2. Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1994.
- Samson, Jim. "Nations and Nationalism." In *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, ed. Jim Samson, 568-600. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Sanford, Gordon Thomas. "The Overtures of Hector Berlioz: A Study in Musical Style." Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1964.
- Schindler, Anton. *Beethoven as I Knew Him*. Translated by Constance S. Jolley and edited by Donald W. MacArdle. New York: W.W. Norton, 1966.
- Schnapp, Friedrich. "Franz Liszts Stellung zu Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 61 (1925): 67-80.
- Searle, Humphrey, ed. and trans. *Hector Berlioz: A Selection from His Letters*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1966.
- _____. "The Orchestral Works." In *Franz Liszt: The Man and His Music*, ed. Alan Walker, 279-317. New York: Taplinger, 1970.
- _____. "The Weimar Years." In *The Music of Liszt*, 2^d ed. rev., 74-75. New York: Dover Publications, 1966.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Unabridged William Shakespeare*. Edited by William George Clark and William Aldis Wright. Philadelphia and London: Courage Books, 1997.
- Stendhal [Henri Beyle]. *Racine and Shakespeare*. Translated by Guy Daniels. US: Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., 1962.
- Temperly, Nicholas. "The *Symphonie fantastique* and Its Program." *Musical Quarterly* 57 (1971): 593-608.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1997.
- Tovey, Donald Francis. *Essays in Musical Analysis*. Vol. 4, *Illustrative Music*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Wagner, Richard. "On Franz Liszt's Symphonic Poems." In *Richard Wagner's Prose Works*. Trans. William Ashton Ellis, vol. 3, 236-54. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1894. Reprint, New York: Broude Brothers, 1966.

_____. *Wagner on Music and Drama: A Compendium of Richard Wagner's Prose Works*. Trans. William Ashton Ellis, selected and arranged by Albert Goldman and Evert Sprinchorn. New York: Da Capo Press, 1981.

Watson, Derek. *Liszt*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1989.

Wegeler, Franz and Ferdinand Ries. *Beethoven Remembered*. Translated by Frederick Noonan. Arlington: Great Ocean Publishers, 1987.

Whitesell, L.A. "E.T.A Hoffmann and Robert Schumann: The Blending of Music and Literature in German Romanticism." *Journal of the American Liszt Society* 13 (1998): 73-101.

Williams, Simon. *Shakespeare on the German Stage, vol.1, 1586-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Williamson, John. "Progress, Modernity, and the Concept of the Avant-Garde." In *The Cambridge History of the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Jim Samson, 287-317. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Wilson, Christopher. *Shakespeare and Music*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1977.